Current Projects in Historical Lexicography

Current Projects in Historical Lexicography

Edited by

John Considine

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS
PUBLISHING

Current Projects in Historical Lexicography,
Edited by John Considine

This book first published 2010

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-2116-0, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-2116-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

HISTORICAL DICTIONARY PROJECTS

JOHN CONSIDINE

1. The history of historical dictionaries

Historical lexicography, in a broad sense, is one of the oldest kinds of lexicography. It is, as the papers in this volume suggest, also a very diverse activity, or genre, and its history helps to explain its diversity. A full history of historical lexicography does not exist, and would be worth writing. The short sketch which follows is meant to provide some basic context for the rest of this volume. In keeping with the scope of the contributions to this volume, it is for the most part confined to languages of western European origin, with a particular emphasis on English and other Germanic languages. It naturally excludes so-called historical dictionaries which are in fact alphabetically ranged biographical or general historical encyclopedias: in this book, historical dictionaries are dictionaries which treat the historical development of words. Etymological dictionaries, to which true historical dictionaries are closely related, constitute a very ample subject in their own right, and are not treated here; nor, again for reasons of space, are historical thesauruses.

1.1 Historical wordlists and dictionaries: the first twenty-two centuries

The first extant wordlists in what appear to be the three oldest continuing lexicographical traditions, those of the Sanskrit, Greek, and Chinese languages, all developed out of monolingual commentaries on literary classics. These traditions of commentary and lexicography were the products of cultures which had enjoyed a period of literacy so long that the language of their classic texts—the Vedas, Homer, Confucius—had become difficult for later readers to understand. The Sanskrit tradition begins with a vocabulary of Vedic words, itself of uncertain date, on

which there is a commentary which has been dated to c.250 BC, the *Nirukta* (Bronkhorst 2001, 152). The Greek tradition was already mature by the time of Aristophanes of Byzantium, who flourished at the end of the third century BC and the beginning of the second (Pfeiffer 1968, 198). The succession of extant wordlists in the Chinese tradition begins early in the Han period, around the second or third century BC, with the *Erya* (Yong and Peng 2008, 41–43; 59f.). Early bilingual lexicography might of course be undertaken with the aim of collecting glosses on texts written much earlier than the time of the glossator—the medieval Latin–vernacular glossaries are examples—but the historical dimension is much more important in the Sanskrit, Greek, and Chinese traditions, all of which are informed by consciousness of change within a single language.

This is not the place to tell the story of the slow and majestic development of the historical part of the Chinese lexicographical tradition, of which an excellent treatment forms part of one of the volumes of the series *Science and civilization in China* which was initiated by Joseph Needham (Harbsmeier 1998); it has now been supplemented by a fuller but less readable one from the beginnings to 1911 (Yong and Peng 2008). The Sanskrit tradition, which has necessarily had an historical component from its inception due to the status of Sanskrit as a learned language, has also been discussed elsewhere (Patkar 1981). The Greek and Latin traditions, and those of the European vernaculars, would repay much fuller monographic investigation than they have received so far; a start at telling the story of the early modern historical lexicography of Latin, Greek, and some of the medieval languages of western Europe was made in Considine 2008. The dictionaries of which I gave an account there were nearly all written from a historical perspective, but many of them shared a limitation: they were written on the basis of texts which had not been satisfactorily dated, and their makers were therefore not in a good position to tackle the historical evolution of language varieties. (To some extent this is a continuing problem: for example, there is no consensus as to the dating of many Old English texts, not least *Beowulf*, and so, firm and precise chronological ordering of quotation evidence is not possible in a dictionary of Old English.) So it was that the pioneering dictionaries of scholars such as Pierre Borel (1655; see Amatuzzi 2010), Franciscus Junius (a1677/1772), and William Somner (1659) were historical in so far as they dealt with medieval language varieties, but did not attempt to present dated texts.

1.1.1 The invention of modern historical lexicography by Passow

In the case of ancient Greek, by contrast, there is good evidence for the relative or absolute dating of a great many texts. Exploiting this evidence was not the primary concern of the greatest early modern lexicographer of ancient Greek, Henri Estienne, the maker of the *Thesaurus graecae linguae* (1572): he arranged his dictionary in an alphabetical sequence of roots each of which was followed by its derivatives, giving it to that extent a diachronic quality, but did not arrange quotations in chronological order within each entry (Considine 2008, 84–86). The possibility of a truly historical lexicography of ancient Greek remained latent until the publication of a famous (though now rather elusive) tract, *Über Zweck, Anlage, und Ergänzung griechischer Wörterbücher* (1812), by one of Estienne's first truly original successors, Franz Passow (for whom see Aarsleff 1967/1983, 252–255). His words deserve quotation at length. He saw Greek, like any other language, as

> ein empirisches Ganzes, eine historische Masse, in der jedes Wort als einzelnes Factum erscheint, das zu den übrigen in gewissen chronologischen Verhältnissen steht, und durch diese sowohl seiner ersten Erzeugung, als seinen fernern Modificationen nach vielfach bedingt ist … Es ist schon angedeutet, dass die Nachweisung des Schriftstellers der ein jedes Wort gebraucht hat, eine chronologische Bestimmung enthalten müsse: es folgt also, dass nicht der erste, der beste; sondern der älteste als erste Auctorität für das Wort, das zur Sprache kommt, angeführt werden muss (Passow 1812, 26; 32).
>
> [an empirical whole, a historical mass, in which each word figures as a single fact, which stands in a particular chronological relationship to the remainder—and on this, both its first creation and its further modifications depend in many ways. … We have already suggested that the indication of the writer who has used a particular word must include a chronological specification; it therefore follows that the first authority adduced for a word which comes into the language should not be the first in quality, the best, but rather the earliest.] (my translation)

This is the founding document of modern lexicography on historical principles. Before Passow, many dictionaries were certainly historical in the sense of treating obsolete language varieties, and some of these were compiled with the more or less explicit aim of serving historical scholarship. Very few or none, however, had the systematic aim of treating the full history of every word in a given language (but cf. section 1.1.3 below). After Passow had offered his vision of a dictionary of ancient

Greek in which each entry would tell the story of the word of which it gave an account, from its earliest attestation until its extinction or the cut-off date of the dictionary, lexicographers could aim to put this vision into practice: to compile what are now known as dictionaries on historical principles.

