Anja Smith

(Re)defining the role of the foreign language learners' dictionary: Towards a concept for a phraseopragmatic GFL dictionary for French learners

Abstract: This article attempts to re-define the notion of foreign learners' dictionary on the premise that it is analysable as a social construct, by using discourse and text analytical methods combined with a primarily phraseological approach to language and foreign language (FL) learning. Following a discussion of the theoretical and ideological underpinnings of metalexicographical discourse with respect to the digital revolution, the study questions some typological issues linked to the concepts of bilingual dictionary and translation before applying the notions of dictionary- versus user-centredness to an exploratory study based on an online questionnaire concerning the role of the dictionary for FL learning. The analysis reveals the complexity of these notions as well as their interrelatedness with the terms of knowledge- vs. communication-orientedness from a function theoretical point of view. In the conclusion, the findings of the study are connected to the concept of understanding as a central didactic component both within the phraseopragmatic approach to FL learning and the re-definition of the role of the FL learners' dictionary.

Keywords: bilingual dictionaries, digital revolution, dictionary functions, GFL, learners' dictionary, phraseography, phraseopragmatics, user-orientedness

1 Initial observations and basic concepts

The general consensus regarding dictionaries is that since the arrival of the digital age, a *revolution* has taken place, leading to profound changes which affect all aspects of dictionary making and use. Many articles and books published on the subject contain phrases which imply fascination mixed with reserve or even apprehension. Thus, Zimmer (2014) reports on different reactions to the end of the print version of the *Macmillan* dictionary expressed by such opposite judgements as "a moment of liberation" on the one hand and "a sad day" on the other (p. 275–276). Zimmer's own optimistic appraisal of a situation providing "fresh opportunities for lexicographers to engage with generations coming of age in the electronic era" is nevertheless "tempered" by "an

Anja Smith, ATILF (CNRS & Université de Lorraine)**;** ATILF, 44, avenue de la Libération, F – 54000 NANCY, e-mail: anja.smith@univ-lorraine.fr, URL: https://www.atilf.fr/

understanding of how electronic formats for dictionaries and thesauruses are still a work in progress, with many growing pains along the way" (p. 276).

The frequency with which the progressive death of the print version of dictionaries is announced, nevertheless appears in almost ironic contrast with the unabated production of (printed) articles, books and metalexicographical publications on the subject. The subtitle of the supplementary volume to the three-volume-edition of *Wörterbücher – Dictionaries – Dictionnaires* (Hausmann et al. 1989–1990–1991), suggests that its publication was driven by the desire to incorporate, and thus control, "Recent Developments" by focussing "on Electronic and Computational Lexicography" (Gouws et al. 2013). In the end, the breathtaking progress of neural machine translation[1] might lead, however, not only to the end of print dictionaries but of digital dictionaries as well. After all, recent studies point to frequent use of online translation tools (OTT) such as *Google Translate* (https://translate.google.com/) or *DeepL* (https://www.deepl.com/translator) by foreign language students which, in time, may outpace the use of online dictionaries (for an overview see O'Neill 2019). This unsettling hypothesis seems less likely to prove true than might be thought, however, since the relative popularity of a wide range of scientific, commercial and "alternative e-dictionaries" (cf. Nesi 2012: 363–378) appears to contradict the assumption of decline. Besides, students' judgements regarding the quality of online dictionaries (OD) are distinctly more positive in terms of "reliability and accuracy" compared to OTT (cf. O'Neill 2019: 268–271).

Given the immense progress of OTT over the past five years, this judgement might recently have turned to OTT's advantage.[2] However, it remains unclear what is to be understood by reliability and accuracy. What assessment criteria are they based on? Do the students refer to the quality of translation, to the dictionary's role as an aid to understand and/or use a word or expression with respect to a communicative production or reception activity or, more generally, to learn a language? It is equally unclear whether reliability and accuracy represent qualities inherent to dictionaries in terms of tools, whether they can be imputed to their makers, or else, whether they reflect the (in)competencies of the students themselves. Studies targeting dictionary use suggest that students do not always know how to exploit different dictionaries to their full potential (for a critical overview see Nied Curcio 2015). Therefore, it is plausible that assessments such as the abovementioned should be viewed foremost as personal conceptions of what OTT are, compared to OD, and what their use consists of.

---

1 Neural machine translation is an advanced form of machine translation that does not simply use statistical methods but is based on neural networks that learn data in a similar way to the human brain. This AI-assisted method is used by the online translation tools *DeepL* and *Google Translate*.

2 This assumption, however, is ultimately as risky as the previous one. Heid's (2013) reflections on the impact of computational linguistics on lexicography concluded that "[i]t is always dangerous to try to come up with predictions regarding the future. [...] the prediction that printed dictionaries were a thing of the past, [...] has not stood the proof of time". Despite these reserves, Heid does not exclude the possibility of "a closer relationship between dictionaries and other information tools" (Heid 2013: 29–30).

The epistemological stance of the present study, then, is that the role of foreign language learners' dictionaries needs to be (re)defined based on the way they are conceived both by their makers and their users. This implies an inductive approach which challenges traditional typological distinctions, such as the one between monolingual and bilingual dictionaries. The confusing variety of articles in the *Encyclopedia of Lexicography* by Hausmann et al. (1989–1990–1991) containing the qualifier "bilingual" can be seen as an illustration of the difficulty in using this term for typological purposes. Hausmann's typology of bilingual specialized dictionaries (Hausmann 1991: 2877–2881) tends to confirm this diagnosis, since the article starts by pointing out the "problems of the bilingual dictionary" regarding its role in the acquisition of a foreign language. According to Hausmann, these problems are due to the necessity of having to take into account not simply the word, but the syntagmatic, contextual, phraseological unit in order to avoid wrong expressions in the target language (Hausmann 1991: 2877). Hausmann thus concludes that the basic unit of a bilingual dictionary is not the word but the phraseological unit: "Die Grundeinheit des zweisprachigen Wörterbuchs ist gar nicht das Wort, sondern die Formulierung, d.h. eine syntagmatische, kontextuelle, phraseologische Einheit" (ibid.) (The basic unit of the bilingual dictionary is, as a matter of fact, not the word, but the formula, i.e. a syntagmatic, contextual, phraseological unit).

From a phraseological and/or construction grammatical point of view, however, this necessity to posit the phraseological unit as the basic unit of a dictionary, be it mono-, bi- or plurilingual, does not appear problematic. On the contrary, phraseological and construction grammatical approaches to language are currently considered to represent valuable analytical and descriptive methods with respect to language teaching and learning leading to holistic, usage-based models of phraseographical description (see e.g. Schafroth 2014; González-Rey 2017). Sinclair's emphatic plea in favour of "the phrase, the whole phrase and nothing but the phrase" (Sinclair 2008: 407–410) expresses the deeply felt conviction that the shift from a monolexical approach of dictionary making to a multilexical approach requires perseverance and resilience. The shift requires perseverance, since the lexicographer's task in identifying "multiword meanings" (ibid.: 409) involves complex statistical analysis which have to be applied "cyclically" to be "the basis of a self-organising model which would eventually produce an exhaustive lexicon of the language" (p. 410). And the shift requires resilience, since the authority and influence of traditional Grammars have imposed a descriptive model based on the strict separation of grammar and lexis, hence "phrases have no chance": [...] "Before even being identified as phrases, they are saddled with a grammatical analysis and each word is allocated a meaning; such assignments are irrelevant and often misleading, and give the researcher a task which is completely unnecessary – to correlate these irrelevant assignments with the accepted meaning of the phrase" (p. 408).

The emotional impetus reflects the strong resistance that the Editor in Chief of the "Collins Cobuild" project probably encountered, since his theory did not merely question the monolexical approach to dictionary making and hence the assumed dominance of traditional grammar over the lexicon, but the role of the dictionary makers

themselves: By replacing parts of the meaning-description of phraseological units with the formal analysis of abstract patterns in combination with statistical methods, the lexicographers find themselves deprived of the creative pleasure of describing the meaning of these units simply through introspection.

