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**ABSTRACTS**

**MICHAEL ADAMS** (Indiana University at Bloomington)

*Trench’s Richardson: Reading the Origins of the Oxford English Dictionary*

Richard Chenevix Trench mentions Charles Richardson and his *New Dictionary of the English Language* (1836) frequently throughout his lectures to the Philological Society, *On Some Deficiencies in Our English Dictionaries* (1857), both with praise and as illustrating those very deficiencies. Richardson, Trench proclaims, was “the first deliberate and consistent worker” in English lexicography, and “[i]t cannot be brought as any charge against him … that he has left much in it for those who come after him to accomplish.” But it is clear that Trench has read Richardson’s dictionary with penetrating attention. Richardson “has drawn, as he justly makes his boast in his Preface, a large number of books within the circle of his reading, which had never been employed for lexicographical purposes before … Yet it lies in the necessity of things, in the limited capacities of any single man, that of the works he uses, some, and those important ones, can only have been partially read.” In the course of *On Some Deficiencies*, Trench observes, “Some shortcomings have been pointed out in our Dictionaries, and though, taking them in all, they cannot be said to be few, yet the books from which they are chiefly drawn, as you will not have failed to observe, are comparatively few; and even these books are capable of yielding infinitely more in this kind than they have here yielded.” Richardson’s listeners and subsequently readers would have to take him at his word, but for Richardson was this claim mere intuition or a tested fact?

Trench’s copy of Richardson’s *New Dictionary* is owned by the Lilly Library at Indiana University, where I have been able to examine it in detail. On the evidence contained therein, the answer to the question above is “tested fact.” Trench annotated his copy of Richardson
heavily. Some of the annotations directly connect his reading of Richardson and On Some Deficiencies, but the volume of annotations far exceeds the evidence cited in Trench’s lectures or the version of them published by the Philological Society (1860). From these annotations and On Some Deficiencies, we can reconstruct Trench’s critical method and assess the scope and particularity of his lexical and readerly interests. In the annotations, he establishes a method for reading dictionaries but he also proposes the terms on which one should read texts in the making of dictionaries, how one gleans significant evidence from the texts that comprise historical English.

My purpose in this paper is thus to describe Trench’s annotations and point up the terms on which they inform On Some Deficiencies, but also to suggest the genesis of On Some Deficiencies — did Trench have the deficiencies in mind before reading Richardson and reading a small ring of texts in order to criticize Richardson or did the argument arise from the annotations? Many features, textual and material, lead me to conclude that the precise acts of reading in question followed formulation of the lexicographical program. Also, Trench had to select examples for On Some Deficiencies from copious marginal notes, and the annotations thus help us better to understand how Trench refined his reading of the state of English lexicography from an over-reading of the New Dictionary, all the while affirming the intertextuality of lexicography and the literature on which it draws, an intertextuality in readerly experience, rather than one merely composed in a dictionary text.

JÓZSEF ANDOR (Dept. of English Linguistics, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary)

The representation of synonymy and polarity of deadjectival intensifying adverbs in editions 1 – 8. of the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary

The present study observes and investigates the representation of the synonymic relations as well as the polarity of ten deadjectival intensifying adverbs (awesomely, awfully, dreadfully, shockingly, strikingly, stunningly, terribly, terrifically, thrillingly, tremendously) in all of the editions of the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary. Eight editions of OALD were published between 1948 and 2010, however, the first edition was titled A Learner’s Dictionary of Current English by its editors: A. S. Hornby, E.V. Gatenby, and H. Wakefield. This edition, actually happened to be the second in the line, as the same team of editors (under Hornby’s direction) had an earlier dictionary with the same scope published by Kaitakusha in Tokyo, Japan in 1943, titled Idiomatic and Syntactic English Dictionary. Study of that early version has also been included in the present paper. Consequently, the orientation of this investigation falls within the domains of diachronic lexicography and lexical semantics.

It has been observed that the representation of the lexical items studied in the different editions of the dictionary in itself is far from being systematic: some of the items have been given as headwords, whereas others as deadjectival derivatives. Representation of the meaning of the lexical expressions occurs on a random basis: whereas some of the items had
an interpretation of their sense given, others did not, therefore, identification of their meaning was left to the user’s (the learner’s) inferential activity in observing randomly chosen examples. The same holds for the representation of synonymic relations between the items. Since the publication in 1995 of a corpus-based version followed by the availability of a CD-ROM attached, some synonyms have been added to the sense descriptions for the sake of clarification of meaning relatedness, however, on a random basis. Synonymy is known to be a semantically-pragmatically based, gradable notion. Meaning-related facets of its nature have to be identified and represented with the highest degree of precision possible. Another critical feature of intensifying deadjectival adverbs concerns the nature of their expressed hyperbolicity and polarity, characterization of which features was totally left out of consideration in the various editions of OALD. This is a major problem, as it can be inferred from the examples given that the original, dominantly negative polarity of the literal sense and connotation of the expressions has undergone a significant rate of neutralization, delexicalization, and a meaning shift towards the expression of positive polarity occurred. Details about the process of such meaning shifts are observed, analyzed, and interpreted with precision in the present paper with reliance on two major authentic sources: historical data gained from the electronic version of the Oxford English Dictionary (2nd Edition, Version 4 – 2009), and data mining in the British National Corpus.

DR. DABNEY A. BANKERT Professor of Medieval Literature, James Madison University

GOD and MAN in Old English: The Lexical Construction of the Cultural Past

The principal entry for the noun “GOD” in Joseph Bosworth’s 1838 A Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language is, like many other such entries in the dictionary, expansively encyclopedic. Praise for the “beauty in the name appropriated by the Saxon and German nations to the Deity,” is followed by the contrasting binary ”God and good,” “man and wickedness, sin,” and by the explanation that “the Saxons called him God, which is literally the good; the same word signifying both the Deity, and his most endearing quality. For those qualities which the gothic nations considered the best and most attractive,” readers are advised to consult the entry for “guϸ.” “GUϸ,” denoting “rage, the fury in battle, the highest god [of the Scandinavians], Odin,” is further explicated as follows: “The name of God is justly defined from good: not after the usual mode of thinking, because he is kind and beneficent; but because he is furious and destructive.” The ensuing exposition, a full column in length, articulates the greatest virtue, bravery in battle, and the “meanest of vices,” cowardice. These conjoined entries together with the related entry for “MAN,” represent Bosworth’s amalgamation of the (chiefly unacknowledged) work of historians Sharon Turner and Sir Francis Palgrave, Danish philologist Erasmus Rask, Frisian philologist J.H. Halbertsma, and Holstein merchant/scholar C.H. Stahl. Their contributions are revealed in the extant dictionary manuscripts, in correspondence, and in Bosworth’s annotated books, all held in the Bodleian Library. This paper reconstructs Bosworth’s adaptation of his sources and composition of the entries, exposing his knowledge of and complicated attitude toward
the use of accents to differentiate among orthographically identical words. It also exposes what the entries reveal of the contrasting ideological visions of Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon cultural pasts embraced by nineteenth-century British philologists and historians. The Scandinavian “pirates,” “robbers,” and “heathens” contrast with the Anglo-Saxons, freedom-loving rebels against tyranny in whose society the roots of British legal, constitutional, and theological institutions can be located. This divergence in cultural visions infiltrated early editions and translations of Old English texts on which we still sometimes depend and it persists in popular imagination.

MAGDALENA BATOR, School of English, University of Social Sciences Warsaw, POLAND

A lexical and structural analysis of the culinary recipe – Anglo-Norman vs. Middle English

The recipe as a text type has been investigated among others by such scholars as Görlach (e.g., 2004), Carroll (1999), Mäkinen (2006) and Taavitsainen (2001a, 2001b). Schmidt (1994) distinguishes three types of the genre: the medical, culinary and general. The research done so far deals mostly with the medical recipe or treats the text type as a whole without discussing the differences between the particular sub-types. The few studies devoted exclusively to the culinary recipe usually concentrate on its single features (e.g., Culy 1996, Massam and Roberge 1989).

A diachronic study of the recipe shows a great way of development of this text type, since the earlier a recipe the more it varies from what we know today (see e.g., Culy 1996, Martilla 2009). The earliest culinary recipes, written in English, come from the late Middle English period. However, culinary material can be found also earlier, i.e. at the beginning of the Middle English period: “the earliest culinary recipes occur in two Anglo-Norman manuscripts” (Hieatt and Jones 1986: 859).

The aim of the present paper is to compare a sample of the early Anglo-Norman culinary material with the Middle English (corresponding) recipes. The former come from the end of the 13th and early 14th c., the latter range from the beginning of the 14th c. until the end of the 15th c. The study will be twofold. First, the formal features of the texts will be investigated, such as the form of the heading, complexity of sentences, length, etc. Then, we will have a closer look at the lexicon used in the recipes, with special attention paid to the similarities and differences in the choice of vocabulary within the two databases (AN and ME), in order to see to what extent the English recipes vary from the Anglo-Norman ones.

The corpus consists of two parts: the Anglo-Norman database - based on Hieatt and Jones’s collection (1986); and the Middle English database, formed from recipes, found in various collections and written at different stages of the Middle English period, which include
instructions for the preparation of the same dishes as the Anglo-Norman texts, so that the character of the material in both databases is similar.
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JOHN CONSIDINE, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Medulla, Promptuarium, Catholicon anglicum, Ortus: how and why were they made?

Before the publication of the Dictionary of Sir Thomas Elyot in 1538 transformed the bilingual lexicography of English and Latin, a family of substantial fifteenth-century dictionaries glosed Latin words with English equivalents and vice versa. Two branches of the family, the English–Latin dictionaries called Promptuarium parvulorum and the Latin dictionaries with English glosses called Ortus vocabulorum, were printed in a number of editions from the turn of the sixteenth century onwards. Another English–Latin branch, called
Catholicon anglicum, is extant in two manuscripts. The oldest branch of the family includes a group of dictionaries known as Medulla grammatic, and a single dictionary preserved in Trinity College, Cambridge, MS O. 5. 4. These are, like the Ortus vocabularum, Latin dictionaries with sporadic English glosses; they had a common ancestor which can be shown to have had fewer English glosses than the extant dictionaries. I would like to ask two sets of questions about this family of dictionaries.

Firstly, where did they come from? They have been seen as elaborate compilations from a wide variety of earlier sources, and their compilers sometimes presented them as such. But it is not clear that fifteenth-century information management techniques would have been sufficient to merge material from numerous sources into a single new dictionary, and there are sixteenth-century and later analogies which suggest that the compilation of dictionaries is often a less elaborate process than meets the eye. So, can light be shed on their sources?

Secondly, why were they made? This question applies in particular to the Ortus vocabularum and to the group comprising Trinity O. 5. 4, the Medulla tradition, and their common ancestor: what was the point of a Latin–Latin dictionary with sporadic English glosses? Why were the English glosses present at all, and why were more entries not glossed, either in manuscript recensions or in printed editions of the Ortus?

PAUL COOPER, UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL

“Each its own separate sphere”: dialect dictionaries and the enregisterment of nineteenth century “Yorkshire” dialects

Regional dialect dictionaries can be instrumental in the enregisterment of dialects. Frequent and consistent representation of dialect features in word lists and glossaries leads to ‘vernacular norm formation’ (Johnstone & Baumgardt 2004: 115). When these norms become associated with social values such as geographical region, they can form a repertoire of features which are representative of a particular dialect. This happens through processes of enregisterment, where a linguistic repertoire ‘becomes differentiable within a language as a socially recognized register of forms’ (Agha 2003: 231). Enregistered features can also be the subject of overt social commentary, as in many cases there is wide awareness of them and the social values they are associated with.