Most immediately, Passow himself produced a dictionary of Greek, published as a new edition (1819) of J. G. Schneider's *Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* (1798–1799). This had itself been compiled with the aid of Estienne's *Thesaurus* (Schneider 1798–1799, 1:vii). Passow hoped to revise Schneider's *Handwörterbuch* in a series of new editions, in the first of which the language of the earliest Greek poets would be thoroughly reconsidered, more and more recent stages of the ancient language being similarly reconsidered in subsequent editions. Passow died before completing this plan, which was taken up by the English lexicographers Henry Liddell and Robert Scott in their *Greek-English lexicon* of 1843, which acknowledged its debt to the work of Passow on its title page. It "covered the whole period from the beginnings—Homer, as it then was—to AD 600" although "few of the later authors were read with any thoroughness" (Glare 1987, 7). Subsequent editions of Liddell and Scott appeared in the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

1.1.2 The *Thesaurus linguae latinae*

By the end of the century, classical Latin, the materials for which are not as copious or as chronologically diverse as those for ancient Greek, was being registered in the first published parts of the vast *Thesaurus linguae latinae*. The preparation of a major new Latin dictionary had been canvassed twice in the earlier nineteenth century, and was finally initiated in the last quarter of the century: a journal, *Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie*, was launched in 1883 to gather materials in preparation for the dictionary project; plans for the dictionary were shaped between 1889 and 1893; four and a half million citation slips and references to secondary scholarship had been prepared by 1899; and the first fascicle of the *Thesaurus* appeared in 1900 (Oldfather 1922, 46–49). The principles of the dictionary were not exclusively historical: each entry was "arranged, as far as is possible, with the postulated semasiological development", but within each sense the citations were in chronological order. The Latin to be surveyed was that of "every Latin text, including inscriptions, coins, etc., through the second century [AD] as well as extensive, representative selections … to the seventh century" (Schnur 1962, 230).

1.1.3 General historical dictionaries of the vernacular languages

Nineteenth-century classicists were not alone in their understanding of the possibilities of historical lexicography. In 1808, the Scottish antiquary John Jamieson published the first volume of his *Etymological dictionary of the Scottish language*, which treated Scots from the earliest available materials to Jamieson's own day, and was illustrated with quotations placed in chronological order. Jamieson's interest in tracing current Scots words back to their earliest attestations arose from his belief that the origins of the Scots language were distinct from those of English. In this he was mistaken, but the energy and learning with which he pursued his theory by researching in a dated body of texts led to "le premier dictionnaire britannique méritant le titre d'historique" (Aitken 1973, 38; see also Rennie 2008). An abridgement appeared in 1818 and a two-volume supplement in 1825. The shared intellectual background which might have led Jamieson and Passow independently to such similar ideas about historical lexicography cannot be discussed here.

The nineteenth-century dictionary projects which would develop Passow's ideals most significantly were, with the exception of the Greek dictionaries which built on his own and the *Thesaurus linguae latinae*, of vernacular languages.

The first was the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (*DWB*, 1852–1961) of Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, which was conceived as early as 1838. Its first fascicle appeared in 1852. Quotations were not dated in its early volumes, and at no time did it seek to give a full account of medieval varieties of German, but its coverage of early modern and eighteenth-century German was undertaken on historical principles, which were made increasingly clear in later volumes (see Osselton 2000, 62; Bahr 1973, 25f.). Eleven years before the first fascicle of *DWB* was published, Émile Littré had signed a contract with the publisher Hachette for a similar work, which was to be published as his *Dictionnaire de la langue française* (1863–1873; for it, see Hamburger 1988, 84–85; 147–167). Littré acknowledged the inspiration of *DWB*, and followed the Grimms' example in his scanty provision of dating; he treated medieval material, presented in each entry as "une collection de phrases appartenant aux anciens écrivains ... disposées dans l'ordre chronologique", as providing a historical background for the post-1600 French which was the focus of his dictionary (see Osselton 2000, 64–68). A third project had been founded by the Dutch philologist Matthias de Vries in 1851, before either the Grimms or Littré had begun to publish. This, a dictionary of post-medieval Dutch, would be realized on increasingly rigorous historical principles as

the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* (*WNT*, 1882–1998 and 2001; see Osselton 2000, 68–72).

These three dictionaries were followed by the *New English Dictionary* of the Philological Society of London, subsequently known as the *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*), the preparation of which began in 1857, with a first fascicle appearing in 1884. The principles established for it between 1857 and 1860 were those of Passow (Aarsleff 1967/1983, 255–263), and "these principles, together with the work of John Jamieson … provided the theoretical framework for James Murray when he began work on the *OED* in 1878" (Silva 2000, 79). Noel Osselton (2000, 73) has made the important point that

> The one feature which most of all marks out the *OED* among its rivals is the sheer length of its continuous documentation from the earliest records of English down to the very latest … None of the other dictionaries discussed here [*DWB*, Littré, *WNT*] attempts anything so ambitious.

OED is arguably the historical dictionary *par excellence* on account of its ambitious historical range, not to mention the diversity of the varieties of English which it documents.

Two more major historical dictionary projects had begun by the time the first fascicle of *OED* appeared. After an abortive project in the 1860s, serious planning for a historical dictionary of modern (post–1520) Swedish had begun in 1883, and would lead to the publication of the *Ordbok över svenska språket* (1893–), usually known as the *Svenska Akademiens Ordbok* (*SAOB*). Although this dictionary was sponsored by a national academy, it was not edited on the academy principle—which has as its object the normative presentation of a vocabulary based on that of the canonical literary texts of recent centuries—but on historical principles (Ekbo 1973, 45–46). Finally, in the first year of the twentieth century, the Danish scholar Verner Dahlerup, who had been collecting materials for a Danish dictionary since 1882, signed a contract for its publication. He realized in the following years that his work should be modelled on the ongoing *SAOB*, *DWB*, *WNT*, and *OED* projects; it was to become the *Ordbog over det danske Sprog*, an historical dictionary of Danish since 1700 (*ODS*, 1918–1956: see Haugen 1984, 21; Malone 1928).

1.1.4 Dictionaries of medieval language varieties

None of these dictionaries attempted comprehensive treatment of the earliest stages of the languages they documented. For Old High German, Middle High German, and Middle Low German there were already

glossaries and dictionaries by the time the Grimms began work, not least Eberhard Graff's *Althochdeutscher Sprachschatz* (1834–1846). Oskar Schade's *Altdeutsches Wörterbuch* (1866), dedicated to Jacob Grimm, was to bring much early material together, and the *Mittelniederdeutsches Wörterbuch* of Karl Christian Schiller and August Lübben (1875–1881) offered an extensive treatment of Middle Low German, and the *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch* (1854–1866) of Middle High German.