A similar mechanism might be at work with respect to a tendency to assess the value of bilingual dictionaries as generally less important than that of monolingual dictionaries: since the meaning descriptions (sometimes called definitions) in monolingual dictionaries involve the writing of paraphrases as well as a systematic presentation of synonyms on the basis of the linguistic and lexicographic competence of the maker, they may procure a sense of personal satisfaction which cannot be supplied by a bilingual dictionary to the same extent. Regardless of the speculative character of these assumptions, they can demonstrate how lexicographical practice and theory depend on the personal views and convictions of the (meta-)lexicographer. The often polemical discussion of basic concepts such as genuine purpose and dictionary function which opposed the German lexicographer Herbert Ernst Wiegand and the Danish representatives of the theory of lexicographical functions (see e.g. Bergenholtz & Tarp 2003) reveal the existence of an intimate link between scientific axioms and personal views on both the field of study and the world in general.

In the present study, dictionaries are viewed as linguistic artefacts which can be described as social constructs emerging from oral and written interactions between lexicographers, lexicographers and experts of related fields, lexicographers and their editors, lexicographers/editors and (expert and non-expert) users as well as between users. Since, for reasons of space, not all constellations of interaction can be considered, only a selected number of aspects regarding the metalexicographical discourse produced by experts on one hand and (expert and non-expert) users on the other will be presented and discussed here. Among this limited number of aspects, the metaphoric labelling of the digital age as a revolution as well as the frequent association of the notion of bilingual dictionary with the concept of translation will be critically examined in the second part. In the third part, the focus will be on the perceptions and opinions of expert and non-expert users of dictionaries, collected by means of an online questionnaire. The fourth and final part will present a few conclusions together with a general presentation of a concept for a phraseopragmatic learner's dictionary for German as a foreign language (GFL).

The absence of consensus on the definition of learners' dictionary is probably due to conflicting linguistic and lexicographical theories (cf. Bielińska 2009), an issue going beyond the limits of the theoretical and methodological framework of the present study. Hence, the definition of the GFL dictionary in terms of a learners' dictionary must be based on a pre-theoretical, pragmatic approach. For this study, a definition in terms of a dictionary intended for learners of GFL is necessarily minimal and provisional, since the distinctive features will have to be (re)constructed from the concepts emerging from the different metalexicographical discourses produced by dictionary makers and users. Metalexicographical parameters such as dictionary type, lemma selection,

access structure, definitions, descriptive categories, overall organization of entries etc. are only considered to the extent that they occur in these discourses. The approach is radical in the sense that it questions not only the role but also the concept of dictionary as an object of metalexicographical study.

2 What is a dictionary? – Metalexicographical discourse

2.1 The digital revolution from the metalexicographers' point of view

The more or less recent developments (see above) raise the fundamental metalexicographical question of "What is a dictionary?" The considerable impact of the electronic age on the lexicographical age appears to be widely acknowledged by lexicologists and lexicographers (cf. e.g. Lew/de Schryver 2014; overview in L'Homme/Cormier 2014), yet the question concerning the exact nature of dictionaries tends to be eluded. The table of contents of the above mentioned supplementary volume by Gouws et al. (2013) can be viewed as reflecting a general tendency to displace the focus from the "What" towards the "How", namely by concentrating on specific aspects such as dictionary types and functions, dictionary subjects, research into dictionary production and use, lexicographic training etc. (cf. Gouws et al. 2013: IX–X). This phenomenon can be observed throughout the four volumes, thus pointing to the fundamental difficulty in defining the nature of dictionaries.

Some scholars manifest a certain delectation in observing the decline of print dictionaries by expressing simultaneously their delight in entering an age centred on more practical issues, namely in terms of user-friendliness/easy access and "a more pragmatic and less ideological or dogmatic view of dictionaries" (Lew/de Schryver 2014: 342). Thus, Lew/de Schryver (2014) present the "digital revolution in lexicography from the perspective of the dictionary user" (p. 341) as a liberation of "the dictionary" ([highlighted by quotation marks] ibid.) perceived as an "authority" that was "rarely questioned" and whose "often cryptic lexicographic contents" the user "was burdened with" when trying to "decipher" it (ibid.). Moreover, print dictionaries are presented as emanations of a capitalist system preoccupied by selling and opposed to any kind of change, let alone a revolution: "Centuries of lexicography saw a lot of repetition, including wholesale copying of dictionary content; change, if any, was slow and painful" (Lew/de Schryver 2014: 342). The political dimension of this criticism appears in the image of empowering which transpires through the assertion that progressive digitalization entailed an involvement of the users who "themselves started getting involved in bottom-up dictionary-making" (ibid.).

The digital revolution viewed as liberation from the chains of an authoritarian order incarnated by the dictionary as the secularised version of the Bible entails a dis-

regard for print dictionaries. It also delivers a cue to what a dictionary is, namely an object highly invested with cultural and historical value and thus exposed to iconoclastic criticism. The reason for the dictionaries' tendency to either attract censure or praise speaks to their use as aids to understand words (language) as well as things (the world). Since knowledge is power, dictionaries can be perceived as symbolic representations of whoever detains the power.

From a pragmatic point of view, dictionaries represent artefacts designed to mediate between elements of the lexicon and humans seeking to understand and use them. The specific tool of mediation consists in a description and/or illustration of the meaning of a given lexical unit, which implies that the user will have to decipher (see above) the description/illustration in the hope of accessing its meaning. In terms of communication theory and technology, we can say that lexical mediation is based on complex processes of en- and decoding messages involving the dictionary maker at one end of the communicative channel, the dictionary user at the other end and the dictionary in the middle. Viewed in this way, the dictionary fulfils two separate functions, since it does not only serve as a mediator between a specific linguistic unit and the person seeking to understand it, but also as a means of communication (i. e. channel) between the dictionary maker and its user. This distinction seems important insofar as it explains why the meaning descriptions are potentially problematic: produced by a dictionary maker who might not apply the appropriate encoding strategies, these descriptions may not ensure easy decoding and thus understanding by the user. This ultimately leads to the kind of conflict reflected by the criticism described above.

What insights can be drawn from this discussion regarding the question "What is a dictionary"? Elements for an answer can be found in the underlying assessment criteria of Lew and de Schryver's comment, which, since they are oriented towards the users' needs, can be formulated in terms of general guidelines:
- a dictionary must offer easy-to-understand meaning descriptions (no deciphering necessary);
- it must be adaptable to the user's needs (no slow and painful changes);
- its contents must be a means of empowerment of the users (no authoritarian burdening with cryptic contents);
- it must be collaborative (bottom up and not top down).

This must-do list emphasizes the prescriptive dimension of certain types of metalexicographical discourse. Less salient in the original texts, it allows us to view the intertwinement of normative and descriptive discursive elements and raises the question of metalexicographical discourse as a genre. However, this aspect will not be further commented upon since it does not directly contribute to the aim of the present study.

Distinctive features of dictionaries which can be derived from the must-do list are the following:
- user-orientedness
- accessibility (easy access to linguistic forms and meanings)

- multipurpose (adaptable to users' needs)
- empowering/empowerment
- collaborative/collaboration

This non exhaustive list can be further exploited within a frame-analytical approach: It is possible to assign the listed qualities to multiple semantic frames, among which the "TOOL-frame" appears to be particularly relevant. Another frame, equally relevant, is the "LINGUISTIC MEDIATION"-frame.

Furthermore, it should be pointed out that the above-mentioned dictionary qualities do not represent mere desiderata, but that a considerable number of online data-banks and tools, such as learning apps, bi- or multilingual online dictionaries as well as linguistic online portals, strive to meet these expectations by combining different elements such as a dictionary including a translation tool, a vocabulary trainer as well as grammatical exercises. This multipurpose aspect of digital tools has a direct impact on the way they are used by learners, resulting in new and sometimes problematic search- and learning strategies (see e.g. Müller-Spitzer et al. 2018)[3]. The frequent combination of different tools within one super-tool increases the complexity of metalexicographical research and discourse, making the task of defining the dictionary even more perilous.

