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MAKING A COLLOCATIONS DICTIONARY

Abstract: This paper seeks to explain the process and principles behind the selection and presentation of collocations in the Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English. It argues for a pragmatic interpretation of the concept of collocation, based firmly on the needs of language learners. Thus, the whole range of collocations is included, from the relatively weak to the strongest and most restricted, but with the greatest emphasis on the “medium-strength” collocations between these two extremes. Judgements were not made as to the “predictability” of particular word combinations. The presentation of the collocations in the dictionary is designed to make selection of the best collocate by the user as intuitive as possible. Where possible, grammar is “pre-digested”, with collocates presented in the form in which they are most likely to be used. Collocates are grouped (but not labelled) according to semantic categories. The aim was to make the dictionary accessible not only to keen linguists, but to all who wish to improve their writing in English, whether interested in the mechanics of the language or not.

There are two main challenges facing anyone wishing to produce a dictionary of collocations. The first is selecting the material to include in such a dictionary. The second is how to present that material once selected. It is necessary to be very clear, not only about what exactly we mean by collocation, but also about the needs and expectations of the users of such a dictionary.

I first heard the term collocation in 1992, when I was working at a teacher training college in Legnica, Poland. I was introduced to the concept by my colleague, Major Martin, an ex-British army language trainer. He would stick his head round the door of my classroom and bawl, “Auspicious!” at me, and I would have to bawl back, “Occasion!”, and then explain to my students what this was all about. This, by the way, was after I had studied French for seven years at school, got a degree in English, and been teaching English for nearly two years without collocations ever having been mentioned to me.

Native speakers, of whatever language, are masters of collocation almost by definition, but most people, in my experience, outside the fields of language study and teaching, have never heard of the term and cannot begin to guess what it means. Language professionals – unlike myself fourteen years ago – will now almost all have heard of it and most will agree on the importance of collocation in language teaching, but there is still no universally accepted definition of what
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collocation actually is. People have been trying to pin it down, on and off, since the 1930s.

Palmer had it that “a collocation is a succession of two or more words that must be learned as an integral whole, and not pieced together from its component parts” (1933, 7), which may be good as a start but is not the whole story. (This definition would include idioms, for example.)

More recently, we have Hill and Lewis (1997, 1) saying that “collocation is the way in which words occur together in predictable ways,” whereas George Woolard “reserves the term collocation for those co-occurrences of words which I think my students will not expect to find together” (2000, 29).

I could rehearse the long debate encapsulated here and point out some of the apparent contradictions, but these will be fairly familiar. We all know the kind of thing collocation is and we can give examples of items that are collocations – such as auspicious occasion – undoubtedly a strong collocation, though perhaps of somewhat limited use – but we still don’t have a definition that allows us to say categorically that any given word combination is or is not a collocation. Nevertheless, it was necessary to be quite definitive about each individual word combination: should it be included in the dictionary or not? This decision had to be made well over 200,000 times in the course of compiling the Oxford Collocations Dictionary, a project that took around nine years from the initial conception to eventual publication.

The main tool at our disposal to aid us in this task was the British National Corpus. This is a large database containing 100 million words of running English text collected from a whole range of sources – fiction and non-fiction – books, newspapers, magazines, letters, memos, debates and everyday conversation. Exploring this corpus with Keyword-in-Context concordancing tools, compilers of the dictionary were able to check how frequently any given combination occurred, in how many (and what kind of) sources and in what particular contexts. Figure 1 shows part of the concordance for the noun mist. The lines have been sorted alphabetically according to the word to the left of the keyword. From this it is easy to pick out heavy as an adjective collocate. Sorting right (see figure 2) gives nearly as clear a picture of verbs that immediately follow the keyword. In this section of the concordance, come down, clear and cling can be picked out.