Old French had, since Borel (1655), been treated in an early wordlist enriched with some quotations, in which a number of forms were dated (Lacombe 1766; 1767), and in other early dictionaries, published and unpublished (see Damian-Grint 2006), such as J. B. B. Roquefort's *Glossaire de la langue romane* (1808), which abandons Lacombe's attempts at dating forms but is richer in illustrative quotations. Robert Kelham's *Dictionary of the Norman or old French language* (1779) is devoted to Law French, a variety developed in England and used into the early modern period. The *Dictionnaire de l'ancien français* by Frédéric Godefroy, dedicated to Littré, was in many ways unsatisfactory (see Marcou 1889), but offered a richer documentation than before of Old French. Old Occitan was included in Lacombe 1767 but subsequently had its own dictionary, the six-volume *Lexique roman* of François Juste Marie Raynouard (1835–1844). This, although well documented with quoted material, did not attempt a chronological presentation of the evidence; nor did the eight-volume *Provenzalisches Supplementwörterbuch* (1892–1924) of Emil Levy which followed it.

As Marijke Mooijaart's contribution to this volume explains, a *Middelnederlands woordenboek* in nine alphabetical volumes, the first released in 1885, covers later medieval Dutch. *OED* had been preceded by the work on Old English of Bosworth and Toller (see the Bibliography entries in this volume for Bosworth and Toller 1882–1898 and Toller 1908–1921) and of Ettmüller (1851) and Grein (1861–1864), and did not attempt to document Old English forms which had not survived into the Middle English period. For Swedish, a dictionary of the special vocabulary of medieval legal texts had been published, and a more general dictionary of the medieval language had been begun, before the first volume of *SAOB* had appeared: they are Schlyter 1877 and Söderwall 1884–1918 respectively. Likewise, *ODS* had been preceded by a dictionary of Danish to 1700 (Kalkar 1881–1918).

1.2 Historical dictionaries since 1901

The six great vernacular dictionaries undertaken in the nineteenth century stand at the head of one of the two major traditions of post–1901 historical lexicography: that of the multi-volume dictionary which gives a comprehensive account of a major literary language, or of one well-attested local or temporal variety of such a language. Many dictionaries in this tradition were undertaken in the twentieth century, and the survey below is not comprehensive. More specialized single-volume historical dictionaries——for instance, documenting the vocabulary of single authors, single texts, particular dialect areas, or particular subject areas—have been even more numerous, and only a few are mentioned below.

1.2.1. Varieties of English

The first edition of *OED* was completed in 1928, with a supplement in 1933. After this, the focus of English-language historical lexicography changed. This change was the result of a great impulse which had been given in 1919 to the development of the multi-volume historical dictionary tradition as applied to varieties of English. In that year, William Craigie, then one of the editors of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, made a presentation to the Philological Society of London in which he suggested the development of a set of period dictionaries of English. These, he imagined, would cover Old, Middle, and early modern English, and the late modern English of England; earlier and later Scots; and the English of the United States (Aitken 1987). Craigie's audacious plan has been realized in three sets of dictionaries. For early English, there are the ongoing *Dictionary of Old English* (1986–) and the completed *Middle English Dictionary* (*MED*, 1952–2001, for which see Blake 2002 and Stanley 2002). For Scots, there are the *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* (*DOST*, 1931–2002) and the *Scottish National Dictionary* (*SND*, 1931–1976), now united online as the *Dictionary of the Scots Language*, as Maggie Scott explains in her contribution to this volume. For the English of the United States, there are the *Dictionary of American English* (1936–1944) and its successor the *Dictionary of Americanisms* (1951).

The *Early Modern English Dictionary* project had generated at least one attractive specimen entry in the early 1930s (Fries 1932b) and was still looking feasible nearly fifty years later (Bailey 1980), but it has at last been abandoned, and its materials, built up by editors at the University of Michigan, are now at Oxford, where they are available to editors working on the revision of the *Oxford English Dictionary* (for their legacy, see M. Adams 2010).

This revision project succeeds the work of Robert Burchfield on a new four-volume supplement to the *OED* which was published from 1972 to 1986, and of John Simpson and Edmund Weiner on a second edition of *OED* (1989) which brought the first edition and Burchfield's supplement together (for both, see Brewer 2007). More important than the appearance of the printed volumes was the fact that the text which underlay them was in machine-readable form. The preparation and gradual online release of the third edition of *OED*, which is based on, but comprehensively revises, the second edition, is by far the most important ongoing contribution to the historical lexicography of English (for it, see e.g. Simpson, Weiner, and Durkin 2004 and Podhajecka 2010).

Among one-volume historical dictionaries of English, the six most notable to have been published in the twentieth century are perhaps the *Dictionary of Canadianisms* (1967), the *Dictionary of Jamaican English* (1967), the *Dictionary of Newfoundland English* (1982/1990), the *Australian National Dictionary* (1988), the *Dictionary of South African English* (1996), and the *Dictionary of New Zealand English* (1997); for the first of these, see Stefan Dollinger's contribution to this volume, and for the last three, see my contribution to the Appendix which follows chapter 7. To them might be added the *Concise Scots Dictionary* (1985), for which see Maggie Scott's contribution to this volume, though its debt to the larger dictionaries of Scots makes it a somewhat different kind of work. They have in the twenty-first century been joined by Lise Winer's *Dictionary of the English / Creole of Trinidad & Tobago* (Winer 2009; cf. Winer 2010). All of these are regionally restricted. Historical dictionaries of English restricted by subject, as represented by the project described in Juhani Norri's contribution to this volume, have been varied in their coverage.

1.2.2. Other Germanic languages

The historical lexicography of Dutch in the twentieth century was naturally dominated by the completion of the *WNT* project; Marijke Mooijaart's contribution to this volume describes the relationship between the two great Dutch dictionaries founded in the nineteenth century and the more recent dictionaries of early medieval Dutch and Old Dutch, the *Vroegmiddelnederlands woordenboek* (2001; see Pijnenburg 1997) and the *Oudnederlands woordenboek* (2009; see Louwen 2008 and Schoonheim 2008). A historical dictionary of Dutch legal terminology from the fourteenth to the eighteenth century was first suggested in 1941, and work towards this end was under way in the 1990s (Verhas 1997). An historical

dictionary of Frisian from the period after 1800 is under way (*Wurdboek fan de Fryske taal*, 1984–); a dictionary of the language of the Old Frisian charters was projected in the 1990s (Vries 1997); and historical dictionaries of Middle Frisian and Old Frisian are being planned (Fryske Akademy 2004).