2.2 Bilingual dictionaries and the concept of translation

When looking for ways to avoid problematic meaning descriptions, one solution appears to be using bi- or plurilingual dictionaries, since they present translations of lexical items into another language and thus seem to offer a more direct access to meaning by avoiding circular definition. But do translations really offer direct access to meaning? One of the frequently criticized aspects of bi- or plurilingual dictionaries concerns what are alleged to be insufficient or inadequate examples illustrating the various meanings of lexical items according to the contexts in which they are used. An insufficient number, or an inadequate choice, of examples can represent an important obstacle for a language learner to understand the meaning(s) and use of a lexical item in the target language. Thus, mere translations of often polysemic and/or polyfunctional words or expressions do not guarantee any direct access to meaning. This explains, morevover, why the issue of bilingual dictionaries is largely interconnected with translation issues, leading to discussions not only of different types of equivalence but also of the insufficiencies of bilingual dictionaries (for a critical overview see Gauton 2008; for a critical discussion from a functional perspective, see Tarp 2013: 425–430).

Within the field of FL learner metalexicography, i. e. the theory of how to make and use dictionaries to provide an aid or tool for learning a second or a foreign lan-

---

3 I thank Martina Nied Curcio for mentioning this aspect.

guage, translation represents a frequently discussed issue. Studies on dictionary use, for example, often compare the use of dictionaries and OTT (see above), but rarely question the usefulness of translation per se regarding the acquisition of FL competencies.

From the epistemological point of view of the present study, however, translation plays a minor role regarding the (re)definition of FL learners' dictionaries. The difficulties of learners in understanding and, consequently, learning a foreign language cannot be overcome simply through translation, since this very specialised type of activity requires a high level of lexico-grammatical, stylistic and intercultural knowledge. To the less proficient learner, the dictionary providing translational equivalents represents a mere "Nachschlagewerk" (reference tool, cf. Wiegand et al. 2020: 118) for a quick look up of isolated word forms. This assertion finds an echo in Kühn's critical judgement of a dictionary typology based on possibilities of use, which he justifies by opposing learning dictionaries ("Lernwörterbücher") to translation dictionaries ("Übersetzungswörterbücher"):

> Eine solche Typologie verdeckt die Kluft, die häufig immer noch zwischen potentiellen und tatsächlichen Benutzern bzw. Benutzeranlässen und -zielen besteht. [...] Im Bereich der Schullexikographie waren die sog. mehrsprachigen Grundwortschatzbücher als Lernwörterbücher konzipiert, genutzt wurden und werden sie allerdings als rudimentäre Übersetzungswörterbücher [...]. (Kühn 1989: 122)[4]

The look-up function is predominant when learners are engaged in a reception or production activity and can be associated with incidental vocabulary learning (cf. Laufer & Hulstijn 2001). Even if this form of non-intentional learning might be likely to be globally less effective compared to more awareness-raising forms (cf. Chen et al. 2021), some studies carried out on the effectiveness of incidental vocabulary learning suggest that the distinction between incidental and intentional learning is perhaps less relevant than the type of task they are associated with, such as their combination with the "construct of task-induced involvement" proposed by Laufer/Hulstijn (2001).

Regardless of the possibility that the look-up function may be detrimental to effective vocabulary learning, the discussion of factors likely to facilitate this process, such as involvement and awareness indicate that bilingual dictionaries cannot be considered as learning aids or tools on the basis of providing translational equivalents. Such an assumption would be as absurd as asserting that walking to work helps you to stay in good physical and mental health and simultaneously offering you a company car to ensure that you can get to work and back as fast as possible.

It is evident that using dictionaries merely to obtain the translation of a given word or expression defeats the object of learning a foreign language: The triumph of neural machine translation may be proof that machines can learn natural languages, but it is

---

4 English translation: Such a typology conceals the gap that often still exists between potential and actual users or user purposes and goals. [...] In the field of school lexicography, the so-called multilingual elementary vocabulary books were conceived as learning dictionaries, but they were and continue to be used as rudimentary translation dictionaries.

of little use for humans pursuing the noble yet complex and laborious task of learning a foreign language. The necessity for any (human) language learner to develop their individual set of language learning skills, independently of any easy-at-hand AI-assistance, is based on the realization that quick access to translation does not equal understanding. If understanding were a simple synonym of translation, the ubiquity of digital tools and applications providing almost instant text-to-text, text-to-voice as well as voice-to-text translations would make any effort to learn another language redundant.

Hence, a distinctive feature of a FL learners' dictionary cannot be translation, but facilitating the process of understanding by providing a maximum of information on forms, functions and use of linguistic units both in the L1 and the L2. Suggestions as to how all this information could be integrated into a model of lexicographical description will be briefly presented in chapter 4. The parallel lexicographical treatment of a linguistic unit in L1 and L2 implies that equivalents are provided, but the learner will be cognitively involved by having to choose the equivalent which is most appropriate within a specific situation and context. The function as an understanding aid does not only apply to a learner's dictionary but to any kind of dictionary:

> Le dictionnaire se conçoit [...] dès le début comme un instrument à la fois didactique et pédagogique dont la vocation est celle de servir d'aide à la compréhension. (González-Rey 2017: 28)[5].

The following observations and reflections will tackle the question of the role of bilingual dictionaries from the learners' point of view. This means that the notion of genuine purpose coined by Wiegand (1998: 299) is specified according to the function theory by Tarp and Bergenholtz (cf. e.g. Tarp 2013; Bergenholtz/Tarp 2003; Bergenholtz/Tarp 2002) in terms of a utility product (cf. Tarp 2013: 466) which, in the context of the present study, primarily concerns the use of dictionaries by non-specialist French native speakers studying German as a Foreign Language (GFL) at university.

3 The role of the dictionary as an aid for foreign language acquisition: Findings from an online questionnaire

The findings presented in this part are based on an online questionnaire which was created for the purpose of an exploratory study of teachers' and students' perceptions and opinions regarding the role of the dictionary as an aid for foreign language

---

5 English translation: The dictionary is [...] conceived from the very beginning as an instrument that is both didactic and pedagogical, whose vocation is that of serving as an aid to understanding.

acquisition[6]. It was conducted in 2023 at the University of Lorraine (France) on a relatively small scale: A total number of 34 answers were collected after a link to the questionnaire had been sent to my students, the majority of whom attended GFL classes for non-specialists, as well as to colleagues, the majority of whom are lecturers at the English department. Since the proportion of lecturers was relatively low (32%) and only two considered themselves experts in either linguistics or applied linguistics, their answers were evaluated indifferently from the rest.

The overall aim consisted in finding out which functions and qualities are generally attributed to dictionaries, but also which aspects were perceived as flawed. For reasons linked to limited space, only two out of ten questions are presented and discussed in this context, both of which were formulated as open questions.

In addition to these knowledge-oriented targets, my personal experience as a GFL lecturer at a French university represents a driving force. Having been teaching GFL to non-specialist students for many years, one major observation is that the students' linguistic competencies evolve very slowly, and that not only their grammatical (in the traditional sense of the word) but also their lexical knowledge in terms of vocabulary tends to stagnate over the years. Neither digital/online nor print dictionaries are used to their full potential. The numerous forms of vocabulary trainers, for instance, offered free of charge by many online dictionaries, are barely known of, let alone used by the students. Dictionaries are perceived as problem solvers which they mostly consult sporadically to solve translation problems, but the results are rarely successful. Convinced that the perception of dictionaries as problem solvers represents a misconception, a number of questions developed for the questionnaire are formulated to reveal the nature of dictionaries as constructs. The first question stresses the subjectivity of the definition expected: "D'après vous, qu'est-ce qu'un dictionnaire?"[7]

The analysis of the answers leads to two interrelated findings:

a) a relative balance between dictionary-centred and user-centred views;
b) a shift from the langue paradigm to the parole paradigm.

The notions of user-centred (UC) vs. dictionary-centred (DC) views are the result of a qualitative analysis of recurrent phrases as well as the underpinning frames which can be grouped into three categories: UC, DC as well as a mixed category (UC/DC). The following extracts serve as examples:

1. **UC**: *Il s'agit d'**un outil nous permettant de comprendre** le sens des mots et de nous renseigner sur ses propriétés grammaticales.* (It is **a tool that helps us understand** the meaning of the words and to gather information about their grammatical properties.)

---

[6] Original French title of the questionnaire: "Le rôle du dictionnaire dans l'apprentissage des langues étrangères".

[7] English translation: According to you, what is a dictionary?