Cooper (2013, 2014) illustrates that we can also discuss enregisterment in historical contexts and identifies a repertoire of enregistered “Yorkshire” features in nineteenth century Yorkshire dialect using dialect dictionaries as a key indicator of the link between language features and place. Many features of this repertoire are relatively stable across the county, despite there being many dictionaries and glossaries purporting to represent many intra-Yorkshire dialect areas. In this paper I investigate how these intra-Yorkshire varieties were perceived in the nineteenth century. I discuss the role that regional dialect dictionaries play in the creation and maintenance of explicit links between dialect features and specific areas
within Yorkshire. Certain intra-Yorkshire varieties are mentioned, overtly commented upon, and discussed frequently and consistently in the nineteenth century, illustrating a perception that there were “Yorkshire” varieties that were distinct from one another. By considering dialect dictionaries and glossaries for these individual areas we can therefore see awareness of the differences between individual “Yorkshire” dialects. Furthermore, features which are frequently and consistently presented as marking the distinction between areas may allow for the identification of enregistered sub-“Yorkshire” repertoires for specific locations within the county.
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**AVELINO CORRAL ESTEBAN**

“To what extent is Scottish English lexis influenced by Scottish Gaelic in the Outer Hebrides?”

**Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España**

Unlike what occurs in the Highlands or in other islands where, in recent years, their Scottish English varieties have changed away to a Lowland model, in the Outer Hebrides, an area known for its strong Gaelic heritage, as well as in a few more remote areas, the Scottish English variety, commonly referred to as Island (Scottish) English (Catford, 1957:111), continues to show Gaelic marked accent and lexis. Although due to the influence of standard English the grammar of this Scottish English variety has gradually lost much of its Gaelic
distinctiveness, since speakers use very few syntactic structures which would be considered non-standard, the accent, however, remains typically Scottish and there are still many Scottish Gaelic lexical items which a speaker may choose to use. The main aim of this paper is to contribute to the knowledge of Scottish English by studying the impact that Scottish Gaelic has had on its lexis, which seems to call into question the commonly shared assumption that the Celtic impact upon English has been minimal on all levels of language. This study will also show that the variety of Scottish English spoken in these communities seems to exhibit a certain variation, due to the different forms that Scottish Gaelic presents in this area, and perhaps a possible Scandinavian influence. The bulk of the data used for analysis consist of lists of words, expressions, and constructions from a group of rural and urban Scottish Gaelic and Scottish English bilingual speakers from Lewis, Harris and Barra, and the findings are subsumed under the four general headings of etymology, spelling, definition and lexical coverage.

Keywords: Scottish English, Outer Hebrides, Scottish Gaelic, lexis, influence
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JANET DECESARIS WARD, Institute for Applied Linguistics, Pompeu Fabra University and PATRICK HANKS University of the West of England and University of Wolverhampton

The Linguistic Persistence of Technology

One of the goals of research in lexicology and lexicography is to understand the mechanisms by which words change in meaning and how the resulting polysemy is represented in dictionaries. Leading authorities on metaphor, for example Bowdle and Gentner (2005), have observed that changes in word meaning are very often brought about by metaphorical
extension of an earlier literal meaning. Technology is a rich source of conventional metaphors. This is partly because many domain-specific technologies involve some sort of interaction between human beings and the world in which they live. Human beings, being analogical creatures at heart, tend to pick up the lexical items used in one domain and apply them more generally, or to some other domain. It is commonly held that when a word is used metaphorically, its meaning is related to and derived from the literal meaning of the word.

In this paper, we explore this relationship between literal and derived meanings by presenting some case studies where the current meaning of a word originated as a metaphorical exploitation of a literal sense in the domain of agriculture. The words we discuss are *browse*, *earmark*, *harness*, *harrow*, and *yoke*, all of which originally belonged to the domain of agriculture and which today are primarily used in other domains. Following Hanks (2013), we take the view that words in isolation have meaning potential rather than meaning per se. Different aspects of such meaning potentials are activated in different contexts. In other words, phraseological context is necessary in order to determine the meaning of a word. For this reason corpus data is needed to identify the conventional patterns of use that are associated with a particular meaning. This view of word meaning allows us to empirically show whether the current meanings of a word are dependent on, independent of, or enhanced by resonance with the original or ‘literal’ meaning of the word. For example, up to the 19th century, in an era when the principal motive power for land-based vehicles was horse power or oxen power, the word *harness* was in everyday use. The role of a harness was (and is) to provide the human driver of a draught animal with a means of controlling its movement. In the 19th century, as horse-drawn technology was replaced by steam ad gasoline, this particular sense became more evidently domain-specific. The word itself, however, did not lose salience in the general language. Instead, a small cluster of established metaphors took over as what some people would regard as the new literal meanings, including (noun): "any set of equipment for attaching to the body of a person for any of various purposes" (a child in a car, a parachutist, a hiker, etc.). As a verb, the sense "get control over (some powerful source of energy or innovation)" has become predominant: in the British National Corpus, the three most frequent direct objects of *harness* are *power*, *energy*, and *resource*. Harnessing *horses* and *dogs* is still present in BNC, but less salient than it was in earlier centuries.

Several questions concerning both lexicology and lexicographic representation arise in our study. Is a metaphor still a metaphor for current speakers even after the literal sense has become archaic? To cite one of our examples, is a *harrowing experience* still to be classified as a metaphor, even among people who never refer to the agricultural activity of *harrowing the soil* around growing crops?

Finally, we look at how these five words have been represented in several dictionaries of English. Although most dictionaries cover the senses revealed by the patterns we have identified in corpora, the differing degrees of linkage between the original sense and derived senses that are shown by the corpus data are not always reflected in dictionaries.

References
Scottish in Seventeenth-Century English Lexicography: the Role of Francis Junius (1591–1677)

In the history of English lexicography, Scottish has always occupied a precarious position. Referred to as a regional ‘dialect’ by Samuel Johnson, the language of Scotland needed an unstoppable pioneer such as John Jamieson to launch it into the lexicographical mainstream which has now resulted in the *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* and the *Scottish National Dictionary*.² Going back in time, into the seventeenth century, one often searches in vain for Scottish – even in dictionaries of etymology: neither Stephen Skinners *Etymologicon lingua Anglicanae* (1667), nor the anonymous *Gazophylacium Anglicanum* (1689) feature any Scottish, except for unavoidable words as *kirk*, for which one is then referred to *church*.

A remarkable exception, however, is Francis Junius’s *Etymologicum linguae Anglicanae*, which features a substantial number of Scottish words, both as lemmata and as parts of the etymological discussions. Published posthumously in Oxford (1743) by the antiquarian Edward Lye, the *Etymologicum* had been compiled in the course of Junius’s long career as a lexicographer and etymologist. Junius’s Scottish entries derive from his study of Gavin Douglas’s *xiii. Bukes of Eneados*, published in London in 1553, of which we find the evidence in his own annotated copy (now MS Junius 54) and in a glossary and a list of Greek explanations of Scottish words (now MSS Junius 114 and 74, respectively). In 1668, Junius told his friend William Dugdale about his study of Douglas’s *Eneados*: ‘I stumbled upon manie passages wherein this wittie Gawin doth grosly mistake Virgil, and is much led out of the way by the infection of monkish ignorance then prevailing in Church and common wealth: yet there is verie good use to be made of him’.² Unfortunately, the letter does not tell us what was so useful about this Scottish material. And why?

In this paper I will review Junius’s lexicographical work on Scottish and try to answer the question why Junius chose to include the Scottish material in his *Etymologicum linguae Anglicanae*; what value he attached to Scottish and whether his use of Scottish made a

---


difference to the lexicographers who came after him. We will see that his selection of Scottish forms will have to be considered in the light of Junius’s ideas about etymology and the history of languages, and that even Samuel Johnson took notice of Junius’s Scottish experiment.

STEFAN DOLLINGER (University of British Columbia, VANCOUVER)

Regional labelling and English historical dictionaries: two methodological suggestions from DCHP-2

The marking of the regional dimension of lexical items is one of the standard features in most kinds of dictionaries, from general language dictionaries to historical dictionaries and even some learner dictionaries. Despite its widespread use, lexicographical work on regional markings, or diatopic variation, is scarce and most handbooks do not or only cursorily address the issue (e.g. Cowie 2009, Sevensén 2009). The texts that do write on the topic paint a dreary picture: Landau (2001: 220), for instance, reports that American English dictionaries “have had an indifferent record in reported regional usages”, and Hausmann (1985: 377, qtd. in Niebaum 1989: 666) raises concerns about the lack of theoretical foundations of marking systems in general language dictionaries, which are deemed “indispensable” but characterized as “theoretically weak” across the board. In the context of historical lexicography, the Dictionary of American Regional English stands out in regards to labelling practices. Rooted in fieldwork data, DARE’s marking system may be considered standard-setting, especially in relation to the regional labels which lie at the very core of the work (Cassidy 1973, von Schneidemesser 1997).

DARE’s positivist approach to regional labels is both daunting and difficult to replicate, as most historical lexicographers are not trained regional or social dialectologists. The present paper suggests two methodologies that historical lexicographers may find useful for solving the problems of regional labelling: the use of visualization techniques based on normalized web data (Dollinger 2013, Brinton In press) and the adoption of written questionnaire surveys (Markwardt 1973) for a subset of high profile or otherwise interesting terms. On one level, this approach emphasises the “modern reflex” of historical forms and uses present-day data to better understand the past. On the other hand, it argues for the use of heuristic methods, i.e. methods that can be used for – in principle – many lexemes in a historical dictionary (web visualization), while applying more precise methods to a subset of terms (questionnaires).

It will be argued that the use of these synchronic methods in addition to the historical quotation file not only enhances the precision of regional labels in DCHP-2 (Dollinger, Brinton and Fee In prep.), but also balances the need for highly particular historical data (the philologist approach) with the benefits of a more generalizable methodology (the social-science approach). There are dangers of this approach, of course, such as a potential neglect of historical dialect distributions in favour of contemporary ones that would need to be mitigated. If successful, however, the approach might lead to historical dictionaries that are
more precise in their regional labelling and even more relevant for their “daughter dictionaries”, such as general and learner dictionaries.
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**STEPHEN EVANS, Department of English at The Hong Kong Polytechnic University**

**Word-formation in Hong Kong English: Diachronic and synchronic perspectives**

The publication of the first dictionary of Hong Kong English (HKE) (Cummings & Wolf, 2011) marks a major milestone in the legitimisation of HKE as an autonomous variety of English. This paper examines the emergence and current prevalence of the lexicon of HKE, as represented in Cummings and Wolf’s (2011) dictionary and Bolton’s (2003) appendix, using five recently compiled corpora of English in Hong Kong. The diachronic perspective is provided by a 91-million-word corpus of Legislative Council proceedings (1858–2012) and a collection of 1,379 letters published in the city’s leading English-language newspapers (1842–2010). The synchronic perspective is derived from a 3-million-word corpus of lifestyle-magazine articles (2005–2012), a database containing 2,820 letters published in the
South China Morning Post in 2012 and the well-known Corpus of Global Web-based English. These corpora are used to assess the representativeness of the HKE lexicon, to identify the principal processes of word-formation and to determine phases in the evolution of HKE vocabulary.

The analysis revealed that around 80 per cent of the entries in the dictionary and the appendix appear in at least one of the corpora. This means that 146 items in the 714-word lexicon do not materialise in any of the databases. The core constituents of this lexicon are the 261 items that appear in three or more of the corpora. Consistent with Bolton’s (2003) findings, the majority of these items fall into the borrowing or coinage categories of word-formation. The three most productive processes of word-formation entail the borrowing or translation of words from Chinese (generally Cantonese) and the creation of new compounds with English words.