For Danish, the most important story is that of the admirably rapid completion of the *ODS* and the making of its five-volume supplement; for Swedish, it is that of the ongoing *SAOB* project (see Ekbo 1973, 46–49). A comprehensive historical dictionary of Icelandic from 1540, *Ordabók háskólans* (*The dictionary of the university*) was inaugurated in 1944, with the intention of using printed, manuscript, and oral evidence, the latter being a feature which does not usually appear in a historical dictionary.[1] It was said in 1983 that "editors hope to complete collecting material in ten years and publish a sample volume" (Merkin 1983, 130); the project maintains an online presence, but no printed part seems to have been published at the time of writing. A dictionary of Old Norse prose, covering material from the period up to 1540, the *Ordbog over det Norrøne Prosasprog* (1989–) was inaugurated in 1939 and has produced four volumes (see Kalinke 1991, 375; Poole 2005). A dictionary of the language of texts from late medieval Norway was being planned in the 1990s (Simensen 1997a; 1997b).

In 1957, as the first edition of *DWB* neared completion, plans were made for a new edition of the letters A–F, which had been the first to be completed, so that their treatment differed most markedly from the standards of the most recent volumes. (Although *DWB* is so closely associated with Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, it was in fact their work—the last entry on which Jacob worked was that for *Frucht*—which was felt to have become obsolete.) Two teams worked in parallel on this *Neubearbeitung*, one in East Berlin and one in West Germany, at Göttingen: just as *WNT* arose partly from the attention of scholars in the Netherlands and Flemish-speaking Belgium to their shared language (and the Instituut voor Nederlands Lexicologie is to this day a Flemish-Dutch institute), and *OED* has editorial staff in England and the United States, so the *DWB* revision project acknowledged the joint linguistic heritage of what were at the time separate countries. Its first fascicle appeared in 1965 (for it, see Bahr 1973, 28–29). An impressive array of more specialized multi-volume historical dictionaries of German appeared in the course of the twentieth century. Individual varieties of German have their own

[1] "Some 150 000 citations from present-day colloquial Icelandic, many of them recording words, senses and idioms never attested in writing, have been provided by hundreds of listeners to a special radio programme" (Merkin 1983, 130).

multi-volume historical dictionaries, such as the two stages of the *Preussisches Wörterbuch* (1935–1944 and 1974–2005). Major period dictionaries are in progress: the *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch* (1952–), the *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch* (2006– : see Gärtner and Plate 1997), and the *Frühneuhochdeutsches Wörterbuch* (1986–). There is even an unusually ample single-author dictionary consecrated to the usage of Goethe, the *Goethe Wörterbuch* (1978–).

Four volumes of a dictionary of Yiddish on historical principles, the *Groyser verterbukh fun der yidisher shprakh* (1961–1980), appeared before the project was apparently abandoned. Finally, a major but incompletely historical dictionary of Afrikaans, the *Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse taal* (1950–), was undertaken in the first half of the twentieth century, and has continued to progress against a background of dramatic political change; for this dictionary and the gaps it leaves in the lexicography of Afrikaans, see Jeremy Bergerson's contribution to this volume.

1.2.3. Romance languages and Latin

One of the most important historical dictionary projects of the later twentieth century has been the making of the *Trésor de la langue française*, undertaken in 1960 under the direction of Paul Imbs (*TLF*).[2] Like Littré's dictionary, which it was designed to succeed, the *TLF* is primarily a dictionary of comparatively recent French, that of the period since 1789, but each of its entries, as well as being illustrated with quotations from this period, ends with rich documentation of the earlier history of the word in question. The *TLF* project drew on a computer-generated archive, and was hence able to offer innovative statements of the relative frequency of the words it documented. Early volumes of the dictionary were edited on an unsustainably ambitious scale, so that its coverage is unbalanced by what Noel Osselton (2007) has called "alphabet fatigue"; the third of its sixteen volumes only begins with *ange*, and the first eight only cover the range *A–fuyard*. Even the entries for words later in the alphabet are, however, extremely valuable.

For Old French, the *Dictionnaire* of Godefroy has been succeeded by the *Altfranzözisches Wörterbuch* conceived as early as 1858 by Adolf Tobler, of which the first volume appeared posthumously in 1915, edited by Erhard Lommatzsch (see Studer 1917). The last volume edited by

[2] For an early report of its making, see Imbs 1973, and for an informative review, Asher 1975.

Lommatzsch appeared in 1976, a year after his own death: sixty years' continuous editorship of a historical dictionary is a remarkable achievement. The eleventh and last volume in its alphabetical sequence appeared in 2002. A *Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle* (Huguet 1925–1967) helps to bridge the gap between Tobler–Lommatzsch and the *TLF*. For insular French there is the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* (1977–1992), of which a second edition (2005–) is now in progress. The lexicography of Old Occitan, in the twenty-first century as in the pioneering work of Raynouard, is not conducted on fully historical principles: the *Dictionnaire d'occitan médiéval* (1996–) presents the senses of each word "dans un ordre aussi plausible que possible," admitting that "la systématique de l'analyse sémantique ne reflète pas nécessairement les articulations de l'évolution historique" (préface, sect. 2.2).

No fully historical dictionary of Italian has been produced, although the use of quotations in vernacular lexicography was pioneered by the makers of the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* of 1612, and in a nineteenth-century dictionary, that of Tommaseo and Bellini (1861–1879), "although it gives priority to modern usage, ample space is devoted to past usage, documented by quotations from authors" (Beltrami and Fornara 2004, 367). In the *Grande dizionario della lingua italiana* (1961–2004), each sense of each word is illustrated with chronologically arranged quotations, but the senses themselves are not chronologically arranged: on the contrary, current senses precede obsolete ones. Nor are the quotations dated, though there is an index of sources from which dates can be more or less precisely worked out. A historical dictionary of pre-1400 Italian, the *Tesoro della lingua italiana delle origini*, is being edited and published online; plans for a historical dictionary of the language in its more recent stages have been shelved (Beltrami and Fornara 2004, 372–373).

As Fernando Tejedo-Herrero remarks in his contribution to this volume, work on the historical lexicography of Spanish has developed more slowly (for an overview, see Dworkin and Gago-Jover 2004). The long-standing preoccupation of the Real Academia Española has been with synchronic lexicography, and one twentieth-century historical dictionary project was interrupted by the Spanish Civil War and subsequently abandoned (Seco Raymundo and Soldevila Durante 1973, 3).

A projected dictionary of the earliest written Romanian, that of the sixteenth century, was discussed at a conference of 1971 (Dimitrescu 1973). Like the *Dictionary of Old English*, it was to be based on an exhaustive survey of the extant evidence (ibid. 23).

The *Thesaurus linguae latinae* has continued to document classical Latin on a grand scale, though the onomastical material included in fascicles for A and B was treated separately in the range C–D and excluded thereafter. The project suffered greatly during the economic crisis of the early 1920s, during which members of staff were "compelled to sell part of their libraries and even of their household furniture" to survive (Oldfather 1922, 53); thereafter it received support from international sources, which was particularly generously renewed after the Second World war (Schnur 1962, 231).