2. **DC**: *Un recueil de définitions des principaux mots et expressions d'une langue donnée, avec des indications étymologiques et grammaticales sur ceux-ci, ainsi que des exemples d'utilisation en contexte.* (**A collection of definitions** of the main words and expressions of a given language containing etymological and grammatical indications as well as examples of use in context.)

3. **UC/DC**: *une source de référence utilisée pour découvrir le sens, l'orthographe, la grammaire, la traduction, etc. du mot* (**A reference source used to discover** the meaning, the spelling, the grammar, the translation etc. of a word.)

The definitions contain more or less fixed phrases recurring in the same or similar forms in other answers. The UC-view focuses on the TOOL-function with respect to the ultimate objective of understanding ("outil nous permettant de comprendre … " [tool enabling us to understand …]), whereas the DC-view is based on the frame of (LINGUISTIC) COLLECTION, which is materialized in the construction[8] *a collection of X.* This construction is extended by a series of specifications and adjunctions which can be represented schematically:

a collection of X (=*definitions*) + SPECIF *(=of the main words and expressions)* + SPECIF/ADJUNCT *(=of a given language containing Y and Y' <u>as well as</u> Y" of Z)*

This schematic representation is, of course, prone to misinterpretation since it does not represent the complex hypotactic structure of the definition. It is merely meant to illustrate the assumption that this type of extension represents a recurrent pattern within metalexicographical discourse.

The third category refers to answers mixing aspects of the UC with aspects of the DC view (UC/DC). This concerns roughly a third of the collected answers (27%), compared to roughly half of them reflecting a DC view (49%) and a fourth concerning a purely UC view (24%). When taking into account the number of UC views within the mixed UC/DC category, the proportion of answers containing elements of UC views rises to 51%. Even though the same calculation results in an equally high increase of the proportion of (partially) DC views, this means, nevertheless, that a small majority of the total population considers the user as a valid parameter within a definition of the dictionary.

The third example displays a distinctly less idiomatic discourse (e.g. **source de référence* vs. *outil de référence [idiom.]*) as well as incoherent juxtapositions of linguistic categories (e.g. **le sens, l'orthographe, la grammaire, la traduction*, etc.), indicating a low degree of expertise in this field. This might be related to age and professional status (students vs. lecturers), but the phenomenon is not salient enough in the data to be further examined. The example illustrates a mixed view (UC/DC) because of a double

---

8 The notion of construction refers to the definition of "Phrasem-Konstruktion" (phraseme-construction) by Dobrovol'skij (2011), which can be paraphrased in terms of a multiword lexial unit with one or several syntactic slots, such as the one discussed here (*a collection of X*). For a discussion of theoretical and methodological issues linked to this notion, see for example Mellado Blanco/Mollica/Schafroth (2022).

focus on the dictionary as reference source and on the act of using the dictionary to discover the meaning. Table 1 provides a non-exhaustive list of recurrent phrases produced by the respondents within the two frames TOOL and (LINGUISTIC) COLLECTION:

Table 1: Phrases within the TOOL- and COLLECTION-frame.

TOOL	COLLECTION
– *un outil pour/permettant de … (a tool for s.th./ enabling [the user] to …)*	– *un ouvrage/livre qui recense (l'ensemble) des mots/ définitions/ … (a work/book that lists all the words/ definitions/ …)*
– *un outil/une aide/ … qui permet de vérifier … (a tool/an aid/ … which enables [the user] to check …)*	– *un ouvrage/livre comprenant (un grand nombre de …) (a work/book containing a large number of …)*
– *un outil numérique (a digital tool)*	– *un gros livre (avec la définition de tous les mots/ expressions/ …) (a big book with a definition of all the words/expressions/ …)*
– *un outil de référence (a reference tool)*	
– *un outil/document/une aide/ … qui (nous) permet (à tous) de trouver/comprendre/rechercher/ … (a tool/document/an aid/ … enabling [us/ everyone] to find/understand/research/ …)*	– *un livre recueillant la définition/les mots/ … (a book containing the definitions/the words/ …)*
– *un outil/une aide/ … qui nous renseigne sur … (a tool/an aid/ … which informs us about …)*	– *un ouvrage/livre/ … rassemblant par ordre alphabéthique/chronologique/ … (a work/book/ … which usefully assembles [...] in alphabetical/ chronological order)*
– *une aide pour comprendre … (an aid for understanding …)*	– *un ouvrage/livre/outil qui rassemble les mots/ expressions/ … (a work/book/tool that brings together [the] words/expressions/ …)*
– *un outil/une aide/ … qui permet à tous de comprendre/trouver/ … (a tool/an aid/ … which enables everyone to understand/find/ …)*	– *mis en ordre alphabétique (listed in alphabetical order)*
– *un outil/un ouvrage/ … qui nous dépanne (lorsque …) (a tool/work/ … that helps us out [when …])*	
– *un outil qui (nous) sert à … (a tool that helps us to …)*	

It must be noted that the phrases concerning the COLLECTION-frame found in the data appear to be less idiomatic (in Sinclair's sense of the term) than the ones listed within the TOOL-frame. It is highly likely that this is due to the metalexicographical discursive frame of the dictionary-centred view, which emerged from the discussion of the construction *a collection of X* (see above). In other words, there is some evidence that this discourse produced by non-specialists represents a particular case of (non-specialist) specialist language-use.

Furthermore, it is important to point out that the mere use of the word *tool* (*outil* in French) cannot serve as a clue for the attribution of a particular sentence to either of the frames. The phrase *un outil qui rassemble les mots/expressions …* (a tool which usefully assembles words in one place[9]) belongs to the COLLECTION-frame, since the semantic

---

9 I hereby address my special thanks to my English native speaker husband to whom I owe this translation.

focus does not lie on the quality of *tool* in terms of aid for the user but on its quality as usefully assembling words in one place. Since this quality refers to the dictionary as the object of the description, it can be described as dictionary-centred. The UC-construction *outil de référence* (reference tool) represents a similar case, since it is possible to produce the DC-centred assertion *un outil de référence qui rassemble les mots* (a reference tool which usefully assembles words in one place). However, the construction *outil de référence* as a basic construction should be exclusively attributed to the TOOL-frame, since reference tool contains an implicit focus on the user performing an act of referencing.

The analysis of word counts by means of the tools provided by Sketch Engine (cf. Kilgariff et al. 2014) leads to a few noteworthy findings. The French equivalent for *word* was used almost systematically in the proposed definitions: from a total of 33 responses, 28 contain the lexical item *mot* (word). Definitions of dictionaries in terms of single word lists can be seen as based on a traditional conception which comes into conflict with a phraseological approach based on Sinclair's idiom principle (see first part). But is it true that dictionary users of the digital age adhere to a traditional conception?

Before attempting an answer to this question, it should be conceded that, given that we are adopting a phraseological approach here, employing analytical methods restricted to single word counts might seem akin to shooting oneself in the foot. This is why the answer must be regarded as speculative and will be confirmed by a more detailed analysis of the users' representations based on text analytical methods. Even though only two out of 33 answers contain a reference to multiword units, language in terms of the raw material of the dictionary is not simply viewed as a system based on a clear-cut division between the lexicon (vocabulary) on the one hand and Grammar (as a set of syntactical rules) on the other. The following terms appearing frequently in the definitions provided by the respondents indicate a pragmatic approach to language, deriving meaning (Fr: *sens*) from the contexts in which they are used:

– *usage* (use)
– *exemples* (examples)
– *outil* (tool)
– *contexte* (context)
– *sens* (meaning, mostly with respect to a particular context)

The use of these terms can be attributed to a predominantly user-oriented perspective, since they occur in responses attributed to the UC category. Does this imply a possible shift from a construct centred on the language system to a construct centred on the parole? If so, this would imply a shift from translation-oriented to understanding-oriented forms of FL learning. One result is likely to temper this speculation: The word *définition* (definition), not mentioned in the list above, occurs 16 times compared to 6 times for the word *sens* (meaning/sense) used in similar contexts. The reason for the extensive use of this term is probably due to the normative effect of its omnipresence in a wide range of disciplines, which is reflected by its frequent use both in pedagogic and scientific discourse.