| were up early next morning. A heavy | mist had fallen, drowning the countryside in |
| around her blearily through the heavy | mist that filled the wood. Everything was |
| sun was beginning to pierce the heavy | mist heavy |
| the banquet ended. Outside a heavy | mist. “Like the professional assassin you |
| which, blurred with rain and heavy | mist obscured everything, and the departing |
| Sick Fund. <p_4> Despite the heavy | mist , presented a uniform greyness. “Yet |
| the soldiers were shrouded in a heavy | mist Near 40 walkers assembled at St |
| She moved to the door and through her | mist , suiting their purpose perfectly. |
| clammy hands. It was rather a horrid | mist of pain, Nina saw Joe standing outside, |
| sound of Man. Hootings and shouts, hot | mist ; you felt as if it might be concealing |
| mist and lights … and I was numb with fear. | mist |
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had stopped now but an illuminating
of the mountain periodically hidden in
vertically plunging forest, wreathed in
vice versa, as you put it. The train, in
continued. Flakstad was drowning in
Ahead of them lay the Nile, bathed in

"It's no worse than driving into the building. She seemed haloed in
but was like a dark capsule afloat in
a field of clover were knee-deep in
The riverbanks were wreathed in
The moon, at its full, was swathed in
grey, a scattering of houses shrouded in
looked like a ruined city, shrouded in
Seemed to fill the room with a white
, but as the sun set we had a magnificent
, and for the most part deathly quiet
, was unable to stop in time. The rail-
backlit from the northern sky.

out of the stillness, a lone nightingale

It's no worse than driving in
I said, to comfort him, though in fact
hair wet and tendrilled, clothes drip-
She walked round and lifted one of the
Their voices across the water were
The banana groves and the guava
Out of the stillness, a lone nightingale
Suddenly, I see a boat weaving its way

"Then the of the clinging mist. "Such a bikers. "But beware! Dartmoor
been sliced off; when it's cloaked in a
whispering seed and the tenuous
reminded her of Japanese paintings. The are frequently enveloped in cloud and
Hill. As we slowly descended, the
up. "They waited while the
The thick, creamy crest and the rainbow
seaward. The weather helped. The early
come up above the eastern ridge and the
Him, but he skips backwards, and as the
to be firing their weapons. Suddenly the
Derry Morning</h1> <poem> <l> The Icy fields, furrows of water, leaves of
way through the shadows of a forest, just risen above the mountain. Then the
There was low cloud, white drifts of Whistler's statement that when evening
Down towards Lyndhurst. The ground crept over me. The sky was grey, and