The *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, planned from 1931 onwards, undertook an efficient re-examination of classical Latin up to AD 200; an extraordinary feature of this dictionary is that the introduction to its first fascicle announced the intention to publish the dictionary in eight fascicles, to appear at the rate of one every two years, and that this intention was accurately executed, the eighth and final fascicle (*sopor* "deep sleep, drunken stupor" to *zythum* "beer") duly appearing fourteen years later.[3] This project had significant connections of personnel with *OED*: "Credit for the scheme of the dictionary and organization of the work in its early years is due principally to Mr. Wyllie", formerly of the *OED* (for him, see Brewer 2007, 82–94), and Richard Palmer, an assistant editor of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* from 1957, migrated to *OED* at the conclusion of that project.

Some of the most remarkable historical lexicography of the Latin language in the twentieth century has addressed post-classical varieties. Multi-volume dictionaries on historical principles have, for instance, been undertaken for medieval Latin from a number of different regions (Sharpe 1996, 104–105), and an online *Neulateinische Wortliste* (Ramminger c.2004–) is documenting Latinity from Petrarch to 1700. Polyglot, but with Latin as a significant element, is the work undertaken by the *Lessico intelletuale europeo* project, which includes dictionaries (e.g. Ciliberto 1979) as well as verbal indexes and other tools (see Lamarra 1982).

1.2.4. Slavonic languages

An historical dictionary of Old Church Slavonic, the *Slovník jazyka Staroslověnského* / *Thesaurus Palaeoslovenicae* (1966–1997), has appeared in four volumes, a specimen having been published in 1956. Eastern Slavonic varieties from the eleventh to the seventeenth century are

[3] The place of *zythum* in the Latin wordlist explains why the title of Schnur 1982 begins "From *A* to *Beer*."

treated as Russian and covered in the *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI–XVII vv.* (1975–), described by one reviewer of early fascicles as a "scandalously bad historical dictionary" which is "pervaded by … incompetence and professional irresponsibility" (Lunt 1979, 920). The common written language of the Eastern Slavs until the fourteenth century, i.e. before its diversification into Old Russian, Ukrainian, and Belarusian, is treated in *Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka (XI–XIV vv.)* (1988–), announced in 1966 and based on materials gathered in and before 1963, but delayed for political reasons (De Vincenz 1992–1993).

An Old Ukrainian dictionary covers the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the earliest period in which the language was distinct from common Eastern Slavic, the *Slovnyk staroukrains'koi movy XIV–XV st.* (1977–1978); a dictionary of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Ukrainian is in progress (*Slovnyk ukraïns'koï movy XVI--pershoï polovyny XVII st*, 1994–).

A dictionary of Old Czech was begun in the early twentieth century (Gebauer 1903–1916), reaching the letter N, and has a successor which has begun at N (*Staročeský slovník* 1968–). Polish is treated in a series of historical dictionaries: the language of fifteenth-century and earlier texts in the *Słownik staropolski* (1953–2003); that of the sixteenth century in the *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku* (1966–); that of the seventeenth- and early eighteenth century in the *Słownik jezyka polskiego XVII i pierwszej połowy XVIII wieku* (1977–), and that of the more recent period in the *Słownik języka polskiego* (1958–1969). For these dictionaries and the digitization projects associated with them, see Bień 2009.

A projected dictionary of sixteenth-century Slovenian was being planned from 1973 onwards (Premk 1980, 97f.), but appears not to have been published.

1.2.5 Other European languages

The languages of Europe do not all lend themselves to documentation in major historical dictionaries, because they do not all have long written traditions.

Irish does have such a tradition, and indeed a native lexicographical tradition dates back to around 900 AD. The first fascicle of a *Dictionary of the Irish language based mainly on Old and Middle Irish materials* (1913–1976) appeared in 1913, at which point the hope was expressed that the whole work would be finished in seven years (Watson 1913); the second fascicle appeared in 1932. Later fascicles were published under the modest title *Contributions to a dictionary of the Irish language*. The whole work

has been digitized (see Nyhan 2008). The *Electronic dictionary of the Irish language* website comments on some of the dictionary's shortcomings—which, as with *DWB* and *WNT*, include inconsistencies resulting from changing editorial principles—and notes that it is not fully historical: "it would have been desirable to arrange forms and senses chronologically, thereby illustrating the historical development of the lexicon, but the problem of dating Irish texts was, and remains, huge, and the editors were no doubt correct in avoiding this hurdle."

A *Historical dictionary of Scottish Gaelic*, covering material from the sixteenth century onwards, was launched in 1966 at the University of Glasgow. The website of the Department of Celtic and Gaelic there reports that the project "aimed to produce a comprehensive historical dictionary of Scottish Gaelic based on printed and unpublished sources, including undocumented oral vocabulary. With the retirement of Departmental staff associated with [it], the productive gathering stage of the project was formally suspended in 1996." A new Scottish Gaelic dictionary project, *Faclair na Gàidhlig*, is being planned, and has its own informative website.

For Welsh, whose written tradition, like that of Irish, goes back into the early Middle Ages, an historical dictionary modelled on *OED*, the *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru* (1950–2002), was undertaken at the University of Wales at Aberystwyth in 1920, the first part being published in 1950 (Hawke 2008, 305–307). A separate dictionary of the language of early Welsh poetry (Lloyd-Jones 1931–1963) lapsed on its editor's death.

An extensive dictionary on historical principles of the Hungarian of Transylvania, the *Erdélyi magyar szótörténeti tár* (1975–) is in progress.

1.2.6. Other world languages

Very few dictionaries from this potentially vast field can be treated here. An *Encyclopaedic dictionary of Sanskrit on historical principles* was undertaken at Deccan College, Pune [formerly Poona], in 1942, under the editorship of S. M. Katre (see Katre 1980, 180–181 for the inception of the project, and Patyal 1999 for its director). The first fascicle of the dictionary appeared in 1976, when a reviewer comparing the extent of its first fascicles to that of the treatment of the same alphabetical range in earlier Sanskrit dictionaries calculated that "the whole of this tremendous undertaking will eventually run into 300 or 400 volumes" (J. C. Wright 1978, 388). In a survey of Indian lexicography in 1980, Katre mentioned an abandoned project for a dictionary of Tamil on historical principles

(183) and plans for historical dictionaries of languages such as Bhojpuri (184).