The paper contributes to the literature on HKE in two particular ways. First, a sizeable segment of this growing body of work has focused on the phonological dimension of the variety. In contrast, the lexical aspect of HKE has received relatively little scholarly attention. The present paper, which capitalises on substantial sets of diachronic and synchronic data, is also one of the few empirical investigations of the principal processes of word-formation in a second-language (or ‘new’) variety of English; and such work that has been conducted in this area has been from a purely synchronic perspective. Second, one of the limitations of lexicographic studies of second-language varieties such as HKE is the absence of a diachronic perspective, a lacuna which this paper seeks to bridge. The compilation of a corpus of Legislative Council minutes spanning 154 years makes it possible to identify phases in the evolution of the HKE lexicon since the late 1850s and thereby provide evidence of the history of HKE as a variety. Just over a half of the items in the existing lexicon appear in the Legislative Council corpus, and over a third of these 395 words – mostly loanwords from Chinese and loan translations – made their initial appearance between 1990 and 2012.

References


ANN FERGUSON and ALISON GRANT, Scottish Language Dictionaries

Towards a Revision of the Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue: Scottish Lexicography in the Digital Age

William Craigie commenced his preparatory work on A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue (hereafter DOST) in 1919, with the first fascicle appearing in print in 1931. Over the
next seventy years, twelve volumes in total were published, encompassing the Scottish language from its divergence from Old English up to the year 1700. The completed dictionary was then converted from printed text to an electronic format by OCR scanning (together with the ten-volume Scottish National Dictionary, which covers the period from 1700 onwards), to form the online Dictionary of the Scots Language (hereafter DSL) which was launched in 2004.

This was a huge endeavour in itself, and was further complicated by the profusion of variant spellings, which were frequently abbreviated in order to save space, and although the resulting truncations were not difficult for a human to interpret, they were largely opaque to computerisation. September 2014 saw the launch of a new version of the DSL which was the culmination of a major project to reformat the structure of the dictionary and design a new, clear user interface with more flexible search facilities. A database structure was created, to ensure referential integrity. For future editing, the new structure is linked to a bespoke online editing tool.

However, the content of the DSL still remains unchanged from the original printed volumes, and the fact remains that some of Craigie’s earliest material is now approaching its centenary without any revision. With the second edition of the Concise Scots Dictionary nearing completion, the editorial team at Scottish Language Dictionaries are now embarking on a major new project – to revise and update the content of the DSL. Clearly, much has changed in lexicographic practise since Craigie started preparing his hand-written entry slips, and the major challenge now is the development of a twenty-first century methodology for dealing with the vast resources available in the digital age.

One strand of our approach is to make use of the resource that we already have: data which is internal to DOST itself. The database structure will enable us to interrogate the whole content, which will allow entries to be supplemented, or new entries to be created, from material found in other entries. The challenge remains however in identifying this material in a language which has no standardised spelling. Another strand is the identification of suitable source-material not read for the original dictionary, such as that in the Helsinki Corpus and the Linguistic Atlas of Older Scots; and also onomastic material such as place-names and surnames, which has traditionally been overlooked by lexicographers.

Our paper will address how we can tackle these challenges by reaching out to the wider academic community to optimise the available resources, as well as utilising our own resources.

ANNA HELENE FEULNER, Berlin

“Wordhord: A new etymological dictionary of Old English”

Etymological research has made considerable progress during the 20th century. And there is a great difference between Indo-European Linguistics today and Indo-European Linguistics as
it was taught in the times of the Neo-Grammarians, when many of our standard handbooks, grammars and dictionaries saw their first editions.

The last years have seen considerable efforts to prepare new etymological dictionaries for several Indo-European languages, among them Latin, Greek, Old Frisian, Old High German, … but not for Old English.

To date, there is only one etymological dictionary of Old English, Holthausen’s *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (21963), first published in 1934. Entries in Holthausen are very short; as a rule they merely list a number of supposed cognates, without explanation or comment. Holthausen’s notation does not differentiate between native and borrowed words; moreover, he includes several ghost words (e.g. OE *delfin* and *sprinca*). The book is unsatisfactory and very much outdated. Bammesberger (1979) offers a number of addenda and corrigenda, but unfortunately he has never found the time to write a ‘new Holthausen’.

The *OED* covers those OE words that were still in use after 1150 (e.g. †drightin < OE *dryhten*), but by this time a substantial and important part of the OE lexicon had already disappeared (see the preface to the first edition, quoted in Stanley 1987: 20-1).

After having collected materials for over 20 years, I have now begun to prepare a new etymological dictionary of Old English, according to the state of the art in historical-comparative linguistics. Using illustrative examples from entries on native and on borrowed words, my paper will outline the scope and method of this undertaking.
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Sources for the Lexical Study of the South, 1500-1900.

In the Early Modern period the literary representation of dialect and works such as Alexander Gil’s *Logonomia Anglica* (1619) and John Ray’s *A collection of Words not Generally Used* (1674) are our main sources for the study of regional variation. Of the Southern dialects, initially Kentish and later the South-Western variety, soon became associated with comic characters in canonical fiction, poetry and drama. As regards dialect literature, Kentish antedates the first instances we have of Northern dialect literature. Literary authors repeatedly used the same traits: the voicing of initial fricatives, the occlusivization of interdental fricatives, *ich* forms, etc. (See further García-Bermejo Giner 2013, Wakelyn 1988). The other southern dialects were ignored for the most part (Andrew Boorde’s “Iche Am a Cornishe man” (1547) is a well known exception). As the centuries went by the same pattern was repeated as regards their lexical study. Compared with the North, the Southern dialects have been paid little attention to by dialectologists until recently (For instance Anderwald 2004 or Wagner 2013).

The aim of this paper is a description of the Early and Late Modern English sources for the lexical study the South. My attention will be focused mainly on Joseph Wright’s bibliography for the southern counties in *The English Dialect Dictionary* (1898-1905) as well as on other literary sources in *The Salamanca Corpus* (2011-).

References


ANNE-CHRISTINE GARDNER and NICOLE STUDER-JOHO (University of Zurich)
Meekness, meekleik or meekship? – Regional variation and spatial diffusion in Early Middle English suffixation

In the centuries after the Norman Conquest the English word formation system was characterised by considerable variation and competition concerning suffixes such as -dom, -hood, -leik, -ness, -reden and -ship, which occurred in abstract nouns derived from adjectival or nominal bases (e.g. goodness, falsehood, hardship). Data collected from the Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English (LAEME) reveals that these suffixes were productive at different points in time, and also to varying degrees in the major dialect areas. Derivatives in -ship, for instance, are strongly associated with the West Midlands, -leik with the former Danelaw, and -hood with the South East and East Midlands dialects. Overall, evidence suggests that East Midland writings tend to adopt lexical innovations and trends more quickly, whereas West Midland texts seem to retain more conservative or declining features for longer. These regional patterns also become manifest when examining parallel derivatives, i.e. formations which contain the same base but a different suffix, such as brightness and bighthood, or meekness, meekleik and meekship. According to their entries in the Middle English Dictionary (MED) and the Oxford English Dictionary (OED), such parallel derivatives can be regarded as synonymous; as more than one suffix is available in the same semantic context, the selected derivatives offer important insights into regional ‘preferences’ for particular suffixes. In the suffixes -ery (robbery) and -ity (chastity), introduced through Romance borrowings and only of budding productivity before the mid-fourteenth century, regional variation seems much less apparent; however, formations with these suffixes, -ity in particular, are also of interest since they also occur in sets of parallel derivatives such as chastity, chasteness and chastehood.

Gardner (2014) highlights general patterns in the regional variation of these suffixes in relation to larger dialect areas, but her findings indicate that is worthwhile to study their regional development in greater detail and to assess whether their spatial diffusion corresponds to already known patterns from the Early Middle English period (Studer-Joho 2014). The present study therefore displays the regional dissemination of suffixes like -hood and its variants -had, -hed and -hod, -leik, -reden, -ship, -ery or -ity and the regional pattern of the parallel derivates in descriptive maps that do not only display the location of attested forms, but at the same time also show the period and relative frequency of a feature. This method reveals periods and areas of greatest frequency and productivity without having to rely on predefined Middle English dialect areas. Moreover, it allows a discussion of the regional variation of the features in greater detail than has been possible with traditional methods.
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Vocabularies versus Encyclopedic Compendia in 19th century Medical Lexicography: Richard D. Hoblyn’s Terminological Dictionary

During the 19th century there was an extraordinary rise in the development of medical lexicographic works in France and Germany, which gradually spread to other places like Spain, Great Britain or Italy, for example. This lexicographical “fever” was expressed mainly in two types of works: terminological dictionaries and encyclopedic dictionaries. The key difference between them was that the former – also called by their authors “Vocabularies” – focused on words, on terms (this explains why the entries included were not too prolix, but rather short containing precise definitions); whereas in encyclopedic dictionaries – also known by some authors simply as “Dictionaries” – words were pushed into the background, because the important issue was the “things”, the concepts, especially the new ones. These were, in fact, medical manuals arranged in alphabetical order used by professionals searching for the most current trend in Medicine; this is evident not only in the large extent of articles but also in the words gathered, which are not all that could be included within a terminological dictionary, but rather those whose content had undergone a significant change in recent times.

These encyclopedic works proliferated in Germany and, dramatically, in France, where, however, terminological vocabularies did not experienced such a great development. This was not the case of Great Britain or Spain where several medical vocabularies were published. Besides paying close attention to the etymology of terms, these works tried to establish the correct use of endless new words that were appearing everywhere as a result of the constant progress made in Medicine. A good example of this is the terminological medical dictionary by Richard D. Hoblyn, which was released in 1835, but underwent a good number of editions throughout the century.

This dictionary and its success, as well as the reasons for the development of terminological versus encyclopedic lexicography, will be the focus of our paper.
Looking at the Stars: Bringing a Print Dictionary of Slang into a Digital World

‘We are all in the gutter. Some of us are looking at the stars’.

In 2010 I published Green’s Dictionary of Slang. Its three volumes and 6,200 pages embraced 17 years of work and offered a dictionary of slang ‘on historical principles’ that covered over 500 years of history and the Anglophone slangs of five continents.

Those 17 years, of course, coincided almost perfectly with the burgeoning of what is now known as the Internet. In 1993, when I began work on GDoS, the net carried 1% of two-way communications; that figure is now over 97%. I found that thanks to the this digital revolution my world, like that of everyone else, had turned upside down. I set out on GDoS thinking that with publication I would arrive at the top of a mountain; I found that I was at the bottom of the deepest of chasms. Which has meant that at least one aspect of GDoS’s subsequent progress has focused on my attempts to dig myself out. I lack a major sponsor, traditional publishing has yet to catch up with the revolution that is decimating it, I have had no choice but to go it alone. The gutter language has no choice but to aim for the digital stars.

IRÉN HEGEDŰS & GÁBOR GYŐRI (University of Pécs, Hungary)

Same, some and semi: another case for the cognitive linguistic implications of etymology

There seems to be no doubt about the origin and etymological relationship of the English words same (adj.) and some (pron.): they constitute ablaut variants (o-grade versus zero-grade) of one and the same archaic Indo-European root (cf. OED ssv. same, some, Kroonen 2013: 425, 491). Their etymological evolution is summarized in (1) and (2).

(1) same < MidEng. same ← Old Norse same (masc.), sama (fem.) < PGmc. *sama(n)- ‘the same’< PIE *somaH-o- (o-grade)

(2) some < OEng. sum pron. < PGmc. *suma- ‘some(one)’< PIE *smH-o- (zero-grade)

Furthermore, the Modern English lexemes same and some descend from the same stem as the combining forms semi- (borrowed from Latin) and hemi- (borrowed from Greek directly or via Latin). The borrowing of the neoclassical combining forms have produced an etymological triplet as shown in (3), and the native Old English prefix sām- ‘half’ has gradually become obsolete and is now confined to dialect use.

(3) sam- (dial.) < OE sam- < WGmc. *sāmi- ← Latin sēmi- ← PIE *sēmi- ‘half’
While the historical development of the sound shape of these elements seems clear, the semantic and conceptual connection between the meanings ‘same’, ‘some(one)’ and ‘half’ is far from obvious and calls for a systemic explanation. Therefore, the paper also examines the conceptual relationship between these meanings and attempts to provide a cognitive semantic explanation of how these concepts are linked to each other.

