

Julie Coleman and Anne McDermott (Editors). *Historical Dictionaries and Historical Dictionary Research: Papers from the International Conference on Historical Lexicography and Lexicology at the University of Leicester, 2002.* 2004, vii + 224 pp. Lexicographica. Series Maior 123. ISBN 3-484-39123-5 (Pb.). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. Price: €68.

The papers collected in this volume were originally presented at an International Conference on Historical Lexicography and Lexicology organized by Julie Coleman, and meant to fill the gap created by the two International Round Table Conferences in Florence and Leyden in 1971 and 1977 respectively. The purpose of the conference was to bring together scholars and academics working in the field of historical lexicography, whether researching the history of historical dictionaries or whether compiling dictionaries with a historical point of departure. Accordingly the collection, competently edited and introduced by Julie Coleman and Anne McDermott, is arranged in two sections, reflecting the distinction between those researchers tracing the historical development of dictionaries and those practitioners faced with the problems and challenges of the compilation of historical dictionaries. The first part dealing with the history of dictionaries consists of twelve papers (two-thirds of the book), while the second part dealing with the practice of historical dictionaries consists of six papers (one-third of the book).

Although the twelve papers in the first section, with the exception of four, all discuss English dictionaries, the characteristics of these dictionaries revealed in the discussions have enough generalizing value also to be applicable and comparable to similar types in languages other than English.

These papers are headed by John Considine's contribution: "Du Cange: Lexicography and the Medieval Heritage". After starting off with a rehearsal of the life of Du Cange and the publication histories of his dictionaries, Considine discusses the claim that Du Cange's work with its Latinist and Byzantinist bias was essentially a patriotic, Francocentric enterprise. Considine shows how Du Cange's account of medieval Latin, the *Glossarium latinitatis*, illuminated not only the history of French institutions, but also the origins of the French language itself. Furthermore, his research on Byzantine Greek, which culminated in the *Glossarium graecitatis*, forms part of a network of historical scholarship and polemic whose tendency, and even design, was to bring the Byzantine heritage to France. Considine subsequently advances the idea that the case of Du Cange provides support for the argument that historical lexicography may often or even always lie in the reconstruction of a lost cultural heritage or the rebuilding of a lost cultural homeland, which can only be remembered and mapped as well as possible in a dictionary. This argument makes the paper of Considine a fitting introduction to the following eleven articles on the history of dictionaries.

The next two papers, that of Reiko Takeda and that of Ian Lancashire, are thematically connected, both dealing with manuscript dictionaries, Takeda with

a single manuscript and Lancashire with a whole collection of manuscripts. In "Cambridge, Trinity College Library MS 0.5.4: A Fifteenth-century Pedagogical Dictionary?", Takeda sketches the background features and significance of the manuscript and especially the complete dictionary included in it. The manuscript is a comprehensive manual, compiled and produced specifically for the teaching and learning of Latin. In the dictionary, however, some English definitions appear alongside the Latin, but some entries contain English descriptions only, indicating a departure from the practice of glossing Latin texts. This shows a shift towards the use of English in teaching Latin. In "Lexicography in the Modern English Period: The Manuscript Record", Lancashire gives an overview of the manuscript record between 1475 and 1700 in the web-based corpus of several hundred lexical texts, The Lexicons of Early Modern English (LEME). There are among others ten types of manuscript collections that need attention, bilingual dictionaries, glossaries and topical vocabularies, prose treatises and grammars, books annotated by contemporaries, reference works on proper and place names and monolingual glossaries, the wide range already indicating the reasons for the realization and compilation of these manuscripts. These manuscripts from the early modern period exist for various reasons, for instance, they are late survivals of medieval glossaries, antiquarian research papers, personal study aids, and also works for private consumption. Lexicons are valuable not only for the recovery of the meanings of words, but also as instruments of religious, political and social power. The founding of the Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries marked the mid-1580s as a watershed in English speakers' lexical self-awareness.

Olga Karpova's paper "Author's Lexicography with Special Reference to Shakespeare's Dictionaries" states that English author lexicography represents the largest groups of reference works. As all these concordances differ in the manner in which the material is presented, the number and variety of information categories and the type of notational devices, she uses Shakespeare's dictionaries as the most comprehensive group to trace the peculiarities of their development. She concludes by showing that this group of dictionaries has three main features: corpus, citation and label, each of which can be complete or differential. Such a classification makes it possible not only to trace the main trends in the history of authors' concordances, but also to typify other kinds of writers' dictionaries, taking into consideration their own information categories. Additional advantages of these concordances are that they could be used as reliable sources for authors' quotations in the compilation of other types of reference works and that their limited number of information categories makes the complete inclusion of all words from an author's works possible.