The *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* (1956–), founded in 1921 and now nearing completion (see Stolper 1991 and more recent reports on the website of the dictionary), gives a comprehensive account of Akkadian, a Semitic language used in and beyond the Fertile Crescent from c2400 BC to c.100 AD.[4] A model for it was the *Wörterbuch der aegyptischen Sprache*, founded in 1892 (Erman and Grapow 1926–1963); this dictionary of ancient Egyptian is physically distinctive, since the hieroglyphic characters in which its headwords are given necessitated its reproduction from handwritten sheets. The Oriental Institute at Chicago is now home to another historical dictionary with the aim of documenting an ancient language on the basis of all the surviving texts, the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary* (1980–), founded in 1975.

Reuven Merkin's survey of historical dictionaries, cited more than once above, may be quoted in extenso for the dictionary project on which he himself worked, the *Ha-millon ha-histori la-lashon ha-ivrit* (*Historical dictionary of the Hebrew language*; the transcription of the Hebrew title and its translation are Merkin's), undertaken in 1954:

> Work on it is being done in two stages: in the first one—scheduled to continue over a generation—computer-generated lemmatised concordances are being produced from (a) manuscripts of most written sources ... and (b) from first printed editions of selected sources—literary and non-literary—down to present-day Hebrew. Each concordance is accompanied by lexicographical, grammatical, and statistical indices automatically produced. Over 500 sources, containing some 7 000 000 words, have been processed so far, and a sample volume of the dictionary is in preparation. (Merkin 1983, 130–131)

By 2004, the project was still in a preparatory stage (Rubinstein 2004).

2 Seven current projects in historical lexicography

The seven projects which are described from the first-hand experience of their present or former editors in this book are arranged very roughly in chronological order of their subject-matter. One of their common features is that they engage not only with the language varieties which they

[4] Its editor sent a congratulatory message in Akkadian on the completion of *MED*, beginning "Tikip santakki mala bašmu" and translated as "You wrote on tablets, checked, and collated everything …" ("Thei made a gaderyng" 2002, 22).

document but, naturally, with the traditions of historical lexicography which underlie them; hence the introduction to those traditions given above. All of the language varieties documented by these projects—Old English, Spanish, Middle English, Dutch, Canadian English, Scots, and Afrikaans—have, as we have seen, received some attention from historical lexicographers already. The challenge shared by the contributors to this volume is that of developing, rather than initiating, traditions.

In the first chapter, "Building a lexical database of Old English: Issues and landmarks", Javier Martín Arista describes a lexicographical project, the Nerthus database, which is not directed towards the production of a conventional dictionary, but towards that of a lexical database of derivation, with about thirty thousand entries for individual lexemes. This is a particularly appropriate approach to the vocabulary of Old English, which is, as Dieter Kastovsky (1992, 294) has remarked, "characterised by large morphologically related word-families, where the relationship is transparent not only formally but most often also semantically", so that, in contrast to the vocabulary of modern English, much of it is "derivationally related by productive word-formation patterns". The Nerthus project's attention to this lexical productivity explains its name, for Nerthus was, at least in Jacob Grimm's reading of Tacitus, a goddess of fertility (Grimm 1835, 152).

As a database of derivation, the Nerthus project has intellectual affinities with Henri Estienne's *Thesaurus graecae linguae* of 1572. Estienne's attention to the lexical productivity of ancient Greek determined the etymological ordering of his dictionary, which could only be easily consulted by using an alphabetical index and, although Passow was impressed by its rationality and explanatory power, was abandoned in the great re-edition of the *Thesaurus* by Hase and the Dindorfs (Estienne 1831–1865). Since the medium for Nerthus is an online database, it can combine ease of consultation with the representation of productivity.

This ease of consultation naturally extends to the examination of affixes as well as words: Martín Arista has shown elsewhere how Nerthus can be used to examine the commonest Old English prefix, *ge-*, and has suggested there that much more semantic information would need to be added to the database to enrich this examination further (Martín Arista 2005–2008). The comprehensive examination of Old English derivation which the database offers depends on a comprehensive account of the vocabulary of Old English and of the meanings of each word, and this is at present provided neither by the work of Bosworth and Toller, nor by *OED*, nor by the ongoing *Dictionary of Old English*. While Nerthus stands in a clear tradition of Old English lexicography, reaching back through Clark

Hall's dictionary (1894/1960) to Clark Hall's sources and reaching back directly to other nineteenth-century dictionaries such as Ettmüller (1851), it furthers and interacts with that tradition in ways which Martín Arista and his colleagues continue to explore. A development which the project team anticipate is an expansion further into the field of syntax, recalling Adolf Tobler's belief "that the lexicographer's business was to solve syntactic problems" (Studer 1917, 99).

Finally, one distinctive feature of Nerthus is the attention to grammatical theory which shapes it, and Martín Arista remarks on some of the project's connections with functional grammar in his contribution to this volume.

The next chapter moves forward chronologically to the thirteenth century. In "Progress toward a historical dictionary of a legal text in Spanish: The *Siete Partidas* (1256–1265/1491)", Fernando Tejedo-Herrero describes a project directed towards the vocabulary of a single text of great historical importance, the thirteenth-century lawcode called *Las Siete Partidas*, drawn up between 1256 and 1265, of which the earliest printed text dates from 1491. The vocabulary of lawcodes has for centuries been of great interest to lexicographers studying the medieval vernaculars: for instance, Lacombe's *Dictionnaire du vieux langage françois* of 1766 is described on its title-page as "enrichi de passages tiré des manuscrits en vers et en prose, des actes publics, des ordonnances de nos rois, etc" and its *Supplement* of the following year declared more explicitly that it was compiled "pour faciliter l'intelligence des lois, des usages, des coutumes, et des actes publics". As mentioned above, a dictionary to the language of Swedish legal texts was undertaken in the nineteenth century, and similar dictionaries for Old Frisian and medieval and early modern Dutch were being planned at the end of the twentieth. Lexicographers were not least interested in lawcodes because of their wide cultural interest: the law takes account of a great range of human activities, and an elaborate lawcode like the *Siete Partidas* therefore has an encyclopedic quality.

So it is that the *Siete Partidas* calls for a full treatment of its vocabulary as an important document in its own right, and also as a richly various and culturally important specimen of the Old Spanish language, which has, as we have noted above, been incompletely treated by lexicographers. The absence of a comprehensive historical dictionary of Old Spanish has, as Tejedo-Herrero notes in his contribution, "has favored the emergence of a sizeable number of more focused lexicographic projects", his being one of them. The project aims at the comprehensive documentation of the Spanish vocabulary of the *Siete Partidas*, a text of approximately 800,000 tokens, this comprehensiveness aligning it with

projects like the *Dictionary of Old English* and the planned dictionary of sixteenth-century Romanian rather than larger projects like *DOST*, a regular challenge for whose editors has been the need to excerpt selectively while capturing as full and representative a range of material as possible (cf. Aitken 1980). The principles of the project under consideration here have, as it happens, led to a wordlist of very much the same extent as that of Nerthus: about 30,000 items.