In a cognitive semantic analysis the semantic value of a word is specified with respect to a domain of presupposed knowledge. Such a domain can be any structured experience without which a concept cannot be understood. Basically, the concept is linked to the domain in a part-whole relationship, that is, it forms part of the structured experience in which it is embedded.

The semantic relatedness of some, same and semi- must be explicable as forming parts of one and the same experiential domain. We hypothesize that this is an image schematic domain since the concepts in question originate directly in embodied, physical-perceptual experience. Due to this fact these concepts appear to belong to a matrix of related image schemata (e.g. collection, splitting, iteration, part-whole, link), a matrix which is embedded in a more general image schematic domain (unity/multiplicity) (cf. Clausner & Croft 1999).
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SARAH HOEM IVERSEN

“The rise and fall of The Young Reader’s Oxford Dictionary (TYROD)”

Children’s dictionaries are still an under-researched area, and the history of children’s lexicography even more so. Béjoint (2010: 48) has remarked that children’s dictionaries ‘are interesting for the metalexicographer, although they have rarely been the object of research’. My previous research examined the development of the children’s dictionary as a distinct genre in Britain in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This paper explores the development of the very first children’s dictionaries at the Oxford University Press.

Today, the Oxford University Press publishes a wide range of bilingual and monolingual
dictionaries for children and schools. In 1960, however, OUP still had no dictionaries aimed at primary school children. Indeed, Volume III of the extensive *History of Oxford University Press* (Louis ed. 2013), which details the Press’s history from 1896-1970, has little to say about children’s dictionaries.

The present paper investigates the making of what was supposed to be the very first dictionary for younger children (aged 8-11) published by the Press, namely *The Young Readers’ Oxford Dictionary*. This project started in 1960, when James Nimmo Britton, former education editor for John Murray (Burgess 2004), asked “ought we to publish a Junior School Dictionary below the level of our present School Dictionary, designed for Primary School?” (Letter dated 10 November 1960, OUP archives, PP.11093).

This was the start of a drawn-out process that included discussions on the extent to which a dictionary at this level was useful, what primary school children required in a dictionary, how definitions should be written, and the quality of pictorial illustrations. Correspondence between publishers, lexicographers, contributors, and first readers show that there was often strong disagreement on these issues. At several stages, the TYROD project ran into difficulties and had to be halted. Finally, however, the lexicographers who had worked on the project from the start, A. J. Spooner and J. O. Weston, published *The Oxford Children’s Dictionary in Colour* in 1976.

Drawing on OUP archival notes from 1960-1976, this paper examines the principles underlying the making of the first children’s dictionary at the Press. Early statements of principles and dictionary sample pages are compared to the final publication, in order to explore the extent to which lexicographical principles and editorial guidelines corresponded with the finished product.

The paper explores the principles and guidelines that related to the challenges of creating a dictionary specifically aimed at primary school children. A particular focus is defining language and register, for instance in relation to colloquialisms and slang. From the correspondence between lexicographers and publishers, it was clear that this was a fraught issue.
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More Principle or More Practice? – Structure and Vocabulary of the *Promptorium Parvulorum* and the *Catholicon Anglicum* in Comparison

This paper compares the structure and the vocabulary of the two fifteenth-century dictionaries *Promptorium Parvulorum* (PP) and *Catholicon Anglicum* (CA), two of the oldest bilingual dictionaries which developed in many European countries from the end of the 14th century onwards, combining Latin with the respective vernaculars. Of the four bilingual dictionaries surviving from late medieval England the PP and the CA are the ones with the language order English-Latin, while the *Medulla Grammatice* and the *Ortus Vocabulorum* have Latin as their source language. Whereas the latter ones could develop on existing monolingual Latin dictionaries and vocabularies, the compilation of dictionaries with the vernacular as source language was a novel undertaking. How differently this problem could be solved can be seen in the CA and the PP. One of the most salient features can be exemplified in the entries for *all*. The CA offers 11 Latin equivalents and several Latin explanations for their use in one single entry. The PP, on the other hand, splits it into two entries, and gives one and three translations respectively. The monographs on early English lexicography by Starnes (1954) and by Stein (1985) have dealt with both dictionaries. Starnes, who concentrated on the question of possible sources, postulated the two principles of synonymy and differentiation for the CA. Stein provided a detailed analysis of the structure of the entries and evaluated their position in the development of lexicographical methods in England, reinforcing her findings for the CA in 2004. The proposed paper explores the choice of the English vocabulary and the use of lexicographic techniques by contrasting representative sections of the CA with the corresponding ones of the PP. This compilation is based on the data of *Lexicons of Early Modern English* (LEME). The vocabulary of both dictionaries covers mainly the same topics and has a relatively similar stock of Latin words. The CA, however, has a bigger Latin vocabulary and fewer headwords than the PP. This prompts the question which methods—apart from synonymy in the CA—were used to assign the Latin words to their respective English headwords. An aspect which is closely linked with this is how the vocabulary is explained to the user, who may not only have needed a translation but information regarding the exact meaning and the use of the Latin words.

The CA turns out to be the more ambitious dictionary in its combination of different novel and traditional lexicographical methods, which give the user many choices. But it does not offer all of the information consistently, probably expecting a more advanced user. The PP on the other hand gives only basic information and guides the user with exactly defined headwords to only one or two key translations. This could have been the reason why it was the more practical PP and not the definitely more intriguing CA that went into print in 1500 as a book meant for young scholars.
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**Richard INGHAM (BCU), Louise Sylvester (University of Westminster) and Imogen Marcus (BCU)**

**The bilingual lexis of shipping and manufacture in medieval England**

We report on the Leverhulme-funded Bilingual Thesaurus of Medieval England project, which seeks to identify the extent of language contact influence in occupational domains in medieval England. Project goals are to explore lexical loans and code-switching on the basis of a thorough and rigorous examination of terms specific to such domains as manufacturing, shipping and agriculture in both English and French. The aim is to discover how far particular areas of working life were subject to contact-induced linguistic change, and whether acceptance of or resistance to French lexical influence varied significantly by occupational domain.

In the course of our investigations it became clear that our two main dictionary sources (AND and MED) operated on somewhat different principles in identifying discrete senses of lexemes, and that this would cause potential problems of incommensurability. In this presentation ways of addressing these issues are discussed, and exemplified with reference to navigational senses.

The occupational domain of manufacture has been found to be heavily permeated by French-origin lexis; loan words from French were substantially higher than the average figure for French borrowing identified by Durkin (2014). It was found to be particularly high in the subdomain of metal-working as compared with wood-working. The domain of shipping has been argued by Trotter (2003) and Kowaleski (2009) to have been particularly prone to international influence, especially from French which the latter considers acted as a ‘maritime lingua franca’. It might then be expected that a substantial amount of lexical borrowing from French affected English. Findings showed provisionally that French-origin vocabulary accounted for c. 36% of shipping lexis.

It has also been claimed that French words tend to occur in texts written in Latin, and English words in text written in French. According to Trotter (2003:18), referencing Sandahl (1951:23): ‘In texts whose matrix language is Latin, technical terminology tends to be Anglo-Norman; in texts (rarer) basically in Anglo-Norman, the sea terms tend to be Middle English. This is a curious situation and not an immediately explicable one’. Provisional findings do
not, however, uphold Sandahl's statements. Over 90% of the Anglo-Norman navigational lexis identified by the project (N = 125) occurred in Anglo-Norman texts. The position for Middle English navigational lexical item is similar in that they overwhelmingly occur in English texts.

Language contact influence in the domain of shipping has been found empirically to have been high, as the research of Kowaleski and Trotter would predict. It should furthermore be noted that loanwords from French occurred in everyday maritime occupational lexis, indicating some familiarity with French at non-elite social levels.

IAN LANCASHIRE and ELISA TERSIGNI

Early Modern English Vocabulary Size in Dictionaries and in Letters 1450–1740

English vocabulary grew more in the Early Modern period than at any other time in the history of English. The Online Oxford English Dictionary shows almost an 80 percent increase in vocabulary for the sixteenth century alone. However, some reasons exist to question this growth. Did printing preserve many words of a kind that might have been found earlier but that the manuscript culture of earlier centuries failed to record? Would many terms that are now first documented in the Early Modern period be antedated were a comparable lode of medieval documents to have survived?

A three-year grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada enabled us to develop two new metrics for Early Modern English vocabulary growth (July 2013). One is the vocabulary of period letter writers. From the second half of the fifteenth century to the early eighteenth century, personal vocabulary of about 40 letter writers of all kinds increased gradually by thirty percent. We speculate that the leading cause of this amazing expansion in the command that individuals had over the English language was, not printing, but the emergence of public schools and of humanist influence on education in the early Tudor period.

A second metric calculates the vocabulary of English headword segments of early dictionaries (not the number of word-entries in them) throughout the same period (2012; forthcoming 2015). We use Lexicons of Early Modern English (2006–), now holding 664,000 word-entries and soon to include two substantial etymological lexicons—Gazophylacium Anglicanum (1689) and Nathan Bailey’s Universal Etymological English Dictionary (1737)—to obtain this figure. It represents the vocabulary known to individual lexicographers whose business was collecting words.

Our paper will focus on the results of our research, but we will also describe our digital corpora of early dictionaries and letters, the methods and tools we used to lemmatize their words, and the lemmatization dictionary (now at 35,000 entries) that grew as we did so.

Selected References
Through the 1980s and into the 1990s, a number of national historical dictionaries appeared charting several varieties of settler English. The Australian National Dictionary appeared in Australia’s bicentennial year, 1988, A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles was published in 1996, and The Dictionary of New Zealand English: New Zealand Words and Their Origins followed in 1997. While they were (and are) not the only such historical dictionaries to appear, these three were all explicitly modelled on the Oxford English Dictionary, and were published by Oxford University Press. All three presented a relatively unproblematic view of a ‘national’ variety of English for countries that had been part of the British Empire – although South Africa’s case was the most complex.

This paper seeks to explore some of the issues involved in conceptualising a national dictionary. This involves both more abstract issues and practical challenges for the lexicographer. In an age where ‘nationalism’ can rarely be dealt with unproblematically, and our understanding of culture tends towards the global and transnational, how does a ‘national historical dictionary’ imagine itself? W.S. Ramson, editor of the first edition of the Australian National Dictionary noted in his quotation selection policy that he sought to convey the ‘Australianness’ of a word in his choices – but arguably a notion such as ‘Australianness’ raises some interesting questions for a country that historically has an uneasy relationship with its identity. For the editors of the second edition, who will also have to play a role in promoting the dictionary, these abstract issues of nation prompt some reflection on our endeavours.

More practically, historical dictionaries of regional varieties of English also grapple with the question of what will be included in the dictionary and what won’t. Some terms are arguably seen as ‘quintessentially’ Australian: for example, mate and bloody, or terms that tell us something about particular historical experiences, such as the convict or gold-rush period. Yet such terms are not exclusively or even especially Australian, and some terms may be
more usefully understood as reflective of a broader ‘British World’ colonial experience (historically, if not linguistically).

This paper will discuss some of the issues of working on a historical dictionary, drawing primarily on the work done on the second edition of the *Australian National Dictionary*, but also drawing on the first edition texts of the South African and New Zealand historical dictionaries.

**KATHRYN A. LOWE, University of Glasgow**

**Crowdsourcing the medieval**

Many later manuscript copies of Old English material exist, sometimes written centuries after the original texts in them were initially composed. They are immensely valuable for the study of language change, particularly as evidence of the shift from Old to Middle English, where little material survives from this important transitional period. However, very few such manuscripts have been transcribed, even in part, as only substantive, lexical variants are routinely provided in editions and are not readily usable in this form for purposes of analysis.