Nevertheless, relatively few respondents use the word *traduction* (translation) (4 out of 33), which contrasts with the high frequency of the word *définition* (16 out of 33). Interestingly, only one respondent uses *définition* explicitly as a metalexicographical term by distinguishing between monolingual, bilingual and encyclopaedic dictionary (*par thème* [organized thematically). Most respondents, however, use this word in a more general sense that could be glossed by "explaining the meaning of (a word or expression)". For reasons of space, only one example can be given here:

> *un ouvrage qui permet de trouver l'orthographe, le genre, la définition d'un mot, ainsi qu'un contexte pour le comprendre* ('a work that helps you find the spelling, gender and definition of a word, as well as the context for understanding it')

The phrase implies that the definition alone is not sufficient and needs to be completed by one or several examples of the context to ensure full understanding. This concept of understanding is closer to language in terms of parole than in terms of langue. Since neither definitions nor translations are deemed sufficient to ensure understanding, and since only few references to translation can be found in the data, this may serve as an argument in favour of the hypothesis of a (progressive) shift to the parole paradigm.

Table 2 presents the result of a qualitative textual analysis of a selection of definitions provided by the respondents. It represents a follow-up study to the initial analysis by attempting to specify the general user-category with respect to FL learners and to deepen the linguistic analysis of the definitions provided by the questionnaire. Although the dichotomy user versus dictionary is maintained, an in-depth analysis of a few expressions and phrases produced by the respondents fulfilling the arduous task of producing a personal definition of dictionary shows that the boundaries between these two categories are as fuzzy as the functional distinction between communication-orientated and knowledge-orientated lexicography (cf. Bergenholtz/Tarp 2003).

Table 2: Online questionnaire on dictionaries: Definitions by users as FL learners.

Learner-centred representations* (Communication-orientated – more or less)[10]	Dictionary-centred representations (Knowledge-orientated – more or less)
– Il s'agit d'un outil *nous permettant de comprendre* le sens des mots et *de nous renseigner* sur ses propriétés grammaticales. ('It is a tool *that enables us to understand* the meaning of words and *to learn about* their grammatical properties.')	– un *livre comprenant* un grand nombre de définition (sic!) avec des exemples, ainsi que le genre du mot ('a *book containing* a large number of definitions with examples, as well as the gender of the word')

---

10 The phrase *more or less* is a little wink to the publication "Wortverbindungen - mehr oder weniger fest" edited by Steyer (2004).

Table 2 (continued)

Learner-centred representations* (Communication-orientated – more or less)	Dictionary-centred representations (Knowledge-orientated – more or less)
– Un document (papier ou numerisé) *qui nous permet de trouver* la traduction et/ou la définition d'un mot ('A document (paper or digital) *that enables us to find* the translation and/or definition of a word.') – un livre *où l'on trouve* la définition des mots ('a book *where you can find* the definition of words') – un livre/site *pour rechercher* la definition des mots ('a book/website *for researching* the definition of words') – une aide *pour comprendre* le sens des mots ('an aid *to understanding* the meaning of words') – un ouvrage qui *permet de trouver* l'orthographe, le genre, la définition d'un mot, ainsi qu'un contexte pour le comprendre. ('A book *that helps you find* the spelling, gender and definition of a word, as well as the context for understanding it.')	– Un *ouvrage qui recense* des mots dans une langue et leur définition, parfois d'autres détails (encyclopédie, traduction …) ('A *book that lists* words in a language and their definition, sometimes with other details (encyclopaedia, translation, etc.).') – un *support sur lequel sont recensés* les mots, les usages et les expressions d'une langue. Aussi, *il se doit d'évoluer* avec son temps et de recenser en permanence. Il n'a pas de visée didactique. ('a *medium for recording* the words, usages and expressions of a language. It must evolve with the times and be *constantly updated*. It is not intended for didactic purposes.') – un *gros livre avec* la définition de tous les mots ('a *big book with* definitions of all the words') – Un *livre recueillant* la définition de tous les mots. ('A *book that contains* the definitions of all the words.') – *ouvrage didactique déterminant* les caractéristiques d'un mot, expression … un outil ('a *teaching aid that determines* the characteristics of a word, expression … a tool') – Un *livre rassemblant* par ordre alphabétique les mots utilisés par une langue et *qui apporte* une définition ('A *book that alphabetises* the words used in a language and *that provides* a definition.')

*(My italics.)

The following comment concentrates on three questions:

1) Which discursive elements can serve as criteria for a distinction between user- (i. e. learner-) centred and dictionary-centred representations?
2) To what extent do the definitions consider the FL learning situation?
3) To what extent does the distinction between UC- and DC-representations coincide with a distinction between communication and knowledge oriented lexicographic functions?

Regarding question 1:

Basic elements for a distinction between the above-mentioned categories can be rephrased in terms of semantic (topical) and/or syntactical focusing on the user/ user's actions or the dictionary/dictionaries' actions. Regarding the dictionary-centred

representations, syntactical and topical focusing generally coincides, meaning that the object of the definition, i.e. the dictionary, is the syntactic subject of the sentence. The user- (i.e. learner-) centred representations, however, are essentially based on topical focusing, since the syntactic subject of the sentence remains the dictionary. Two major criteria for the identification of a topical focus on the user/learner consist in:

a) explicit or implicit mentions of the user, mostly by means of a third-person-pronoun;
b) a verb phrase referring to the user's action.

In principle, any sentence based on a verb phrase referring to the dictionary user's actions can be described as potentially user-centred.

The verb phrases occurring in the column attributed to the learner-centred representations can be directly linked to the LEARNING-frame, defined as a multistep-process based on a series of cognitive strategies of meaning-construction:

1. *permettre à qn de rechercher qc* ('to enable s.o. to search for/research s.th.'),
2. *permettre à qn de trouver* ('to enable s.o. to find s.th.'),
3. *permettre à qn de comprendre qc* ('to enable s.o. to understand s.th.').

The progressive character of these three steps can be related to a didactic theory of language teaching and learning, namely the three- and four-step-models developed by Kühn (1992) and extended by Lüger (1997) within the framework of phraseodidactics (cf. conclusion). Within this didactic context, the TOOL-frame discussed above represents a particular aspect of the LEARNING-frame.

Regarding question 2:
Does the attribution of definitions produced by mostly non-expert dictionary users to the LEARNING-frame imply that these users had consciously considered the learning-situation? There is reason for some doubt since direct references to the situation are scarce. Interestingly, it is within the dictionary-centred representations that direct references to teaching and learning can be found: *It is not intended for didactic purposes/ [it is] a teaching aid* (English translations, see above). At first sight, these two assertions seem to contradict each other. However, the first concentrates on the intentional aspect of lexicographic work designed for a particular purpose, namely didactic. The second is based on the TOOL-frame: *a teaching aid that determines the characteristics of a word, expression … a tool*. It remains unclear whether the tool-metaphor implies intentionality on behalf of the lexicographer. Nevertheless, the systematic references to cognitive strategies of meaning-construction within the UC-representations as well as the frequent use of terms such as *definitions* in both types of discourse imply an overall awareness of the dictionary as a medium which can either help understand (-> UC) or provide understanding (-> DC).

Regarding question 3:

According to Bergenholtz/Tarp (2003), two major types of user situations can be distinguished: the knowledge-orientated and the communication-orientated (Bergenholtz/Tarp 2003: 173–174). Their definitions appear to coincide with the distinction UC vs. DC. The knowledge-orientated situation is defined as follows:

> [...] situations where the user for one reason or another wants to obtain additional information on some topic, e.g. general cultural and encyclopaedic information, specialised information regarding a scientific discipline (biology, geology etc.) or information about a specific language related to the language-learning process (for example the learning of a foreign language) (Bergenholtz/Tarp 2003: 173)

In this type of user situation, dictionaries are construed as active providers of information: They dispense knowledge directly to their users, who consult them as they would consult a wise man or woman, or, alternatively, a teacher. This representation corresponds to models of teaching frequently described as teacher-centred and assimilated to a transmissive[11] mode of teaching (cf. e.g. Puren 1995; Liu/Lin/Zhang 2017). There is a certain resemblance between the terms used by Bergenholtz and Tarp to describe the knowledge-orientated situation and the terminology appearing in the dictionary-centred discourse listed above: In one definition, the term "encyclopedia" is mentioned, and most of the definitions contain phrases which accentuate the technicity as well as the extensiveness of lexicographical information in terms of number and size: *a book containing **a large number** of definitions/a **big book** with definitions of **all** the words/ contains the definitions **of all the words**/A **book that alphabetises** the words used in a language and **provides** a definition* (English translations, emphasis added by me). These phrases present lexicographic information as a result of systematic recording of vast amounts of linguistic material.