In "An Analysis of a Seventeenth Century Conceptual Dictionary with an Alphabetical List of Entries and a Network Definition Structure: John Wilkens' and William Lloyd's *An Alphabetical Dictionary* (1668)", Natascia Leonardi describes the basic dependence of the dictionary as a by-product of the more comprehensive plan of the Tables of the *Universal Philosophy*, which form the

second of the four parts of Wilkens' *Essay towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language* (1668). By focusing on the concept 'science' and the related word 'knowledge', she shows that the words in the *Alphabetical Dictionary* are defined by reference to the concepts contained in the Tables of the *Universal Philosophy* and in this way positioned within the hierarchical structure of the classificatory system of the *Essay*. While the hierarchical structure gives information about the elements contained in it, the wider relational network provided by the Tables specifies how an item relates to and differs from the other elements included in the same conceptual semantic field. Because the main concern of the *Alphabetical Dictionary* is not so much the form of natural language as the communicative effectiveness of language, the work displays the semantic value of lexical units rather than the formal properties of the lexemes.

The next three papers by Rowena Fowler, Joan Beal and Julie Coleman discuss individual dictionaries of a specific kind published in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In "Text and Meaning in Richardson's Dictionary", Fowler discusses Charles Richardson's *New Dictionary of the English Language* (1836–1837) which, without any definition field, relies almost entirely on quotations to establish and demonstrate meaning. These quotations, arranged chronologically within four broad historical periods, illustrate all the derivatives of a headword, making no distinction between primary and transferred meanings. This allows the user to rethink the value and application of quotations as the source, establishment and illustration of meaning, and the selection, ordering and contextualization of quotations in a dictionary. Beal's paper "An Autodidact's Lexicon: Thomas Spence's *Grand Repository of the English Language* (1775)", deals with a pronouncing dictionary in which each entry is respelt in a phonetic script of the compiler's own devising, meant for those lacking the possibilities or means for normal schooling to learn to read more easily. Beal's intention is to consider the sources of Spence's words. She argues that Spence, unlike other compilers of pronouncing dictionaries who leaned heavily on Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary of the English Language*, did not simply attach his respellings to Johnson's definitions, but shows independence both in the words chosen and in some of the definitions of words also found in Johnson. The most likely explanation for the mixture of words in the *Grand Repository* is that Spence used a short dictionary as basis for his work, one that either depended on Johnson, or, more likely, one that shared sources with Johnson. In "The Third Edition of Grose's *Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue: Bookseller's Hackwork or Posthumous Masterpiece?*", Coleman considers the evidence of Eric Partridge's claim in the foreword to the 1931 reprint of the third edition from 1796 of Francis Grose's dictionary that, because no additional editor's name is given, this edition, published after Grose's death in 1791, should be seen as the best representation of Grose's own work. After a careful examination of Grose's working method in the first two editions of his dictionary, Coleman concludes that, although there is circumstantial evidence to support Partridge's claim that some of the new material may well be from Grose's

notes, other additions and the revision of existing entries were made by his editor. The evidence is strong to believe that the publishers Hooper and Wigstead hoped that potential purchasers would, as Partridge did, accept the third corrected and enlarged edition as Grose's own authoritative work.

In his contribution "Roget's Thesaurus, Deconstructed", Werner Hüllen sets out to solve the problem of defining the dictionary type to which Roget's work belongs. Hüllen starts with two assertions, namely that Roget's *Thesaurus* is (a) a cumulative dictionary of synonyms and (b) a topical (or onomasiological) dictionary, into which he integrates two other assertions: (c) both dictionary types mentioned in (a) and (b) had their own history and popularity before Roget, and (d) the new and seminal characteristic of Roget's *Thesaurus* was the amalgamation of characteristics resulting from assertions (a) and (b). Firstly Hüllen discusses assertions (a) and (c), tracing the history of cumulative synonym dictionaries and showing that Roget's dictionary was not unique, but that similar dictionaries, although not topically arranged, were published earlier and simultaneously with his. Secondly Hüllen treats assertions (b) and (c) by discussing the characteristics of topical, in comparison with alphabetical, dictionaries and by tracing the history of topical dictionaries. The article ends with Hüllen's discussion of assertion (d), showing how Roget combined two traditions: the notion of an endless network of synonymy resulting from words expressing ideas and a comprehensive ordering of the universe by ideas. Roget's achievement was the finding of a meaningful order of arrangement, different from the meaningless alphabet, for gaining access to the synonymous vocabulary. This, according to Hüllen, was obtained from the general scientific outlook of the so-called utilitarians of the second half of the nineteenth century of which Roget had an ample knowledge.