This paper outlines a new initiative to crowdsource Anglo-Saxon manuscripts containing homilies by the most prolific writer of the period, Ælfric, whose work was copied for over two hundred years and which continued to be read and annotated into the fourteenth century. In this paper I outline the potential for linguistic purposes of analysing full-text copies of Old English material, demonstrating that they offer an unparalleled witness to the development of the English language at all levels in this key transitional period. I discuss ways in which such a crowdsourcing project could best be made to work, outlining some of the technical and methodological issues with this type of approach. I draw both on my own experience and that of other crowdsourcing ventures, such as the Ancient Lives papyri project at Oxford.

**COLIN MACCABE and STEPHEN HEATH**

**Lexicology, lexicography, and keywords in culture and society: race as a test case**

The Keywords Project is a collaborative research initiative investigating ‘key’ words prominently used but also contested in social debate in English, following in the tradition established by Raymond Williams’s *Keywords* (1976), which itself was based on material originally prepared as an appendix to his monograph *Culture and Society* (1958). Different meanings available for each keyword, which vary both in specific sense and in evaluative implication, can confuse rather than progress discussion in which the word is used. The project aims to contribute to our understanding of the processes involved in ‘public
conversation’ and civil society more widely by publishing short entries on approximately 100 such ‘keywords’, along with a project archive of longer essays and materials.

The short essays in Williams’s Keywords took as their starting point entries from the *Oxford English Dictionary*, alongside his own deep reading of texts from the relevant period. The current Keywords Project also pays close attention to entries from the (where appropriate revised) *OED*, and draws on tools such as corpora and electronic text databases, as well as traditional close reading of texts.

This paper will look at race and racism as a test case. Where did Italian *razza* come from (assuming that it is indeed the origin of French race, English race, and cognate terms in other European languages)? How and why did it develop a complex set of inter-related meanings so quickly, and what was the lexical gap that explains their sudden adoption across a wide range of European languages? How does this etymological and historical complexity inform the later history of the word, and the contemporary situation in which racism undeniably exists but race is a much more difficult and contested term?

**MANFRED MARKUS, INNSBRUCK**

*The truth of the pudding of language is in its speakin’: Spoken features in Wright’s *English Dialect Dictionary Online***

The study of spoken features of Late Modern English (1700-2000) has, on the whole, been eclectic and non-satisfactory. There have been phonologies of special dialects in isolation (e.g. Kökeritz 1932); there have been multi-dialect surveys, but with a narrow focus on selected phonological features (e.g. Viereck & Ramisch 1991 and 1997); and there have been historical phonological surveys which, however, have either focussed on earlier periods of the history of English (like Ellis‘ monumental *Early English Pronunciation*, 1869), or otherwise on the development of the standard pronunciation (as in MacMahon 1998) or on social varieties of English within the last 80 years (cf SED, Orton 1961). This paper tries to direct our attention to the general relevance and ubiquity of spoken regionalex English in its pivotal historical phase of the 18th and 19th centuries, bringing Joseph Wright’s *English Dialect Dictionary* (EDD) into play. In spite of its faultiness, this unfairly neglected six-volume book may well contribute to improve the situation of research on dialect-based pronunciation in Late Modern English. The new edition of the digitised *EDD*, to be available soon (2015), is based on the last four years’ correction work of the originally scanned text and on an entirely new version of the tagging and computer application provided to make the valuable contents of the dictionary (easily) accessible.

In a state-of-the-art report, my paper will first present the results of our recent work within the Innsbruck project, which is now in its final phase. I will here focus on methodological and computer linguistic aspects: how we achieved reliability in the reproduction of the text; how the structural complexity of the entries in the Dictionary urged us to create more and more
tags; what difficulties had to be overcome by the adaptation of the tags to TEI codes; what database we decided to use; and, finally, what the new interface looks like.

The second half of my paper will be a demonstration of the role of spoken features in the EDD. Given that I have variously published on spoken aspects of English dialects from a general and survey point of view (e.g. Markus 2012), I will now pay particular attention to some selected spoken features that have so far not been in the centre of scholarly interest and may seem marginal at first sight. They include some of the usage labels in the EDD, such as those of frequency, prosody and pragmatics. The paper will also tackle the issue of Wright’s sources that have some affinity to spokenness, from the non-printed sources provided by correspondents to the printed and yet popular literary sources such as Burns’ poems. In a third point I will deal with the role of certain cultural everyday habits, practised in the form of rhymes, songs, dictums and proverbial sayings.

To combine the two halves of the paper, my discussion of the spoken features will less emphasise their relevance as such, but primarily the question of how they can be retrieved from the 4.500 pages of the Dictionary. This issue of sensible retrieval seems to me to be one of the main topics of computer-based historical lexicography. Due to a particularly synergetic cooperation between philologists and computer specialists within the Innsbruck project in the past, I hope that our insights and answers to the task of valuable retrieval may be of some general lexicographic value.
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R. W. MCCONCHIE, University of Helsinki, Finland
‘No man brings more mind (or more duplicity) to his profession’: Robert James (1703-76) and *A Medicinal Dictionary* (1743)

Robert James’s name occurs only infrequently in modern writings on the eighteenth century, usually in respect of three things: the fact that he was a friend of Dr. Johnson, his hugely successful fever powder, and the fact that Johnson made a contribution to the proposals for his *A Medicinal Dictionary* of 1743, as well as to the dictionary itself (cf. Corley 2004; Hazen 1973: 68-69). Details of his life are otherwise rather sketchy and, once again, much is derived from what comes to us from Johnson, whether his letters or through Boswell, or is conveyed in Munk’s Roll (II, 269). The usual account is a brief summary, offered in passing, of his age, education, professional and personal relation to Johnson, Johnson’s contribution to his dictionary, and his drinking, as well as his licentiousness and knowledge of Greek or lack of it. It is difficult to avoid that sense that the James we can piece together nowadays about James the man is only the Johnsonian view, and the little we get by way of hints and innuendo from that source is not altogether satisfactory. This turns out to be a twentieth century view, however, and one inadvertently coloured by Johnsonian scholars.

There is another view, that conveyed largely in the works of nineteenth century scholars and reference works, and one which corroborated by eighteenth century evidence not usually considered by Johnson scholars, and which was ignored by Johnson himself. This also raises fundamental questions about his dictionary with a new urgency. How was such a prodigious work compiled? Why did such a man spend such an immense effort in making a dictionary which was bloated and impractical? What was his contribution to medicine and medical lexicography in the eighteenth century?

AYUMI MIURA Kansai Gaidai University, Japan

Denominal conversion verbs in the history of English *A picture emerging from the OED Online*

This paper provides a diachronic investigation into the English verbs which are zero-related to nouns denoting roles or professions and which are commonly classified into two classes. To use Levin’s (1993: 184–5) convenient labels, *orphan* verbs represent the class whose members can be paraphrased with the zero-related noun and the verb *make* (e.g. orphan ‘make someone an orphan’), while *captain* verbs constitute the class whose members can be paraphrased with *act* (e.g. captain ‘act as a captain for/toward someone’). In *orphan* verbs, the zero-related noun is being predicated of the surface object of the verb, whereas in *captain* verbs, it is derived from the surface subject of the verb.

The focus of this paper is on the historical syntax and semantics of these verbs and their interrelationship, an area which has been under-researched so far. As a large number of them are sparsely attested or even apparently hapax legomena, illustrative quotations under entries of the OED Online serve as a highly useful dataset, especially for the purpose of obtaining an overview for the whole history of English. My preliminary research on the basis
of the extensive list provided in Bladin (1911) demonstrated that semantic boundaries between *orphan* verbs and *captain* verbs have always been much fuzzier than previously suggested, with those which have the function of both of these verbs almost as many as genuine *orphan* verbs. Interestingly, the growth of these bifunctional verbs reflects the overall developmental pattern of genuine *captain* verbs, with peaks in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, following a clear rise in the sixteenth century. The significance of the sixteenth century as a turning point is also indicated by the fact that this century sees the sudden emergence of the co-occurrence of *captain* verbs with the dummy object *it* (e.g. *housewife it* ‘to be a housewife’), a syntactic feature not available with *orphan* verbs.

Starting from the expanded list of *orphan/captain* verbs compiled from Biese (1941), Marchand (1969), Clark & Clark (1979), Balteiro (2007), Davies (2004), Gottfurcht (2008), and Rimell (2012), I will revisit the issue of the changing syntactic-semantic relationship between and within *orphan* verbs and *captain* verbs from Old English to the twentieth century, with particular reference to their degree of coherence as verb classes. The data extracted again from the OED Online entries present a picture quite similar to that of my preliminary survey, which may be partly ascribable to the structure of the OED such as the total number of quotations and new words in each century. I will also examine if categorisations of the HTOED bring any insight to the vague semantic boundaries of *orphan/captain* verbs.
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KUSUJIRO MIYOSHI (Tokyo, Japan)

John Pickering’s Reference to Dictionaries in His Vocabulary (1816):

America’s First Philological Exploration of Lexicography

The American lexicographer John Pickering is widely known among authorities on Americanisms, his dictionary being published in the 1810’s under the title Vocabulary, or Collection of Words and Phrases Which have been Supposed to Be Peculiar to the United States of America (1816). Allen Read (2002:114), a masterly scholar of Americanisms, acclaiming Pickering as “one of the most perceptive linguists America has produced”, he (1947:271) also regards the Vocabulary as “an important landmark in the study of the English language in America”.

However, despite such a situation, there is the fact that research on the Vocabulary has scarcely been done after the 1950’s; for instance, in the case of the journal American Speech (1925-), this seems not to have carried any papers since 1957. In this regard, Richard Bailey’s “National and regional dictionaries of English”, which comprises one chapter of The Oxford History of English Lexicography (2009) edited by Anthony Cowie is suggestive and symbolical. Bailey, in this chapter, divides the section related to the history of the dictionary of Americanisms into two parts; the one is for the relevant general statement and the other for the treatment of “scholarly dictionaries of Americanisms”. He discusses Pickering’s Vocabulary exclusively in the former.

Then, has research on Pickering’s Vocabulary thoroughly been done? My answer to the question is “Never in the least”. Actually, when browsing through 113 entries in the Vocabulary whose head-words and head-phrases begin with the letters J, K, L, M, N, O and P, which comprise approximate 18 % of all its entries, we can notice Pickering having used well more than 60 reference materials, in which dictionaries, state papers, periodicals, private letters, the records of lectures and sermons are included. And, when seeing these reference materials, Pickering is found to have used them quite finely, thus the body of the Vocabulary being highly scholarly. As far as I can judge, this situation has scarcely been analyzed closely to date.

And my intention in this paper is to clarify Pickering’s use of 18 English dictionaries out of his reference materials within the range of the 113 entries I have mentioned. In order for this purpose to be fulfilled, I will provide four sections for my analysis. They are “dictionaries he referred to”, “his ways of using the dictionaries”, “his use of Webster’s and Johnson’s dictionaries” and “his comparative observation of dictionaries”. To summarize my analysis in this paper, Pickering was versed in the characteristics of wide range of English dictionaries, making the fullest possible use of them to research the historical background of
Americanisms, or words and phrases which had been erroneously ascribed to Americanism. This will be regarded as splendid in the 1810’s America.
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LYNDA MUGGLESTONE, University of Oxford

History and historical principles: Andrew Clark and the English Words in War-Time project

The English Words in War-Time project tracks the changing forms of language as recorded during the First World War by Andrew Clark, rector of Great Leighs in Essex. Starting in the first week of WWI, Clark carefully recorded lexical innovation and change as manifested in public discourse (using a range of newspapers, including the Scotsman, Daily Express, and local press). While the 'historical principles' of the Oxford English Dictionary (on which Clark had early been a volunteer) reached back to 1150, Clark was fascinated by the linguistic possibilities that historical principles as applied on-going history might reveal. His focus lay not in the canonical – how great writers might record, and think about, the war. Instead, he stressed the salience of the ordinary, and the everyday – the evocative language of the popular press, and how the events of war were communicated within the nation at home. The Clark archive offers, however, not merely a documentation of language within a period of significant historical change, but also a closely critical reading of historical principles as attested by the OED. If Clark has early been used a critical reader by Murray, Clark’s collected evidence reveal other aspects of critical reading –by which the evidence of
the *OED* is subject to careful scrutiny and renewed evaluation. His acts of independent collection are, for example, accompanied by a decision not to send this same material to the dictionary. While Clark’s work as a volunteer on the *OED* hence closely informed the methodology he deploys, he would therefore also make a number of distinctive – and deliberate – departures of his own. This paper will examine Clark’s work as private lexicographer in 1914-15, placing his evidence, and critical acts of reading, against that of the contemporary *OED*. It was, after all, as James Murray had early argued, news discourse in which we can most clearly see the linguistic grass grow. Clark set out to prove him right.