Moreover, the number of references to the dictionary in terms of a book is particularly high within this category, and digital types are rarely mentioned. This could explain why there is a tendency to emphasise the question of systematic organisation of entries, mostly in terms of alphabetisation.

Does this mean, however, that dictionary-centred, knowledge-orientated definitions reflect a traditionalist and normative view on language and language learning? Some respondents consider dictionaries as tools which must be adapted to the users' needs: *It must evolve with the times and be constantly updated* (see above). Amongst

---

11 The notion of transmissive teaching can be viewed as a pedagogical belief or construct. In a literature review by Liu/Lin/Zhang (2017), the notion is frequently assimilated to traditional teaching in opposition to constructivist teaching and learning: "Teachers holding traditional (hereafter, *transmissive*) pedagogical beliefs tend to act as authorities in the classroom and to organize teacher-centered activities aimed at transmitting knowledge. [...] While transmissive and constructivist pedagogies might seem to be polar opposites, a given teacher's pedagogical beliefs cannot, in reality, be categorized solely as either. Rather, there is significant evidence that teachers can and do simultaneously hold these seemingly contradictory pedagogical beliefs, [...]" (ibid.: 3–4).

the collected answers described in terms of a mixed UC/DC-category (see above), many contain dictionary-centred phrases by simultaneously adopting the user's point of view:

– *Un ouvrage qui doit recenser les mots, leurs sens et leurs usage [sic!] et non pas imposer un usage (comme le fait l'académie française).* ('A work that should list words, their meanings and uses, and not impose a usage (as the Académie française does).')
– *Document de recherche des définitions, étymologie, nature des mots[.]* ('Research document on definitions, etymology and the nature of words.')

In both cases, the object of the definition, i. e. the dictionary, coincides with its syntactic function as subject of the phrase (= dictionary-centred). Simultaneously, however, the thematic focus reflects the user's point of view: By insisting that the dictionary should content itself in listing words, their meanings and uses "and not impose a usage (as the Académie française does)", the user (re-)assigns the ultimate authority not to the work but to themselves. In the second example, the definition of the dictionary in terms of a research document reflects the user's point of view in a similar way: it is not the document itself which does the research but the user. Therefore, dictionary-centred representations cannot be necessarily regarded as naively assigning authority to the knowledge provided, despite an inherent affinity to transmissive models of learning. Ultimately, categorisations in terms of either user- versus dictionary-orientation, or communication- versus knowledge-orientation, can only be viewed in terms of degree (hence the addition of the attenuating more or less to the categories in Table 2).

Communication-orientated user situations are defined as follows by Bergenholtz/Tarp (2003):

> [...] where there is an existing – or planned – written or oral communication going on between two or more persons and where the lexicographer only intervenes indirectly (through the dictionary) when some kind of communication problem may pop up that can be solved by consulting a diction-ary. This group of user situations is called communication orientated (Bergenholtz/Tarp 2003: 174)

The reference to the lexicographer in this definition can be misleading since commu-nication-orientedness is not primarily a question of the degree to which dictionary makers are implied or not. Basically, it is not a question of who the participants involved are, or how many there are of them, but rather which types of communication-orien-tated activities the users are engaged in. Bergenholtz/Tarp (2003) refer to this aspect in terms of "a very simple model of communication" according to which "communication between two or more persons is made up by the production and reception of texts" (p. 174).

Conceiving communication in terms of types of communicative activities such as the reception and production of oral or written texts is essential, as it constitutes the theoretical and methodological basis of foreign language teaching and learning of the "Common European Framework of Reference for Languages" (CEFR, cf. https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages).   Task-orientation

and language use as social action constitute key concepts, as formulated in the CEFR companion volume (2020):

> The methodological message of the CEFR is that language learning should be directed towards enabling learners to act in real-life situations, expressing themselves and **accomplishing tasks** of different natures. [...] This is not educationally neutral. It implies that the **teaching and learning process is driven by action**, that it is **action-oriented**. [...] It also implies recognising the **social nature of language learning and language use**, namely the interaction between the social and the individual in the process of learning. Seeing learners as language users implies extensive use of the target language in the classroom – learning to use the language rather than just learning about the language (as a subject)." (CEFR 2020: 29–30) (Characters in bold added by me).

The application of these key concepts to the learner-centred representations in Table 2 appears relatively easy insofar as the definitions listed under this category are activity-oriented and imply tasks: *It is a tool that enables us to understand the meaning of words and to learn about their grammatical properties; A document [...] that enables us to find the translation and/or definition of a word* (English translations). However, learner-centred representations of the dictionary in combination with communicative tasks do not exclude activities that are knowledge-orientated. The above-mentioned examples include seeking out information about grammatical properties, as well as the translation and/or definition of a word.

The decisive criterion enabling us to distinguish between communication- and knowledge-orientation can be described as task-oriented dictionary consultation, on the condition that task is conceived within an action-oriented approach to language learning and teaching. This implies that the task is invested with a social dimension and accomplished by means of communicative reception or production activities. Hence, dictionary consultation that is primarily directed at obtaining knowledge does not represent a task-oriented activity, unless it is directly associated with reception or production activities. Yet, the boundaries between these categories remain fuzzy, as shown above and as shown by means of a last example:

> *un outil qui nous dépanne lorsque l'on bloque sur le sens d'un mot, un outil pour vérifier l'orthographe, un outil pour vérifier ce que l'on pense être juste* ('**a tool to help us out** when we get stuck on the meaning of a word, **a tool to check** spelling, **a tool to check** what we think is right')

On the one hand, the repeated use of the tool-metaphor indicates an essentially dictionary-centred, knowledge-orientated approach to language learning, since it is paired with a double focus on the dictionary, both grammatically and thematically. On the other hand, the lexical meaning of the main verbs ("to help us out", "to check") points towards a communication-orientated user situation, since they imply that the user is directly involved in either a translation or a text production activity ("check spelling", "check what we think is right").

4 Conclusion: From the lexicon to the phrasicon

Which lessons can be drawn from the analysis of user-definitions regarding a re-definition of the FL learners' dictionary? The fuzziness of the boundaries between different types of user situations as well as different ideas that people have of what a dictionary really is can be seen as a reflection of rival models of language learning: one which is based on a transmissive, teacher- and knowledge-centred model, and one which is based on a learner- and communication-centred model. No clear answer to the question regarding the role of the dictionary as an aid for language learning can be derived from the previous analysis. Could it be possible that the right question has not been asked yet?

Regardless of the existence of partially rival didactic theories, a concept of language acquisition in terms of a multistep process emerges directly from the data (cf. the three- and four-step models by Kühn 1992 and Lüger 1995 mentioned above). Hence, the question should be: What is the FL dictionary's role with respect to learning conceived as a multistep cognitive process?

The answers given to the last question of the questionnaire provide some clues. Centred on the users' point of view, the phrasing of this question was designed to induce a response reflecting what they would consider to be an ideal dictionary: "Le dictionnaire selon vous … " ('The dictionary according to you … '). As this phrasing also induces a definition, the respondents are forced to recur to similar discursive patterns as for the first question.

The following examples are representative of the collected answers insofar as they explicitly refer to the user's needs, namely the need to acquire a better understanding of how and in which contexts to use words:

– *Un dictionnaire qui expliciterait les contextes où un mot peut être utilisé, avec des exemples clairs et une définition qui l'est tout aussi.* ('A dictionary that explains the contexts in which a word can be used, with clear examples and an equally clear definition.')
– *Un dictionnaire avec plus de transcriptions phonétiques et qui met plus en avant les contextes car parfois on est perdus et on ne sait pas trop comment utiliser un mot* ('A dictionary with more phonetic transcriptions and that puts more emphasis on contexts, because sometimes we get lost and don't really know how to use a word.')
– *un dictionnaire qui donne la définition du mot, sa prononciation, ses usages dans des phrases (c'est à dire qu'il combinerait dictionnaire et livre de vocabulaire avec mise en contexte grammatical et culturel).* ('a dictionary that gives the definition of the word, its pronunciation and how it is used in sentences [in other words, it would combine a dictionary and a vocabulary book with grammatical and cultural context]').