Dalseattie, which was nice until the
days save when heavy rain, snow, or
as he climbed higher, a thick damp
there was a night, long ago now, when a
To be raised. Then the of the clinging mist. Such a bikers. But beware! Dartmoor
been sliced off; when it's cloaked in a whispering seed and the tenuous
reminded her of Japanese paintings. The are frequently enveloped in cloud and
Hill. As we slowly descended, the up. "They waited while the
The thick, creamy crest and the rainbow seaward. The weather helped. The early
come up above the eastern ridge and the Him, but he skips backwards, and as the
to be firing their weapons. Suddenly the Derry Morning</h1> <poem> <l> The Icy fields, furrows of water, leaves of
way through the shadows of a forest, just risen above the mountain. Then the
There was low cloud, white drifts of Whistler's statement that when evening
Down towards Lyndhurst. The ground crept over me. The sky was grey, and
Now *mist* is a medium-frequency word, with a total of 1,195 citations out of the 100 million. Scrolling down 1,200 lines of text, twice, is not too arduous a task. But if we took *occasion*, with nearly 9,000 lines, or *job*, with over 30,000, the work starts to become time-consuming and even somewhat tedious. Further help was provided by a collocation profiling program. Kilgarriff and Tugwell (2001) have described their “Word Sketch” program which extracts collocations from a corpus for use in lexicography. Our corpus engineer developed a similar program, which was able to pick out collocations in particular categories, much as they are listed in the dictionary (see figure 3). These “collocations” are of course no more than words occurring near the keyword in significant numbers, in the relation specified. The lexicographer still needs to analyse the data and accept or reject individual items: in the case of prepositions, many of these co-occurrences were deemed to be coincidental and not really collocational at all. Only *through the mist, in/into the mist* and *mist over something* were deemed to be significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>b4 LHS prep</th>
<th>LHS prep</th>
<th>RHS prep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thick (35)</td>
<td>shroud (21)</td>
<td>through (98)</td>
<td>over (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grey (20)</td>
<td>lose (17)</td>
<td>into (68)</td>
<td>across (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white (24)</td>
<td>vanish (9)</td>
<td>above (4)</td>
<td>above (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early (26)</td>
<td>disappear (9)</td>
<td>in (215)</td>
<td>down (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fine (15)</td>
<td>wreath (7)</td>
<td>from (29)</td>
<td>off (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red (14)</td>
<td>peer (7)</td>
<td>over (4)</td>
<td>around (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heavy (13)</td>
<td>loom (6)</td>
<td>by (30)</td>
<td>through (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thin (11)</td>
<td>hide (7)</td>
<td>up (6)</td>
<td>into (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faint (8)</td>
<td>veil (5)</td>
<td>with (31)</td>
<td>before (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dense (6)</td>
<td>shine (5)</td>
<td>of (193)</td>
<td>up (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slight (6)</td>
<td>emerge (6)</td>
<td>at (8)</td>
<td>from (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dark (7)</td>
<td>cloak (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LHS verb</th>
<th>RHS verb</th>
<th>And/Or</th>
<th>Compound Ns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shroud (21)</td>
<td>hang (19)</td>
<td>rain (19)</td>
<td>morning mist (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swirl (15)</td>
<td>drift (13)</td>
<td>cloud (17)</td>
<td>sea mist (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lose (19)</td>
<td>cling (11)</td>
<td>fog (10)</td>
<td>autumn mist (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vanish (10)</td>
<td>rise (18)</td>
<td>drizzle (4)</td>
<td>dawn mist (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loom (8)</td>
<td>swirl (12)</td>
<td>smoke (4)</td>
<td>evening mist (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disappear (9)</td>
<td>lie (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer (8)</td>
<td>obscure (8)</td>
<td>PP OF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wreath (7)</td>
<td>shroud (7)</td>
<td>tear (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cloak (6)</td>
<td>clear (14)</td>
<td>sleep (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descend (6)</td>
<td>roll (8)</td>
<td>time (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shine (6)</td>
<td>hide (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hide (7)</td>
<td>hover (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obscure (5)</td>
<td>lift (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roll (6)</td>
<td>come (20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. From the Collocation Profile for *mist*, noun
The profiler makes the verbs appear much more clearly, whether they occur before or after the keyword, with or without an intervening preposition. This is particularly useful for a noun like mist, where formulations such as *shrouded in mist* and *lost in the mist* are significant. Figure 4 shows the dictionary entry for *mist*. The correspondence with the collocation profile can be clearly seen.

![Figure 4](image)

**mist** noun

- **ADJ.** dense, heavy, thick *A heavy mist rolled over the fields.* | faint, fine, light, slight, thin | dark, grey, red, white *There was a red mist in front of his eyes.* | dawn, evening, morning | an early morning mist | autumn | sea

- **VERB** + **MIST** be cloaked in, be covered in, be shrouded in, be wreathed in *The harbour was covered in a thick mist.* | disappear into, vanish in/into *The little swarm had vanished in the mist.* | emerge from, loom out of *A large figure loomed out of the mist.* | break through, shine through *Soon the sun would break through the mist.* | peer into/through | be lost in (figurative) *The origins of Morris dancing are lost in the mists of time.*

- **MIST** + **VERB** hang, hover, lie *A faint mist hung over the valley.* | come down, descend *When the mist comes down it comes quickly and covers everything.* | clear, lift *The mist had cleared by mid-morning.* | drift, float, rise, roll, swirl *A grey mist floated towards us.* | a misting mist, a thin mist rising from the river | cling to sth, early morning mist still clinging to the hollows. | fill sth | cover sth, hide sth, obscure sth, shroud sth *A white mist obscured the top of the hill.*

- **PREP** in/into the – *It was hard to make out the path in the mist through the.* | through the – *The cottage was scarcely visible through the mist.* | – over the mist over the lake

- **PHRASES** a curtain/veil of mist

Concordances and collocation profiles together were enormously instructive: it was this process of trawling through the whole language to compile the dictionary that ultimately enabled us to arrive at some sort of understanding of what collocation actually is.