**DR. HEATHER PAGAN and DR. GEERT DE WILDE, EDITORS, ANGLO-NORMAN DICTIONARY**

**Missing Words: The *OED* and *DMLBS* as witnesses of lost Anglo-Norman Words**

In 2012, the Online Anglo-Norman Dictionary (AND2) began a new phase in the ongoing project, wherein links to other relevant dictionaries of English, French and Latin were added to every article. It became evident during the process of linking the AND2 to the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) and the Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources (DMLBS) that an impressive number of the entries in both dictionaries attested to the borrowing of Anglo-Norman words into Latin and Middle English. In addition, it became clear that both dictionaries contained a number of words which claimed to have an Anglo-Norman etymon, which were absent from the AND2.

This phenomenon has been recently studied by Phillip Durkin in his work *Borrowed Words* (Oxford, 2014), in which he examines a numbers of entries in the OED which are believed to have Anglo-Norman etymons that are currently missing in the AND2. This paper would like to offer a complementary (and complimentary!) view of the situation from the point of view of the editors at the AND2. We would like to show how the process of rewriting the entries for P- supports Durkin’s findings as well as examining further the reasons behind these lacunae. We would also like to explore possible ways in which the AND2 can respond to these missing lemmata and their implications for our understanding of the transmission of Anglo-Norman.

**MIROSŁAWA PODHAJECKA (University of Opole)**

**An unknown octolingual manuscript dictionary: *Dictionarium octoglotton* ... (ca. 1700)**

This paper builds on previous research seeking to identify the predecessors of bilingual Polish-English / English-Polish dictionaries. Up to date, five Renaissance and Enlightenment polyglots with Polish and English wordlists have been examined to throw light on the ‘prehistory’ of the bilingual lexicographic tradition (Podhajecka 2013a, 2013b). Quite unexpectedly, an incomplete work extant in the manuscript form, *Dictionarium octoglotton*...
(ca. 1700), has recently been discovered. The aim of this paper is therefore to provide a
tentative analysis of the dictionary, focusing primarily on its Polish and English equivalents.

The polyglot embraces eight Western and Eastern languages: Latin, Russian / Church
Slavonic, Greek, Polish, English, Flemish, German, and French, whose inclusion in a single
volume is astonishing. Suffice it to say that the first printed dictionary to pair English and
Russian, Poletika’s Slovar’ na šesti jazykax” ..., was published as late as 1763. The Russian /
Church Slavonic wordlist recorded in the Cyrillic alphabet turns out to be the richest of all,
which might suggest that the manuscript was penned by a Russian, but it was dedicated to
Frederic III, the elector of Brandenburgia and king of Prussia, not to the tsar. The identity of
the author hidden behind the initials ‘E. G. a B’ remains unknown.

The results of the study indicate that Cnapius’ Thesaurus Polono-Latino-Græcus (1626) or,
more exactly, its Latin-Polish volume became the only source for the Polish wordlist,
whereas the dictionaries by Holyoke (1606), Gouldman (1664), Cole (1674), or Littleton
(1677-78) could be used in compiling the English one. This notwithstanding, the polyglot
includes glosses, such as ‘To play tricks of youth’ (Adolescenturio), ‘That may have two
husbands’ (Bivira), ‘Post wagon’ (Currus publicus), or ‘Bearing twins’ (Gemellipara), which
were not borrowed from any dictionary consulted so far. If the compiler had had a grasp of
English, he might have obviously modified the equivalents offered by other lexicographers,
but, judging by a huge number of spelling mistakes, he probably resorted to copying all the
items verbatim. Which of the existing bi- or multilingual dictionaries with English did he
draw on then? The paper will address this and other issues which have come to the fore.
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Contingency and accident in the construction of Johnson’s Dictionary

Several years ago (1990; 1996; 2005) I was able to publish two unprecedented assumptions about Johnson’s important revision of his Dictionary for the 1773 fourth edition that drew considerable attention of the Johnsonian (and historical lexicographic) scholarly world: 1) that part of the material Johnson and his amanuenses prepared for inclusion into the 1773 edition had been lost and so new revisions had to be constructed piecemeal by other means and in a hurry, making this part text of the published Dictionary different from any other; and 2) that Johnson incorporated authors into his Dictionary as “authorities” for word usage that were politically and theologically conservative and who spoke specifically in favor of the Anglican church in relation to current movements and legislation threatening the independence and preeminent authority of the church. While the first, though necessarily unexplained, was accepted by critics as a possibility (lacking as it did any alternate explanation for the anomalies in the text), the second met with considerable resistance. Some literary scholars argued against such a conscious alteration of the ideology of the Dictionary, insisting that the evidence was inconclusive.

Now it is possible to shed considerable light on both possibilities and to confirm the accuracy of my original speculations. Through the research (soon to be published) of an American scholar named Matthew Davis, we have located a source who can help us explain both anomalies. Investigating the Allen family—the most famous member of which to Johnsonians would be the printer Edmund Allen—Davis has unearthed the figure of John Allen, Vice-Principal of Magdalen Hall, Oxford, who according to family records assisted Johnson in his work on the Dictionary, and who was known somewhat notoriously to have “left pages of the Dictionary behind in a coach.” Furthermore, it has been established that Allen was a vigorous opponent of the Feathers’ Tavern Petition (concerning the relaxation of oaths) and that he had challenged Johnson to write something that proved he was a Christian. Unquestionably, Allen is the source of much of the theologico-political revision of the fourth edition, and his handwriting can be found in some of the surviving materials; additionally, the fact that Johnson relied on him to add his revisions to the work raises the likelihood that he was brought into the process not only because of his learning, but also because of his political views regarding the church and orthodoxy.
This paper traces the new evidence in its relation to the question of Johnson’s efforts for the revision of his Dictionary. Not only does this paper attempt to establish the actual steps of revision now made clear, but it examines the implications of the contingencies and accidents that affected the Dictionary’s construction and the ways in which they can be seen in the work as it comes down to us today. Furthermore it consolidates all new evidence that has come to light concerning the revision since the last comprehensive discussion in 2005. The paper will, finally, conclude with a discussion of the nature of Johnson’s Dictionary in light of the physical challenges he faced in constructing it.

JONNIE ROBINSON, British Library

“Ratching through kintle for bobby-dazzlers: initial reflections on the British Library’s Evolving English ‘WordBank’”

‘Me mam’ – it means ‘your mum’ or summat like that. These are the words of a twelve-year-old girl from Hull recorded at the British Library’s ‘Evolving English’ exhibition in 2010. ‘Evolving English: One Language, Many Voices’ was a major exhibition that explored the evolution of the English Language over 1,500 years through the Library’s extensive collection of manuscripts, printed books, newspapers, sound recordings, digital media and ephemera. The exhibition celebrated historic and contemporary diversity by presenting examples of English usage across time and space. Visitors to the Library’s Paccar Gallery in St Pancras and to complementary mini exhibitions held at six partner libraries across England (Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool, Newcastle, Norwich and Plymouth) were encouraged to contribute a voice recording to create a snapshot of spoken English at the start of the 21st century. They could either submit a word or phrase they felt was somehow ‘special’ in their variety of English (the ‘WordBank’) or recite a reading passage designed to capture their accent (the ‘VoiceBank’).

The public and media response to the exhibition confirmed enormous enthusiasm for debate about many aspects of the English Language, but above all demonstrated our fascination with, and affection for, features of English with which we connect on a personal level – the dialect, slang and nonce-words that express our sense of individual and shared identities. The exhibition attracted over 147,000 visitors, approximately 15,000 of whom – such as the contributor from Hull – submitted recordings that resulted in a substantial audio archive. This paper will describe the Library’s progress in accessioning the WordBank and reflect on the opportunities and challenges faced encouraging the public to participate in creating a substantial present and future linguistic research resource. The paper will outline the Library’s plans for making the data set available to researchers worldwide and explore how different audiences – academic linguists, teachers and learners, creative industries and the general public – might engage with the material as it becomes more widely available.

Javier RUANO-GARCIA University of Salamanca

“When the Provincial Dialects were the subject of Conversation: 18th-century Norfolk words in BL Add MS 32640”
On 31 July 1789, George Nicol (1740?-1828), London bookseller to George III, sent Sarah Sophia Banks (1744-1818) a list of Norfolk words he had requested to a native “Lady, who [was] conversant on this Subject” (f. 237r). A well-known collector of coins and medals that document “the social history of her age” (ODNB s.v. “Sarah Sophia Banks”), Banks’ interest in antiquarian items was also visible in her collection of provincial dialects, which Nicol saw as a “very laudable pursuit” (f. 237r). In fact, by the time she received the list of Norfolk terms, Banks was involved in the compilation of A Dictionary of Lincolnshire and English that, in words of Mathews (1935: 400), constitutes “a definite contribution to our knowledge of the dialect”. This collection is part of a larger unpublished volume entitled Glossaries of Words, etc. in the Lincolnshire Dialect...1779-1814 (now BL Add MS 32640) that consists of four expanded versions of the Lincolnshire dictionary, along with the list of Norfolk items and a short Dictionary of Kentish and English. To my knowledge, Banks’ attempts to document regional uses of her time have gone rather unnoticed. The Lincolnshire dictionary, for example, escaped the notice of Wright’s EDD, as well as of Peacock’s glossary of 1877, and it has received little scholarly attention by modern historians of English dialects. Such has also been the case of the Norfolk words.

This paper examines the Norfolk lexical material contained in BL MS Add 32640. My purpose is to determine the extent to which it contributes to the record of Norfolk English, especially given that early testimonies to the vocabulary of the dialect are characteristically scarce. John Ray’s glossary and White Kennett’s unpublished dictionary are amongst the few early known documents with remarks on Norfolk words prior to the publication of Forby’s Vocabulary of East Anglia (1830) and Rye’s Glossary of Words used in East Anglia (1895). As it happens with the Lincolnshire dictionary, this collection of Norfolk terms has received scant attention, if any, despite the fact that it bears 18th-century witness to some of the words recorded in East Anglian collections of the 1800s and the EDD. With this, I aim to cast some further light on the history of regional Englishes of the 1700s as recorded in a number of manuscript glossaries of local dialects compiled during this period (see Wakelin 1991: 43; Shorrock 2001: 1554).
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LINDSAY ROSE RUSSELL, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Digital Dictionaries and Feminist Legacies: Principles of Crowd-Sourcery from the Original Websters

Beginning in the 1970s, mainstream dictionaries became the target of feminist critique that convincingly documented the androcentrism and sexism of prominent monolingual general-purpose dictionary definitions, illustrations, and sources. In subsequent decades, feminist critique opened onto feminist lexicography, and dictionaries explicitly styled as feminist or womanist were published in both the United States and England. *A Dictionary of Women’s Liberation*, *A Woman’s New World Dictionary*, *A Feminist Dictionary*, *Websters’ First New Intergalactic Wickedary of the English Language*, and the *Historical Dictionary of Feminism* are but a handful of the feminist dictionaries to appear in the past four decades. *The Book of Jezebel*, published in October 2013, is perhaps the most recent instance of a feminist dictionary; it is the print incarnation of a lexicon that circulates on the popular website Jezebel.com. Exploring this archive of historical to contemporary feminist dictionaries, this paper describes the models of crowd-sourcing theorized and enacted by feminist lexicographers, or, to borrow Mary Daly’s term for women weavers of word-webs, websters. Feminist dictionaries offer not only a valuable paradigm for how to invite and sustain reader participation in lexicography; they also issue a powerful challenge to dictionary makers and users to rethink those very roles of “maker” and “user.” Long before wikis and other online dictionaries were welcoming contributions from the public, feminist dictionaries had moved for a radical revision of how dictionaries might be built collaboratively and inclusively.