Since understanding difficulties are primarily imputed to insufficient contextual information, the dictionary's major role consists in providing this information. Most recent

dictionaries, both print and online, strive to present examples of use, intended to illustrate the polysemic nature of linguistic units. Despite ever growing lists of example sentences, facilitated by the advantages of digital processing and AI translation, many FL learners continue, however, to complain about the dictionaries' insufficiencies. Why is this so?

One approach to the question might be to consider the (in-)adequacy of ever-growing databases of example sentences to the specific learning situation of a FL learner. For example, is it helpful for a French learner of GFL to be provided with the following example illustrating the use of the phraseological expression *in der Tat:*

> Zwar impliziert in der Tat auch umgekehrt die (strikte) Konvexität von, dass jede repräsentierende Nutzenfunktion (strikt) quasikonkav ist.[12] (cf. PONS: https://de.pons.com/%C3%BCbersetzung/deutsch-franz%C3%B6sisch/in+der+Tat)

This sentence appears to have been automatically extracted from *Wikipedia* (de.wikipedia.org) and is almost impossible to understand, even for a German native speaker. Apart from missing information regarding the discursive context in which this sentence occurs, the complexity of the vocabulary, as well as the semantic and syntactic incoherence of the preposition *von* (of), render the entry completely inadequate for the purpose of FL learning. The example above is not only problematic in terms of the discursive, lexical and syntactic inadequacy of the sentence, but also with respect to the overall absence of a coherent lexicographical concept: its (potential) role as part of a FL learners' dictionary is severely jeopardised.

If we conceive this type of dictionary not only as an information tool, adopting thereby a knowledge-orientated position, but also as a learning tool, we will have to integrate a didactic component. The role of the dictionary, and ultimately of the dictionary makers, should consist in engaging the users in the FL learning process by assigning them parts of the role usually attributed to the lexicographer: by providing a corpus of preselected phraseological units together with various examples of use, as well as a few analytical categories adapted to the learners' needs, this kind of dictionary could be an incentive for the learner to develop the competencies which are essential for effective language learning[13].

Some elements for a theoretical foundation of a phraseopragmatic dictionary can be found in Lüger (2023):

> Was die Vorgehensweise bei der Vermittlung phraseologischer Einheiten betrifft, kann man – an Kühn (1992) anschließend – folgende Phasen oder Arbeitsschritte unterscheiden: Feststehende Ausdrücke müssen zunächst als solche erkannt, in ihrer Textumgebung identifiziert werden. Das Entschlüsseln der Bedeutung, das Verstehen der pragmatischen Funktionen im gegebenen Ver-

---

12 Given the syntactic incongruence of the sentence, the English translation is rather approximative: *In fact, the (strict) convexity of [...?] implies that every representing utility function is (strictly) quasiconcave.*
13 This concept was first outlined in Smith (2022).

wendungszusammenhang wäre der nächste Schritt, wobei die Konsultation eines Wörterbuchs oft unumgänglich ist.[14] (Lüger 2023: 51)

Within his four-step-model for teaching (and learning) phraseological units, Lüger attributes a central role ("zentrale Rolle", cf. ibid.: 52) to the step dedicated to understanding ("Verstehen"), conceived as a complex process (cf. ibid.). Considering it necessary for the learner to acquire better understanding of phraseological units partially through the analysis of their use in texts, he refers to dictionaries as aids ("Hilfsmittel", ibid.: 53) that can contribute to the development of a methodical feel for in-depth example analyses (cf. ibid.). The role of the dictionary as an aid is thus twofold: it helps the learners to grasp the meaning of an expression and contributes to the development of their overall analytical competencies.

To conclude, the following rough outline of some elementary ideas for a future GFL dictionary will address three of the major issues discussed in chapters 1 to 3 by attempting to:

(1) put into practice the paradigm shift from the single-word perspective to the phraseological perspective advocated by Sinclair (cf. chapter 1);

(2) deconstruct the concept of translation providing direct access to meaning (cf. chapter 2);

(3) overcome the alleged dichotomies between user- versus dictionary-centredness and communication- versus knowledge-orientedness (see chapter 3).

Regarding the first aspect (1): This dictionary is conceived in terms of a phrasicon[15] within a usage-based approach. This implies that lexicographical description of meaning considers the interrelations between all linguistic and extralinguistic aspects of communication, thereby contributing to raising the FL learner's awareness of the multifaceted aspect of meaning.

Regarding the second aspect (2): By adopting a contrastive approach, the risk of recurring to word-for-word translation can be diminished. The presentation of comparable examples of use in L1 and L2 contributes to develop the learners' analytical competencies with respect to the intricate interplay of formal, functional, cultural, interactional and discursive aspects of language. Thus, the construction of meaning becomes a multistep process requiring the learner's semantic involvement (see chapter 2; cf. Nied Curcio 2015: 456; Dziemianko 2012: 332).

---

14 English translation: *As far as the procedure for teaching phraseological units is concerned, the following phases or steps can be distinguished, following Kühn (1992): Fixed expressions must first be recognised as such and identified in their textual environment. The next step would be to decode the meaning, to understand the pragmatic functions in the given context of use, in which consultation of a dictionary is often unavoidable.*

15 The notion of a phrasicon has recently been revived (see e.g. Granger 2009; Singleton 2021). One of the earliest occurrences as a lexicographical term appears in the "Florilegivm Phrasicon" (Huise/Ross 1650).

Regarding the third aspect (3): The phraseological units of this phrasicon will be pragmatic, targeting specific routine formulae primarily fulfilling communicative functions.[16] The essentially pragmatic nature of these units draws the users' attention to questions related to communicative tasks, such as the question of how to express one's opinion appropriately. This kind of question reduces the relevance of distinctions such as communication- versus knowledge-orientation, since the learner will seek access to both general information (e.g. syntactic and prosodic structure, cultural conventions) and to the use and meaning of a given phraseological unit in a specific context.

Finally, this type of dictionary is not a learning, but a learners' dictionary, since the method of learning depends on the way the learners develop their own strategies for researching, finding, and finally understanding the linguistic phenomena they are confronted with. After all, lexicology and phraseography are "a matter of understanding" (cf. Schafroth 2014).

5 Bibliography

5.1 Monographs and articles

Bergenholtz, Henning/Tarp, Sven (2002): Die Moderne Lexikographische Funktionslehre. In: *Lexicographica* 18, 253–263 [<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783484604476.253; last access: 15.04.2024].

Bergenholtz, Henning/Tarp, Sven (2003): Two Opposing Theories: On H.E. Wiegand's Recent Discovery of Lexicographic Functions. In: *Hermes* 31, 171–196 [https://tidsskrift.dk/her/article/view/25743/22656; last access: 15.04.2024].

Bielińska, Monika (2009): Lernerwörterbücher. Terminologischer Pluralismus, Begriffschaos und Typenvielfalt. In: Fontańskiego, Henryk/Molenckiego, Rafal/Wolińskiej, Olga (eds.): *W kręgu teorii: studia językoznawcze dedykowane profesorowi Kazimierzowi Polańskiemu in memoriam*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 30–40.

CEFR = *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (2020): *Learning, Teaching, Assessment: Companion Volume*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing [https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4; last access: 24.04.2024].

Chen, Shuang/Min, Tang/Mingdan, Zheng (2021): Incidental Acquisition and Intentional Learning in Second Language Acquisition. In: *2021 International Conference on Public Relations and Social Sciences (ICPRSS 2021)*. Kunming, China: Atlantis Press, 475–483 [https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211020.202; last access: 16.04.2024].

Dobrovol'skij, Dmitrij (2011): Phraseologie und Konstruktionsgrammatik. In: Lasch, Alexander/Ziem, Alexander (eds.): *Konstruktionsgrammatik III. Aktuelle Fragen und Lösungsansätze*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 110–130.