“Collocability” – if I can use that horrible term – is not a condition that something either has or has not. It exists on a cline: that is, there are degrees of collocation from the strongest, most restricted combinations at the one end, to the weakest, freest combinations at the other.

At the strong end of the spectrum are combinations like *blindingly obvious* and *grey area*. *Blindingly obvious* is strong because the adverb *blindingly* is scarcely used except in combination with *obvious*. In the case of *grey area*, both elements are very frequent words, occurring in many other combinations, but *grey* does not have precisely this meaning in any other combination. You could call it a compound, rather than a collocation, as indeed the *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* (2005) does, but it is included in the *Oxford Collocations Dictionary* (with a gloss) because it does fit into the wider meaning of *area* as a ‘subject or activity’. Learners are not necessarily to know that the idea ‘an area of
sth that is not clear is in fact expressed by an idiom including compound, so it comes under our understanding of collocation.

In the middle of the spectrum, we have examples such as make money and heavy mist. Now, these are all very common words, but not perhaps in their most obvious meanings. Make here means 'earn' or 'acquire' rather than its core meaning of 'create'. Heavy mist may cause no problems of understanding – you can talk about heavy rain too – but you can’t substitute 'strong' in either case (though we do, of course, talk about strong winds).

At the weaker end of the spectrum, we might pick out examples such as enjoyable experience or cause problems. No problems of understanding here, and many users would be able to construct these for themselves. But cause problems does still need to be in the dictionary, alongside the less obvious pose problems and create problems, if only to confirm what learners think they already know.

The existence of a cline of collocability is probably pretty well known. But we did make some observations about the distribution of collocations along the cline, which may be less apparent. The first point we observed was that some of the strongest collocations – including some of those that spring most readily to mind when trying to explain the concept of collocation to someone to whom it is unfamiliar – are actually pretty rare. For example, auspicious occasion occurs only 7 times in the 100 million word British National Corpus. Similarly, cushy job has only 7 citations; rancid butter – quoted by Thierry Fontanelli (along with the more frequent sour milk and rotten eggs; 1994, 42) – has 6, and arrant nonsense 5. We also get low scores for blanket of fog, curtain of mist and veil of mist. These are still significant, however, because we do not say *curtain of fog or *blanket of mist, and this tells us something about the difference, linguistically speaking, between fog and mist: fog lies on a surface, while mist hangs in the air.

As far as I am aware, there are no significant verb + noun combinations that are as rare as this. The strongest that I could think of – verbs that combine with only one noun – were curry favour and foot the bill, with 23 and 106 citations respectively.

Some of these strong, infrequent collocations will be of more interest to learners than others, but there is another important point to be made about them. These strong, but relatively infrequent combinations are in the minority. The less obvious, less interesting, but more frequent combinations are much more numerous.

Let us take the top adjectives that combine with occasion, in order of frequency: other, special, rare, previous, particular, numerous, social and different. Of these, other, particular and different are such frequent, general words that it is very hard to call them collocates of any noun in particular, and indeed they are not included in the OCD entry for occasion. If, instead of taking raw corpus frequency, we take a measure of statistical significance that factors in the relative frequencies of the words in the language as a whole, we get a slightly better match with the dictionary. The top six – rare, special, numerous, ceremonial, previous and memorable – are all included. However, particular and other still score
highly and a conscious decision had to be made to exclude them, just as numerous and previous, also quite general words, were deliberately included. Also included are quite a number of collocations – auspicious, momentous, festive, solemn – which score lower both on frequency and statistical significance.

It was necessary, for each entry, somehow to draw a line between what should be included and what should not. This line could not be based solely on frequency, nor on statistical significance, but was informed by both of these. But it was informed also by editorial judgement about what would be useful to a learner consulting the dictionary.

In deciding what to include in the dictionary, three basic questions were asked: Is this a typical use of language? Might a learner want to express this idea? Would they look up this entry to find out how?