DR DANICA SALAZAR, OED and DR JAVIER MUÑOZ-BASOLS, University of Oxford

Different attitudes, different policies: A historical survey of cross-linguistic lexical influence between English and Spanish

Centuries of sustained contact between English and Spanish have resulted in a high degree of reciprocal loanword transmission between the two languages, a linguistic phenomenon that can be referred to as “cross-linguistic lexical influence” (Muñoz-Basols and Salazar 2015). In this presentation, we will examine Spanish-English cross-linguistic lexical influence using the two most authoritative lexicographical works in both languages as our main sources of data: the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) and the *Diccionario de la lengua española* (DRAE).

Through a chronological analysis of Anglicisms in Spanish and Hispanicisms in English, we will discuss the most common semantic fields from which words were imported into each language in various time periods, the historical and social factors that affect lexical
borrowing, and the impact of the mass media and information technology on the rapid interchange of words between languages. We will also focus on the role played by official policy and speaker attitudes in the selection, usage and integration of loanwords.

In addition, we will highlight the value of historical data in investigations of cross-linguistic lexical influence, for which they provide a quantitative foundation for observing how a language adapts to new realities, and how contact with other languages impacts this constant evolution. This approach is also of particular interest given the contrasting philosophical differences governing language policy and lexicographic traditions in different languages.
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PILAR SÁNCHEZ-GARCÍA University of Salamanca

The contribution of Frederic Thomas Elworthy’s West Somerset Word-Book (1888), w.Som.1, to Joseph Wright’s English Dialect Dictionary

In the Preface to the English Dialect Dictionary (EDD) (1898-1905), Joseph Wright mentions that “upwards of three thousand dialect glossaries and works containing dialect words have been read and excerpted for the purposes of the Dictionary” (1898: vi). Only ninety of these, however, are named in the ‘Select bibliographical list represented by numbers’ on pages v-vi of the EDD. These works are listed and numbered according to county, so that the contributions of these specific sources can be identified in the dictionary by the use of these abbreviated county names and numbers. The dictionary also lists in its monumental catalogue of bibliographic sources a total number of forty documents representative of Somerset speech. They include both literary —Raymond’s Misterton’s Mistake (1888) or Two Men o’ Mendip (1899), Jenkins’ A Secret of two Lives (1886)—, and non-literary material: Baynes’ The Somerset Dialect: its pronunciation (1855), and Jennings’ The Dialect of the West of England, particularly Somersetshire; with a glossary of words now in use there; also with poems and other pieces exemplifying the dialect (1869), amongst others.

This paper analyses the contribution made to Wright’s EDD by one of these sources, Frederick Thomas Elworthy’s West Somerset Word-Book (1888), which is represented as w.Som.1, the only source from the county of Somerset included in the selected
bibliographical list represented by numbers.

The aim of this paper is twofold. Firstly, to evaluate the role of Elworthy’s work in the EDD by considering the proportion of the entries that are quoted in the dictionary and examining their treatment. Secondly, to measure the importance of this work in relation to other sources of Somerset words listed by Wright and quoted in the EDD but not included in the selected bibliographical list.
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HANS SAUER, Munich “Binomials and Lexicography”

Binomials are word-pairs consisting of words of the same word-class that are connected by a conjunction (and, or, etc.) and have a semantic relation (such as synonymy, antonymy etc.), e.g. to have and to hold, begin and commence, lord and master, heaven and hell, men and women, blissful and happy, dulce and sweet. They have been used at all periods of the English language (but also in other languages) and in many genres and text-types, i.e. in glosses, in literary texts (poetry and prose), but also in legal language. They have several functions (often simultaneously), e.g. to create a weighty and ornate style (copia verborum), especially in legal language also to look at things from all sides in order to be as unambiguous as possible, in glosses also to render the polysemy of a Latin word, etc. Some binomials are formulaic and have a long history (such as to have and to hold), whereas others are created on the spur of the moment. In dictionaries binomials are usually not given as headwords, but lead a rather hidden existence under the entry of their first or their second element (or both). In this paper I shall look at the treatment of binomials in some of the larger dictionaries. An alternative to make binomials more prominent would probably be a separate dictionary of binomials. This would be a big project, however, because many thousands of binomials are attested from Old English to the present, and for many authors and texts the binomials used by them have not even been collected, let alone analysed and classified.

DR. JULIA SCHULTZ University of Heidelberg

The myth of France in present-day English – a lexical investigation
The present paper represents a scholarly contribution to research in English lexicology. It constitutes a comprehensive and up-to-date analysis of a significant portion of foreign vocabulary in English: the body of borrowings assumed from French in the twentieth century.

French has long been the donor language par excellence in the history of English. French has contributed to the English vocabulary in the form of new words since before the Norman Conquest. The French influence on the English lexicon represents the focus of linguistic concern in a considerable number of investigations of the language and its development. Yet French borrowings which have recently been adopted into English have as yet figured little if at all in such studies.

The present study sets out to shed light on the French impact on English in the recent past. Technical advance in the electronic acquisition of linguistic data made possible such a large-scale analysis: the results presented in this paper are based on the evaluation of a corpus of 1677 twentieth-century French borrowings collected from the *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, which proved to be a real treasure-house of the language.

This paper intends to provide a rounded picture of the wealth and diversity of the lexical items adopted from French in the twentieth century. On the basis of their meanings, the words under consideration were assigned to different subject fields in order to give an overview of the manifold areas and spheres of life enriched by French in recent times. To illustrate the intensity of French influence on the various subject fields, much emphasis will be given to the quantity and chronological distribution of the borrowings in each field. The focus of this paper will be on the identification of the fairly common borrowings which are part of the core vocabulary included in EFL dictionaries, such as the *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* or the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. Since these types of dictionary record words and meanings that have become comparatively familiar in English, they help to identify those areas where the so-called “myth of France” (Chirol 1973) has been best maintained.
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**Structuring information: Typography in English dictionaries**

The paper investigates a topic which constitutes a central part in dictionary production and invites full exploration in its historical dimension: the visual display of lexical content on the actual page of a dictionary. The progress in the technical possibilities of the printing press made it possible to match visually each linguistic component of a dictionary entry. Thus headword, definition/explanation, translation equivalent, etc. could be distinguished by different font types and sizes as well as spacing and colouring. Moreover, inserting typographical symbols, drawings and pictures allowed the compiler to provide users with further insights into the meaning and linguistic status of the lexical items described and the
Method of compilation. The paper outlines and illustrates the functional exploitation of these devices.

MARTA SYLWANOWICZ University of Social Sciences in Warsaw

Technical terminology in Middle English medical texts

The examination of the vocabulary in medieval medical works reveals that Late Middle English laid solid foundations for the formation of English scientific vocabularies, at least in the sphere of medicine (cf. McConchie 1997; Norri 1992, 2004; Sylwanowicz 2009).

The main aim of the proposed paper is to examine the use and distribution of the specialist terminology in Middle English recipes found in the texts representing three different traditions of writing (remedy books, surgical works, academic treatises). The study will show how the medieval translators varied in their choice of medical terminology. In particular, what motivated them to use foreign forms, and what methods or techniques were used to help the readers understand the terminology. A preliminary investigation has revealed that the formal structure of a recipe might have influenced the translator's choice of specialist terminology. Therefore, the study will also concentrate on the formal features of recipes: heading, ingredients, procedure and application (Carrol 2004: 179). For instance, in the Middle English version of Antidotarium Nicholai, the most representative collection of medieval recipes, each heading of a recipe (usually the name of a medicament) is in Latin. Later, within the text the Latin term is explained by a more familiar expression, e.g.: To make *vnguentum viridium*: ffor to make *a green oynement*. Take celendoyn…. (Antidotarium Nicholai, MEMT, p. 312).

The data for the paper come from the Middle English Dictionary available online and the Middle English Medical Texts (MEMT), a computerised collection of medical treatises from c. 1375 to c. 1500. The MEMT is a comprehensive tool which provides a solid basis for studies focusing on one register of writing.
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Lexical obsolescence and loss: two methodological probes

Our understanding of lexical mortality crucially depends on the nature of sources, methods that the sources allow the analysis to employ, and principal sociolinguistic and structural tendencies at work in a language at any given point in time.

Our joint paper proposes to offer methodological observations on, and ultimately two historical structural perspectives of, the problem of lexical obsolescence and loss, namely as reflected in “Updated Old English” (Dance (2013; cf. also The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220 (2010)) and in Late Modern English (1700–2000).

In the first part of the paper, our analysis attempts to show several structural tendencies at work in the demise of the English vocabulary between 1066 and 1220, illustrating the devastating effect exercised by changes in word-formation patterns and their productivity on a vocabulary organized on the etymological (Mathesius 1939–40) or associative principle (Kastovsky 1992). Comparing the electronic evidence provided by The Dictionary of Old English (A–G) and The Middle English Dictionary with textual material of updated copies of Old English homiletic prose, attention is paid to the interaction between lexical losses (in nouns, adjectives and verbs) and the marginalisation of some of the word-formation patterns employing typological introflection (mainly ablaut and i-mutation) and suffixes of an inflectional, rather than agglutinating, character. The processes described are shown to testify to small, slow, gradual but perceptible beginnings in the intertwined domains of lexis and word-formation of the well-known large-scale typological reshaping of English, at a time when much of the estimated 65–85% loss of Old English lexis (Minkova – Stockwell 2006) is thought to have been taking place.

In the second part of the paper a corpus driven methodology is proposed and applied on large data (over a hundred billion tokens of English text from 1700–2000) made available through the Google Books project. Our main goal is: a) to establish a methodology for finding relatively common words that became obsolete based on their frequency and distribution; b)
to selectively analyse and discuss the conditions of their decline; and c) to propose a classification of obsolete words – both in terms of the degree of their obsolescence (based on their frequency and distribution in the last decade under scrutiny) as well as in terms of the conditions and circumstances of their decline.

Since the practice of current English dictionaries shows relative lack of systematic labelling of obsolete words, we hope the proposed classification may find its use in contemporary lexicography.

In a comparative conclusion, we comment on the differences between the early period of typological reshaping and the latter period of standardisation and stabilisation in light of the processes of obsolescence observed in both parts of the paper.
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of Arts and Sciences delivered on 26 November 26 2013
(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MBzzOnH1Sq4)
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MEGAN TIDDEMAN University of Aberystwyth

**Middle English, Latin, Italian and Anglo-Norman: the mixed-language business accounts of William Cantelowe (1451)**

This paper aims to explore the significance of a mid-fifteenth century mercantile document that offers both insight into medieval language mixing in general and important new evidence of early Italian borrowings in English.

The Cantelowe accounts (Archivi Salviati, Serie 1:339) are found in the *Scuola Normale* in Pisa and detail the sale of a very large shipment of wool (466 pokes) from England to Pisa and Florence in 1451. They were written by John Balmayne for his master, William Cantelowe of London, business associate of the successful Salviati Company. The manuscript was studied by the economic historian, George Holmes, for his 1993 article on Anglo-Florentine trade in which he includes a small number of extracts from the thirty-five folios. Holmes, G. (1993): *Anglo-Florentine Trade in 1451*. In: *English Historical Review* 108, 371-386.
am currently editing the entirety of the accounts as part of my doctoral research into medieval language contact.