Dziemianko, Anna (2012): On the Use(Fulness) of Paper and Electronic Dictionaries. In: Granger, Sylviane/Paquot, Magali (eds.): *Electronic Lexicography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 319–342.

---

[16] Information about the precise nature of the formulae in question can be found in Smith (*forthcoming*).

Gauton, Rachélle (2009): Bilingual Dictionaries, the Lexicographer and the Translator. In: *Lexikos* 18:1, 106–118 [https://doi.org/10.5788/18-0-479; last access: 18.04.2024].

González-Rey, Ma Isabel (2017): Le dictionnaire phraséodidactique: sa place dans la didactique de la phraséologie. In: *Studii de lingvistică (Oradea, Romania)* 7, 27–44.

Gouws, Rufus H., et al. (2013) (eds.): *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Supplementary Volume: Recent Developments with Focus on Electronic and Computational Lexicography.* Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Granger, Sylviane (2009): Commentary on Part I: Learner Corpora: A Window onto the L2 Phrasicon. In: Barfield, Andy/Gyllstad, Henrik (eds.): *Researching Collocations in Another Language*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 60–65.

Hausmann, Franz Josef (1991): Typologie der zweisprachigen Spezialwörterbücher. In: Hausmann, Franz Josef, et al. (eds.): *Wörterbücher – Dictionaries – Dictionnaires. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie*, vol. 3. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 2877–2881.

Hausmann, Franz Josef, et al. (1989–1990–1991) (eds.): *Wörterbücher – Dictionaries – Dictionnaires. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie*, vol. 1–3. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Heid, Ulrich (2013): The Impact of Computational Lexicography. In: Gouws, Rufus H., et al. (eds.): *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Supplementary Volume: Recent Developments with Focus on Electronic and Computational Lexicography*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 24–30.

Kühn, Peter (1989): Typologie der Wörterbücher nach Benutzungsmöglichkeiten. In: Hausmann, Franz Josef, et al. (eds.): *Wörterbücher. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie*, vol. 1. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 111–127.

Kühn, Peter (1992): Phraseodidaktik. Entwicklungen, Probleme und Überlegungen für den Muttersprachenunterricht und den Unterricht DaF. In: *Fremdsprachen lehren und lernen* 21, 169–189.

Laufer, Batia/Hulstijn, Jan (2001): Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition in a Second Language: The Construct of Task-Induced Involvement. In: *Applied Linguistics* 22:1, 1–26 [https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.1.1; last access: 24.04.2024].

Lew, Robert/de Schryver, Gilles-Maurice (2014): Dictionary Users in the Digital Revolution. In: *International Journal of Lexicography* 27, 351–359 [https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecu011; last access: 28.03.2024].

L'Homme, Marie-Claude/Cormier, Monique C. (2014): Dictionaries and the Digital Revolution: A Focus on Users and Lexical Databases. In: *International Journal of Lexicography* 27:4, 331–340 [https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecu023; last access: 28.03.2024].

Liu, Haixa/Lin, Chin-Hsi/Zhang, Dongbo (2017): Pedagogical beliefs and attitudes toward information and communication technology: a survey of teachers of English as a foreign language in China. In: *Computer Assisted Language Learning* [https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1347572; last access: 18.04.2024].

Lüger, Heinz-Helmut (1997): Anregungen zur Phraseodidaktik. In: *Beiträge zur Fremdsprachenvermittlung* 32, 69–120.

Lüger, Heinz-Helmut (2023): Phraseopragmatische Aspekte in der Fremdsprachenvermittlung. In: Mückel, Wenke (ed.): *Didaktische Perspektiven der Phraseologie in der Gegenwart*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 33–60.

Mellado Blanco, Carmen/Mollica, Fabio/Schafroth, Elmar (2022) (eds.): *Konstruktionen zwischen Lexikon und Grammatik. Phrasem-Konstruktionen monolingual, bilingual und multilingual*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

Müller-Spitzer, Carolin, et al. (2018) (eds.): *Correct Hypotheses and Careful Reading Are Essential: Results of an Observational Study on Learners Using Online Language Resources*. In: *Lexikos* 28, 287–315 [https://doi.org/10.5788/28-1-1466; last access: 18.04.2024].

Nesi, Hilary (2012): Alternative E-Dictionaries: Uncovering Dark Practices. In: Granger, Sylviane/Paquot, Magali (eds.): *Electronic Lexicography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 363–378.

Nied Curcio, Martina (2015): Wörterbuchbenutzung und Wortschatzerwerb. Werden im Zeitalter des Smartphones überhaupt noch Vokabeln gelernt? In: *Informationen Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 42:5, 445–468 [https://doi.org/10.1515/infodaf-2015-0504; last access: 12.03.2024].

O'Neill, Errol M. (2019): Online translator, dictionary, and search engine use among L2 students. In: *CALL-EJ: Computer-Assisted Language Learning–Electronic Journal* 20:1, 154–177.

Puren, Christian (1995): La problématique de la centration sur l'apprenant en contexte scolaire. In: *Études de Linguistique Appliquée* 100, 129–149.

Schafroth, Elmar (2014): Eine Sache des Verstehens: Phraseme als Konstruktionen. Ihre Beschreibung in der Lexikographie Französisch/Deutsch. In: Domínguez Vázquez, Marie José/Mollica, Fabio/Nied Curcio, Martina (eds.): *Zweisprachige Lexikographie zwischen Translation und Didaktik*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 83–112.

Sinclair, John (2008): *[Envoi]*: The phrase, the whole phrase, and nothing but the phrase. In: Granger, Sylviane/Meunier, Fanny (eds.): *Phraseology. An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 407–410.

Singleton, David (2021): Phrasicon, Phrase, Phraseology. In: Granger, Sylviane (ed.): *Perspectives on the L2 Phrasicon: The View from Learner Corpora*. Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters, 235–244.

Smith, Anja (2022): Lexicographie bilingue des "actes de langage stéréotypés": la question du sens. In: *Langages* 225, 113–125.

Smith, Anja (forthcoming): Expressions of Opinion Produced by French Learners of German as a Foreign Language. An Exploratory Corpus Analysis. In: *Korpora Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 2 (1) [(Juli 2024, ISSN 2749-4411], [24 pp.].

Steyer, Kathrin (2004) (ed.): *Wortverbindungen – mehr oder weniger fest*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

Tarp, Sven (2013): Lexicographic Functions. In: Gouws, Rufus, et al. (eds.): *Dictionaries. An international dictionary of lexicography. Supplementary volume: recent developments with focus on electronic and computational lexicography*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 460–468.

Wiegand, Herbert Ernst (1998) (ed.): *Wörterbuchforschung: Untersuchungen zur Wörterbuchbenutzung, zur Theorie, Geschichte, Kritik und Automatisierung der Lexikographie*, vol. 1. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.

Wiegand, Herbert Ernst, et al. (2020) (ed.): *Wörterbuch zur Lexikographie und Wörterbuchforschung = Dictionary of lexicography and dictionary research: mit englischen Übersetzungen der Umtexte und Definitionen sowie Äquivalenten in neun Sprachen/with English translations of the outer texts and definitions as well as equivalents in nine languages*, vol. 3: *I–U*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

Zimmer, Ben (2014): Lexicography 2.0: Reimagining Dictionaries for the Digital Age. In: *Dictionaries: Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America* 35:1, 275–286 [https://doi.org/10.1353/dic.2014.0002; last access: 22.03.2024].

5.2 Dictionaries and tools

DeepL Translate. [https://www.deepl.com/translator; last access: 19.04.2024].

Google Translate. [http://translate.google.com; last access: 18.04.2024].

Huise, John/Ross, Alexander (1650): *Florilogivm phrasicon, or a survey of the Latin tongue, according to the elegancy of its proper dialect: necessary for all young students in the same for their better imitation, and practice thereof, either by their voice or pen*. Ed.: Proquest (Early English Books Online). London: (R.N. for W. Garret).

Kilgariff, Adam, et al. (2014): The Sketch Engine: ten years on. In: *Lexicography*, 7–36. [http:www.sketchengine.eu; last access: 24.03.2024].

Pons Online Wörterbuch [https://de.pons.com/%C3%BCbersetzung/deutsch-franz%C3%B6sisch; last access: 21.04.2024].