Tejedo-Herrero discusses some of the specific challenges presented by this material. One is that of deciding whether a given word of Latin origin really was part of the vocabulary of Spanish when used in the *Siete Partidas*; as he points out, medieval Spanish authors were quite capable of describing a well-assimilated word as *latin*, even when it was not spelt like its Latin etymon, if they recognized it as belonging to a technical register. Another, which suggests another point of contact between his project and Nerthus, is that of the treatment of derivation: are a pair of forms which differ only in the presence or absence of a given affix to be treated as variant realizations of a single lexeme? A third is the treatment of participial adjectives and nouns. These challenges, as Tejedo-Herrero remarks, recur in historical lexicography, and he offers analogies with the treatment of Latinate vocabulary in the *Middle English Dictionary* and with the treatment of participial adjectives in the developing practice of the *Oxford English Dictionary*.

This contribution closes with two specimen pages, considerably reduced, from the projected dictionary. These demonstrate some of the points of the typographical presentation of entry structure which were made in the text of the chapter. This is of course a topic which has demanded the attention of historical lexicographers since the nineteenth century (hence the helpful reproductions of specimen entries in Osselton 2000), and which continues to do so in a century in which lexicographers have new opportunities to control and experiment with the graphic design of the dictionary page.

In the last of the contributions to this book which is largely devoted to medieval material, Juhani Norri reports on his *Dictionary of Medical Vocabulary in English, 1375–1550*, a work which, like some of the contributions to the *Lessico intelletuale europeo* series (see section 1. 2. 3 above), maps the vocabulary of one area of intellectual inquiry. This dictionary project follows on from earlier monographs of his, not structured as dictionaries, on the names of sicknesses (1992) and of body parts (1998)—work which made early examples of many words accessible to other lexicographers, so that Norri's *Names of sicknesses* is the source for 18 first citations in *OED Online* at the time of writing, from *macies* n.

"emaciation, wasting" to *rage* n. sense 5d "acute physical pain".[5] The dictionary will, as Norri explains in the present volume, cover the names of sicknesses and body parts, and also the names of instruments (*cautery*, *lancet*, etc.) and of medical preparations (*ointment*, *red powder*, etc.). It will register about 4,500 simple terms and more than 8,000 combinations, including the names of over 600 medicinal waters alone.

Medical vocabulary has always presented special challenges to lexicographers and lexicologists; it was a special interest of Littré's (see Hamburger 1988, 134–136), and the "fascinating and abundant" opportunities for research which it presents have been discussed in an article by a member of the editorial team of the *Middle English Dictionary* (Girsch 1997).[6] It is rich and detailed; treating it adequately calls for more than a little technical knowledge; it varies from one period to another and, sometimes disconcertingly, from one writer to another (see e.g. Landau 2001, 105). The language of English medical texts from the middle ages is more accessible than it used to be, thanks to the publication of many of the texts themselves, and thanks also to the work on sixteenth-century vocabulary of Rod McConchie (see especially McConchie 1997). This is one reason why the completion of the *Middle English Dictionary* by no means completed the lexicographical record of the language of the earliest English medical texts: many of them had not been edited when the first fascicles of *MED* appeared. Moreover, many—38 of the 72 on which Norri draws—remain unedited, and are quoted by him from manuscript. The cut-off point of *MED* is not clearly defined (see Blake 2002, 61; 63), but is no later than 1500, and as Norri explains in this volume, "the period 1375–1550 forms a logical continuum for observing developments in English medical vocabulary." And although *MED* could draw on the expertise of a specialist in medical texts, Margaret Ogden (as noted by Stanley 2002, 32), the closeness of Norri's focus on the half-million-word corpus of medical writings whose usage he documents distinguishes his project from what can be achieved in a general dictionary.

Marijke Mooijaart's contribution, "The complete history? Dutch words in four historical dictionaries", looks backwards to the earliest Old Dutch texts and forwards to the twentieth century (though not the twenty-first, which is the concern of the *Algemeen Nederlands woordenboek*, for which see e.g. Waszink 2010, 81–82). Like Martín Arista's, it reports on the development of a database rather than a conventional dictionary, but in

[5] Excerpting Norri 1992 for *OED* was one of my first jobs as an assistant editor of the dictionary in 1995.

[6] For a case study of medical vocabulary in one of the companions to the present volume, see Benati 2010.

this case the database unites dictionaries rather than providing a complementary lexicographical instrument. The database in question is the Geïntegreerde Taaldatabank (GTB) under development by the Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie at Leiden, which will bring *WNT* and the *Middelnederlands woordenboek* together with their more recent companions the *Vroegmiddelnederlands woordenboek* and the *Oudnederlands woordenboek*, thus making a lexicographical resource even more enormous, and chronologically much deeper, than the *WNT* searchable with a single command.

The four dictionaries united in the GTB are by no means uniform: quite apart from the internal inconsistencies of the *WNT* (see Osselton 2000, 71–72), the two older dictionaries were naturally not laid out on exactly the same principles as the two more recent ones. Mooijaart's chapter sets out the differences between the four dictionaries and the ways in which it is possible to integrate them with each other, for instance by the consistent application of modern Dutch lemmata to entries in the dictionaries of pre-modern varieties. It also comments on some of the tasks which GTB cannot, or cannot yet, carry out: like Martín Arista's, this chapter is a report on a project in progress, engaging with problems which are not yet solved.

Other national dictionary projects are naturally beginning to engage with similar questions to those which Mooijaart raises. When the editor of the *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch* wrote to congratulate the editors of *MED* on its completion, he made the suggestive statement that "We look forward to establishing and continuing contact between the two projects, as we have put online the existing Middle High German dictionaries in an interlinked compound" ("Thei made a gaderyng" 19). *MED* is not yet linked to dictionaries of other medieval language varieties, but it is available online as part of a Middle English Compendium which includes a corpus of Middle English texts and a bibliography. Likewise, for instance, the Old French dictionaries of Lacombe, Godefroy, and others are online as part of the Lexilogos set of resources, and *DOST* and *SND* are united in the online *Dictionary of the Scots Language*. So, the work of the GTB team is part of a wider story—to which many of the papers in Mooijaart and van der Wal 2008 contributed—of the building of connections between online dictionary resources and other online texts.