The paper will present some of the intriguing lexical, lexicographical and, indeed, sociolinguistic questions raised by the Cantelowe accounts. By its very survival, it joins a tiny group of Middle English matrix mercantile records from the 1400s. More importantly, the text offers a fascinating hybrid of four languages; large sections of Middle English or Latin are interspersed with whole phrases or single lexemes in Italian, finished with a sprinkling of late Anglo-Norman. Whilst abbreviations are widely used throughout, the switch points appear inconsistent and nothing like the fixed trilingual business code, based on visual diamorphs, analysed at length by Laura Wright (e.g. in 2002).

Examples of early Anglo-Italian contact are extremely rare and this evidence of an English scribe deftly employing Italian terminology and using the language in full sentences is – as far as I am aware – unique amongst medieval mercantile texts. This goes beyond the transmission of single Italian lexemes, mainly commodities, passed on from Italian merchant to English host in a contemporary commercial record, the Views of the Hosts of Alien Merchants, 1440-44 (c.f. Tiddeman, forthcoming). Of course, it is obvious that employees like Balmayne who worked closely with Italian colleagues at home and abroad would have spoken Italian but concrete evidence of such linguistic competence in the mercantile community is most unusual.

Mixed-language documents typically create challenges for the lexicographer, with each monolingual dictionary creating its own strategies to deal with the inclusion of ‘foreign’ loanwords. However, the Cantelowe accounts are still undoubtedly a valuable addition to the Middle English corpus. As well as several Italian hapaxes absent from the British record (e.g. arsina, macagoni, pezoly) we find other mercantile loanwords that are not currently attested in an English-matrix text until the sixteenth or seventeenth century: e.g. magazino ‘a warehouse’ (OED sub magazine, att. 1583), ditto ‘in the month / year already named’ (OED sub ditto, att. 1625), avery ‘a maritime tax’ (OED sub aveny att.1676).

JUKKA TYRKKÖ University of Tampere

Multilingualism, Hard Words, and Late Modern Dictionaries

Multilingualism, or code-switching, is most often discussed by linguists as a feature of spoken discourse and typically in the context of Present-day English. However, over the last ten years scholarship of historical multilingualism has also increased markedly and there is a growing body of evidence to suggest that code-switching has been an almost ubiquitous feature of English writing since the Middle Ages and that, furthermore, multilingual passages


can be found in most, if not all, genres of writing (see Pahta and Nurmi 2006, Schendl and Wright 2011). To give an example, recent research by the Multilingual Practices in the History of Written English project has demonstrated that the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts (CLMET3), a 34-million-word corpus comprising 333 popular and widely read English texts from a variety of genres, includes words and phrases in at least nineteen different languages (Pahta, Nurmi, Tyrkkö and Petäjäniemi 2014).

The most commonly used foreign languages in English text in the Late Modern period were French and Latin, the former especially in narrative prose and drama, the latter in scientific texts. In this paper, I will examine the treatment of high-frequency multi-word units such as *ipso facto* and *terra firma* in major English dictionaries of the period. Using the CLMET3 corpus as primary source, I will discuss how common such phrases were in popular English texts in terms of both frequency and dispersion, and then see how well, if at all, the contemporary reader could have uncovered their meanings using the major English dictionaries available to them. The dictionaries consulted include Dr. Johnson’s *A Dictionary of the English Language* (1755), Bailey’s *Universal Etymological English Dictionary* (1756), Ash’s *The new and complete dictionary of the English language*, Webster’s *The American Dictionary of the English Language* (1828), and several others. The paper will also address the problem of distinguishing between hard words, loan words, and foreign words from the perspectives of frequency and contemporary lexicographical evidence.
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**GEOFFREY WILLIAMS, LORIENT, FRANCE and JANET DECESARIS, BARCELONA, SPAIN**

*Where parallel lines converge: interactions between English and French through collocational resonance*
No language is an island entire unto itself, and as such English has both given and received words over the centuries, creating a complex palimpsest of semi-correspondences. Variations in meaning patterns in text corpora have been successfully analysed using collocational networks (Williams 1998), with its associated methodology, collocational resonance (Williams 2008) being used to display diachronic changes. The same approach has been applied to dictionary data in an attempt to make the continuity and sources of polysemous variations explicit, most recently in the analysis of Latin-based words that have developed different patterns across French, Spanish and English (DeCesaris & Williams 2014). In this study, we use collocational resonance to analyse the semantic development of two words of totally different etymological origin, *field* and *champ*.

Many words have come into English from French at different periods of time. Some of these, like *culture*, were considered as hard words in Cawdrey’s *A Table Alphabeticall* (1604). As the OED notes, the semantic development of *field* at some point became influenced by association with *champ*. The interest of *field/champ* lies in their common current use as an enclosed agricultural area, which runs alongside a very varied series of extended uses, notably in academia, sports, the military, the sciences and, relatively recently, computing. If we look at earlier dictionaries, French already shows a wide use of derived meanings early on, ranging from agriculture to comb making, as demonstrated in the late 17th century by Furetière. Even if we take agriculture as our base line, as we move back in time the notion of “enclosure” as related to *field* becomes complex: the original sense of field, according to the OED, referred to open country as opposed to a wooded area and clearly, the notion of ‘open country’ is not the same as ‘enclosed agricultural area’. As we move forward in time, the complexity becomes greater, as the entries in OED clearly show. The interesting point is that although the words *champ* and *field* have totally different etymological origins, the figurative exploitations are often parallel. What is even more interesting from a lexicographical point of view is that even more often, they vary.

In order to study the development of senses for *field* and *champ*, we have turned to collocational resonance. Collocational resonance seeks to map changes in meanings potentials over time by revealing underlying aspects of meaning that colour usage across time. Studying the collocational environment of a given keyword through its collocational networks can identify significant phraseological units illustrating certain aspects of the meaning of that word within a precise context; repeating the same process in another context can then reveal the hidden carry-over of aspects of meaning. Collocational resonance can assist, therefore, with understanding not just meaning change, but also the carry-over of aspects of meaning from changing contextual environments, in other words, the small steps of change resulting in meaning extension.

Several interesting questions for dictionaries arise from our study. For monolingual dictionaries, expressing sense development is still a challenge, and particularly so when a highly polysemous word, like *field*, is a part of lexicalized compounds (e.g., the sense in *field guide* is not the same as the sense in *field artillery*). The challenge is equally important for bilingual dictionaries: although *field* and *champ* are usually considered equivalents, studying
the sense developments of field and champ through phraseology found in corpora and
dictionaries shows several patterns of overlapping polysemy (Alsina and DeCesaris 2002) as
opposed to true equivalence. We discuss these patterns in our paper, and suggest ways of
incorporating these relationships and partial parallelisms into dictionary entries.
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POSTER SESSIONS

MAUD BECKER, ABERYSTWYTH UNIVERSITY

In this communication we would like to introduce the text we are presently editing, a
continuation of the Anglo-Norman Brut from the end of the 13th century, contained in the
manuscript BL Cotton Vitellius A.X., and explore its link to other related texts. During the
examination of the chronicle that we will call Continuation, it came to light that the author of
the text used several sources, mostly Latin, that he patched together to form the extant text –
though its current structure probably possess a core that has been enhanced by further
additions. However, by analysing some episodes of the text, mainly concerning
Gloucestershire and its earls, it became apparent that there are two texts that are parallel to
ours: the chronicle attributed to Robert of Gloucester, written in Middle English, and the text
known as the Founder’s Book of Tewkesbury Abbey, a Latin text. The convergence of these
three texts allows us to point towards a common source that could be a lost chronicle of
Gloucestershire, probably in Latin. It is apparently impossible to recover this document,
evertheless, the analysis of the three parallel texts, written in three of the languages of
Medieval Britain, gives us the possibility to investigate the mechanisms of the transmission of information – especially of what we can call legendary or mythical episodes – some modalities of the process of translation, but also the lexicological correspondences between the languages cited above.

In this proposition, we want to look at a few examples that will illustrate a few phenomena of medieval languages translation: Latinisms, replacement by a vernacular correspondent, mistakes in the translation or inaccuracies that can lead to a new meaning, for example. Of course, the use of dictionaries is essential to this type of work and we will show that an intense treatment of the lexis, in three different languages, can help us to look at the words in a different way and to discover the underlying mechanisms that motivated their use in a text. This communication also wants to point out how the coexistence of the three languages in Medieval Britain and its study has to go through a thorough examination of the main dictionaries of these languages as well as a systematic reunion of the results observed.

Maud Becker completed a master in Romance Philology and in Historical linguistics in Neuchâtel, Switzerland, in 2013. She is now completing an edition of a continuation of Wace's Roman de Brut, whose new material will feed into the Anglo-Norman Dictionary.

LIXIA CHENG & GUOHUA CHEN  National Research Center for Foreign Language Education, Beijing Foreign Studies University

Eight years’ Debate for one word until a new entry in OED

Jin (2003) discusses the translation of xìnxīhuà into English, a term meaning ‘information technology application’ or ‘computerization’. The Chinese characters for xīn̄xi literally mean ‘information’ and huà ‘make or conform to’, functioning as a suffix, equal to -ise/ize in English. It considers informationize a “word-for-word mechanic translation” and proposes an indirect translation “to promote IT for national economic and social development” adopted by Wang (2002). Zhao (2005) questions the “insertability” of the indirect translation into the naming of some institutes, though it agrees that there is no English equivalent to xìnxīhuà. The article suggests a derivational word, informationalization, which follows the suffixation practice of -ise/ize, one of the most productive suffixes to change adjectives ending with -al into verbs, such as nationalize, globalize etc. This suggestion draws on the search results of informationalization on Google that there have already been thousands of examples of this word.

Since Jin (2003) and especially Zhao (2005), there has been a heated debate over the translation of xìnxīhuà and dozens of articles have been written for this single term, each offering one or two translations (cf Huang 2006, Wang 2007). Jin (2010, 2011) call into question about the reliability and justification of a new word simply by Google search and regard informationalization as a made-up word as no entry of this word could be found in English dictionaries. In fact, there is informatisation in French, which has appeared
frequently in English news media. But Jin (2011) argues that informatisation is a French word (not suitable for Chinese to English translation). Due to the fact that there was no equivalent in English, he still suggests an indirect translation.

Jin (2011) must have failed to check up the updated OED because the word informatization has become a new entry in March 2010 or perhaps this article had been written before 2010. Thanks to this new entry there has been no more debate since then. But when there is informatisation in French and the word informatization has had a high frequency in the English media in the past two decades, why did it take OED such a long time to include this word and why was informatization instead of informationalization? Based on the data of new entries of OED in the recent two decades, this paper is to explore the principles of OED to make entries for new words and the significance of the new entries for other languages.
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JOSEPH T. FARQUHARSON

The treatment of English and English-related etymologies in Caribbean dictionaries of English(-Creole)

Owing to what has traditionally been referred to as the creole continuum, lexicographers working on the national varieties of English-official countries in the Caribbean have always
been faced with the problem of whether to prepare one or two dictionaries. They have
normally opted for a single volume which essentially places two dictionaries (one bilingual
Creole-English, the other monolingual English) between two covers. This approach presents
several problems especially with regard to the treatment of etymologies of ultimate English
origin. The few meta-lexicographic works which deal with these linguistic varieties tend to
focus on words of non-English origin (e.g. English, African, Spanish), but gloss over the
theoretical assumptions on which the etymologies for English-derived words are based. This
paper explores the etymological treatment of words of English origin in scholarly dictionaries
of Caribbean English and English-related varieties: Cassidy and Le Page (1967, 1980 = DJE)
for Jamaica, Holm and Shilling (1982 = DBE) for The Bahamas, Allsopp (1996, 2010 =
DCEU) for the entire region, and Winer (2009 = DECTT) for Trinidad and Tobago. It
critically analyses their treatment of etymological Anglicisms in the context of roughly six
decades of intense study of Caribbean English-lexified Creoles, as well as the wealth of
practical and theoretical information on World Englishes.