To return, for a moment to a couple of those definitions of collocation: “Collocation is the way in which words occur together in predictable ways” (Hill/Lewis 1997, 1). “I reserve the term collocation for those co-occurrences of words which I think my students will not expect to find together” (Woolard 2000, 29). The emphases here are mine. There would appear to be a contradiction here – but is there? The first quotation begs an immediate question: predictable to whom? The answer is, surely, to native speakers. So if we combine the two statements we arrive at a definition of collocation as combinations that are predictable to native speakers but not to learners.

But I think there is still a problem: which learners do we mean? (And come to that, which native speakers?) Woolard, in the second quotation, is talking about teaching collocations to particular students whom he knows. He can predict, with a fair degree of accuracy, which combinations they will find natural and which will take them by surprise. For the editor of a collocations dictionary it is not so easy. We don’t really know the dictionary’s users, their level of English, their first language, the level and types of interference there will be from the L1, or even what cultural assumptions we can make. Research carried out by Kyohei Nakamoto with Japanese high school and college students showed that word combinations considered to be predictable for European students often cause them problems. The collocation cause damage, for example, a “weak collocation” by almost any standards, was rendered by most of Nakamoto’s subjects as give damage (which is, perhaps not coincidentally, the most literal translation from the Japanese). Make the bed, on the other hand, so idiomatic that it merits a sense of make all to itself in the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, caused few problems for the Japanese students. Nakamoto’s thesis (1992) therefore argues very strongly for typicality, not predictability, as the central characteristic of collocation.

To answer our second question – Might a learner of English want to express this idea? – we could do little better than look at the ideas that people do express, especially in the kinds of texts – essays, reports, letters, narratives – that learners might want to produce. Analysis of this language leads to the conclusion that Jimmie Hill (2000, 64) has it very much to the point: “The main learning
load for all language users is not at the strong or weak ends of the collocational spectrum, but in the middle – those many thousands of collocations that make up a large part of what we speak and write.” It is these “medium-strength” collocations that make up perhaps the bulk of the language, and also the bulk of the dictionary.

The third question asked – Would a learner look up a particular entry to find a particular combination? – leads on to a third observation on the nature of collocation. The relationship between the different elements of a collocation is not equal. You might think of rain and want to know the adjective to use when a lot falls in a short time: heavy rain. You would be unlikely to start with heavy and wonder what to describe with it – breathing? a cold? your heart? Heavy is a very difficult word to define in isolation from its context, except in the most abstract and general terms. It combines with a very wide range of nouns, and means something slightly different in each case (yet in many of these cases, heavy is the word to choose). In effect, heavy takes its meaning from the nouns it combines with. (This is even more true of certain, almost delexicalized verbs, such as do, make, have, give and take.)

When framing their ideas people generally start from a noun. Most writers on collocation agree that collocations are made up of a base and a collocator. In the case of noun collocations, the noun is always the base. It was therefore decided not to include noun collocates in the entries for verbs and adjectives in the OCD. This had the happy effect of freeing up a lot of space in the dictionary for more collocations and examples, which proved particularly useful in the light of our final observation on the nature of collocation.

Words that are more frequent overall in the language tend to have many, many more collocations than the less frequent words. This is particularly true of the frequent nouns. The relationship is exponential. A word that is twice as frequent may have four or five times as many collocations, or even more. The most extreme cases list more than 200 collocations for a single word – the word word being a prime example. Do learners need to learn all 200+ collocations of word? Almost certainly not. But the role of the dictionary is to be a comprehensive resource from which all learners and other dictionary users can make their own selections.