The next chapter discusses another aspect of the relationship between historical dictionaries and language databases. In "A new historical dictionary of Canadian English as a linguistic database tool, or, making a virtue out of necessity", Stefan Dollinger, the editor in charge of the ongoing revision of the *Dictionary of Canadianisms on historical principles*

(*DCHP*), describes this dictionary revision project and the creation of the Bank of Canadian English, "a web-based database application that is used to collect the citations at the base of the revision of *DCHP-2*".

The first edition of *DCHP* appeared in 1967, and was therefore not edited or researched with the aid of computer technology: Dollinger quotes its editor's description of paper slips as its fundamental "tools of research". It went without saying by the time (2004–2005) that a new edition was being discussed, that any revised edition would have to make use of a computerized version of the first edition, and it could be realistically expected that the computerization would have to be done, as an editor of the *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru* has said of the computerization of his own dictionary, "on a shoestring" (Hawke 2008). Dollinger's account of the *DCHP-2* / Bank of CanE project has much to say not only about the tools with which the project works but also about work on (more or less) a shoestring, and hence about the questions of funding which have been so important through most of the modern history of historical lexicography, from the long-running funding problems of *OED1* (see Murray 1977, 251 ff), through the leanest years of the *Thesaurus linguae latinae* and the complaint of the editors of the *TLF* that "constamment la direction du CNRS nous dit: 'il faut faire vite et court'" (Imbs 1973, 9) to the humanities funding crises of the present day.

The Bank of CanE gives the editors of *DCHP-2* access to fuller contexts for the words it documents than the traditional citation slip or its closest machine-readable equivalent. Here again, there is a similarity between work on *DCHP-2* and on the *TLF*: "Sur les concordances les exemples n'ont que trois lignes, mais un système de réferences nous permet de nous rapporter à un autre type de fiches que nous fait l'ordinateur, les 'fiches-texte', qui représentent un contexte de 18 lignes" (Imbs 1973, 12). In another respect, the Bank widens the scope of Canadian historical lexicography in the same direction as the dictionaries of Icelandic and Scottish Gaelic mentioned above, namely the documentation of the spoken language as part of its historical picture.

Dollinger describes some of the uses of the project as it stands, showing the ways in which it offers information beyond the scope of *OED*, and closes with a sombre footnote which returns to the topic of funding:

> While this paper was finalized (early October 2008), news reached us of the layoff of the entire staff of the *Canadian Oxford Dictionary* in Toronto, which was justified on the grounds of the declining sales of paper copies. Clearly, while the availability of a user-friendly online tool is becoming

> more important, the future will reveal the relevance of the historical *paper* dictionary.

An appendix to this volume which bears on the revision of *DCHP* follows chapter 7, and is described in its due place below.

The *Concise Scots Dictionary* (*CSD*) was described in section 1. 2. 1 as one of the twentieth-century dictionaries which is most closely comparable to *DCHP*, although it differs from its Canadian opposite number in its chronological depth and its meticulous specification of the regional distribution of many words. The comparison extends to the ways in which the two dictionaries call for revision. In "Rethinking the *Concise Scots Dictionary* for the twenty-first century", Maggie Scott, formerly of the editorial staff of *CSD*, gives an account of the projected revision of the dictionary, against a background of recent changes in the use and standing of the Scots language.

Some of these changes to the language have surely been fostered by *CSD* itself. As the then editor of *DOST* pointed out in the year after the publication of *CSD*, the funds for the editing of the dictionary, "amounting to some £150,000, came largely as donations from private citizens" (Aitken 1988, 327), and the patriotic interest in Scots which those donations suggest was also to be seen in the reception of the published dictionary:

> It has been a great cultural and publishing success, helping to stimulate an increasing interest in vernacular Scots which has been obvious in lots of ways lately, and also selling over 20,000 copies so far—one single bookseller sold 1000 copies in the dictionary's first three weeks of publication. (Aitken 1988, 330)

A footnote in Scott's chapter, indeed, contrasts strikingly with the footnote just quoted from Dollinger's:

> it was announced in Feburary 2009 that Scottish Language Dictionaries is to receive direct funding from the Scottish Government from September 2009. SLD's Director, Dr Christine Robinson, said that the organisation was "delighted by the news that we are to be funded by the Scottish Government".

Scott discusses a number of changes which are being made in the revision of *CSD*. Some of these are called for by an increasing sense of the autonomy of Scots: hence, for instance, the set of *CSD1* definitions which in effect required readers to turn to a dictionary of general English for further information are to be changed. Others arise from an increasing

sense of the diversity of the language, and its inclusion of urban and innovative varieties, including, for instance, the language of Scots of South Asian descent..

One of these changes removes a highly unusual feature of the dictionary, its indication of pronunciations of obsolete words, which were meant to serve as a guide to the user of the dictionary who wanted to read Middle Scots poetry aloud.[7] This feature asserted a particular kind of continuum with the past, a sense that the obsolete *crawdoun* "coward", which occurs in an excellent passage of Dunbar, has a place in spoken Scots alongside the current *craw* "crow, rook". Re-assessing the relationship of the present with the past is part of revising a historical dictionary: just as *DCHP-2* will undoubtedly register more urban Canadian vocabulary to stand beside *DCHP-1*'s strong representation of the vocabularies of trapping and fishing, so we may suppose that *CSD-2* will aim to present a living, growing Scots in its historical context without making quite the same claims as *CSD-1* for the contemporaneity of Middle Scots.

The final chapter of the book, Jeremy Bergerson's "Towards a historical dictionary of Afrikaans", considers the gap left in the documentation of that language by the *Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse taal*—which, for a start, "includes citations from before the late nineteenth century only erratically" while "the etymologies given are not provided with any consistency"—and the kind of dictionary which might fill that gap. As Bergerson shows, the lexicography of Afrikaans offers some rather unusual problems. It is a Germanic language, a development of Dutch, from which it diverged between the first settlement of South Africa by speakers of Dutch in 1652 and its recognition as an official language in 1925. Much of its vocabulary—99%, as Bergerson puts it (Brachin [1985, 132] suggests 95%, but the basic point is clear enough)—is identical with that of Dutch. So, as Bergerson argues, a historical dictionary of Afrikaans would necessarily address the element which is non-Dutch in origin, or which shows distinctively Afrikaans semantic shifts, or which preserves words no longer generally current in Dutch. It would as necessarily take account of the earliest attestations of a given word, bringing the story down to about 1925, after which the coverage of *WAT* could be consulted by readers interested in recent currency as well as early history.

The use of etymology as a criterion for inclusion would demand an etymological element in the entry structure: the place of etymological

[7] See Aitken 1998, 331, and for Aitken's own contributions to the teaching of the pronunciation of older Scots, see Macafee 2004.