Of almost equal importance with the selection of material to include in the dictionary, was the question of how that content was to be presented. It seemed logical to divide each entry into a number of “slots” according to the part of speech or function of the collocating word. The basic categories for a noun entry are shown in figure 5.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Speech Combination</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Part of Speech Combination</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective + Noun</td>
<td>bright/harsh/intense/strong light</td>
<td>Noun + Preposition</td>
<td>by the light of the moon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantifier + Noun</td>
<td>a beam/ray of light</td>
<td>Noun + Noun</td>
<td>a light source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs + Noun</td>
<td>cast/emit/give/provide/shed light</td>
<td>Noun + Noun</td>
<td>light gleams/glow/shines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun + Verb</td>
<td>light gleams/glow/shines</td>
<td>Preposition + Noun</td>
<td>by the light of the moon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun + Noun</td>
<td>a light source</td>
<td>Noun + Preposition</td>
<td>the light from the window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition + Noun</td>
<td>by the light of the moon</td>
<td>Short Phrases Including the Headword</td>
<td>the speed of light</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. “Slots” for a noun entry in the Oxford Collocations Dictionary

The dictionary is quite literal, even unintelligent, about these slots, so that the verb + noun section includes not only simple verb + noun object combinations, such as *hold a conversation*, but also combinations in which the noun is the indirect object – *deny sb compensation* – or where there is an intervening preposition – *whoop with delight, engage sb in conversation* – or where the verb is in the passive – *be considered a delicacy, be riddled with bullets*.

Another example of the somewhat cavalier approach to grammar, is that we quite cheerfully put into the ADJ slot items that are actually pre-modifying nouns, such as *tax benefit* and *takeover bid*. There are also some predicative adjectives in the noun + verb slot such as *compensation is payable*. The thinking behind this was that the user is thinking, not of a particular word, but of an idea, which is adjectival, or verbal, even if the realization of that idea is actually a noun or predicative adjective.

There was also the question of how to arrange the collocations within the slots. Alphabetical order is only useful to learners if they already know what they are looking for, which is not the point of a collocations dictionary. Instead, collocations are grouped into “subslots” either according to meaning (*a bright/intense/piercing/powerful beam*) or category (*an electron/laser/searchlight/torch beam*). These subslots may be compared to – and were partly inspired by – Mel’čukian lexical functions (Mel’čuk 1998), but with heavy qualifications. No attempt was made to name or define the subslots. This might have been possible in some cases – brightness or power for the first example above – but much more difficult in others. Nor did we try to apply the same range of subslots to all entries. This might have led to a temptation to try and fill all the slots: just as there are some grammatically possible utterances that no one has ever uttered, there are some combinations of ideas that no one has ever wanted to express. To ask what the correct collocation would be in such a case is to miss the point entirely.

Within each subslot we did fall back on alphabetical order, a reluctant simplification made when it was found impossible to indicate relative frequencies in any meaningful way. Frequency is useful as a blunt instrument – is this a collocation or not? – but less useful for making fine distinctions. What learners really need to know is which collocation is the most appropriate for their purposes, and this will vary with the context. Examples and short notes in the dictionary will help to indicate this. Learners may also need to consult a general learner’s
dictionary such as the *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* for further information on register, grammar, usage, and, of course, meaning.

The aim of the dictionary was to be a practical tool, not just – or primarily – for applied linguists, interested in studying how the language works, but for students, academics, business people and everyone obliged to write in English, who may not be very interested in the mechanics of the language, but do wish to be able to express themselves elegantly and precisely in that language. To this end, the theory and grammar behind the dictionary, though, we hope, sound, have been “pre-digested”, so that users do not have to negotiate them but can proceed directly to what they want to say.

Four years on from publication, can the *Oxford Collocations Dictionary* be judged a success? It is not really for me to say, but on the whole I think so: feedback from users has been scarce, but such as we have received has been nearly all positive. Are there any improvements that could be made in a second edition? The most obvious would be to aim to cover American English collocation as well as British English. This would entail certain challenges – not least how to indicate which collocations are British or American only, without turning the page into a sea of brackets and italic labels – but these problems could no doubt be surmounted.

And of course, language changes. We can now *switch our phones on and off* as well as *pick them up and put them down*. The last few years have also seen the rise of the *no-frills airlines* offering flights at bargain prices. Better, larger corpora and more sophisticated computational tools may also reveal more about the core of the language – and collocation is very much at the core – but not, I think, to the extent of making either the lexicographer or the language teacher redundant. The more that it is possible to find out about the language, the greater the need to sift that knowledge and carefully select and present what is most relevant to the needs of the individual language learner.
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