Of a completely different nature than the preceding papers, is Thora van Male's contribution "From Incipit to Iconophor" in which she introduces iconophoric dictionary ornaments through a chronological series of examples from French dictionaries dating from the twelfth to the nineteenth centuries. Tracing the origins of iconophors back to medieval manuscripts in which the scribes used various signposting devices, among others the words INCIPIT and EXPLICIT (to indicate the beginning and end of a text), she shows how the old tradition of illumination had been adapted to and adopted by enough dictionaries to create new conventions and trends. By using two tables listing the different features of these iconophoric dictionary ornaments, which create an important lexicographical paratext Van Male eventually lays out the basic research parameters, both in form and in content, initially to be addressed in studying and analyzing these ornaments with a view to revealing certain conventions and trends in their use.

The last two contributions in this section, that of Maria-Pilar Perea and that of Gregory James, deal with two extraordinary foreign-language dictionaries. Perea starts her paper, "The History of a Multi-dialectal Catalan Dictionary: The *Diccionari Català-Valencià-Balear*", with a description of the two tenden-

cies, which dominated Catalan lexicography in the nineteenth century: regional fragmentation, which resulted in autonomous dictionaries for the different dialects and the preponderance of Spanish, which found its way into dictionaries through translation. This was the situation in which Antoni M. Alcover found himself when, inspired by the ideology of the *Renaixença*, the Catalan Renaissance, he started collecting material for his planned dictionary, which was continued after his death by Francesc de B. Moll who compiled and edited the material in ten volumes. After highlighting some aspects of the history, objectives and methodology of the project, Perea ends with an indication of the future of the dictionary: its updating and computerization. In his paper "Culture and the Dictionary: Evidence from the First European Lexicographical Work in China", James discusses Michele Ruggieri and Matteo Ricci's Portuguese–Chinese glossary to which Pasquale D'Elia gave the title *Dizionario portoghese–cinese*. After identifying the source of the headwords as Jerónimo Cardoso's Portuguese–Latin dictionary, he discusses the headword selection. Furthermore he deals with the romanizations and transcriptions, as well as mistakes, which show that the glossary was not only a reference source at semantic level, but also, importantly for illuminating the way Ruggieri and Ricci learnt to read and write Chinese, at the grapho-phonetic level. The Portuguese headwords are a reflection that Portuguese was the lingua franca among the Jesuits, recruited from all over Europe, both in Goa and Macau where they practised their mission.

The range of subjects, which the six papers in the second section treat are reasonably restricted, two dealing with polysemy, one with polysemy and synonymy, one with etymology, one with citations and one with ordering. These subjects are further limited, because the papers discuss only specific dictionaries, and, as far as two of the papers are concerned, specific examples: in the one case loanwords and in the other Shakespeare's informal English. In spite of this, however, valuable insights into certain lexicographical aspects and implications can be gained from the discussions of these subjects.

The first two articles in this section, those by Antonette diPaolo Healey and Robert E. Lewis, are connected through the subject matter they treat. In "Polysemy and the *Dictionary of Old English*", Healey deals with the ordering of senses in the *Dictionary of Old English*, stating that the evidence of the citations themselves are used as primary guide to sense-division. In this process, two conflicting principles often come into play: should polysemy be reduced by making generalizations or increased by making distinctions? The former presents a sparser description of a word, but perhaps leads to a clearer treatment, the latter results in richer semantic detail and perhaps a truer, more representative structure. However, as the dates of most of the texts are uncertain, the ordering of senses in the *Dictionary of Old English* has to take place according to a logical pattern. This aspect of logical ordering is elaborated further by Lewis in "Aspects of Polysemy in the *Middle English Dictionary*" when he differentiates between the logical approach of the *Middle English Dictionary* and that of the

Oxford English Dictionary, the first being a relational, the second a developmental logical approach. Lewis is of the opinion that in English historical lexicography, the logical has come to be equated primarily with the developmental, rather than the relational. This is revealed by the fact that the *Middle English Dictionary* follows the *Oxford English Dictionary* in giving precedence to most of the traditional concepts of ordering such as, for example, general precedes specific, concrete and general precedes abstract, metaphorical and specific, etc.

Eric Stanley's paper, "Polysemy and Synonymy and How these Concepts Were Understood from the Eighteenth Century Onwards in Treatises, and Applied in Dictionaries of English", is related to the previous two articles. As its title indicates, Stanley discusses polysemy and synonymy within the context of considerations of these terms and how lexicographers interpreted them. In fact, in the conclusion to the paper he says that polysemy and synonymy, although subjects within linguistic theory, have arisen from lexicographical practice: polysemy determines dictionary entries, while polysemy is used in dictionary definitions. He starts off by stressing that words often called synonyms are usually not wholly equivalent. He traces how far some earlier compilers of synonym dictionaries such as Piozzi, Crabb and Wilkens, were aware of this. This leads him to show how synonymy, considered in relation to two or several languages, demonstrates the indeterminacy and impossibility of exact translation. He then illustrates his conclusions by discussing the semantic set of words expressing nothing, and furthermore the pronouns of the second person, which additionally exemplify delimitations of custom and register. Cursorily also referring to Locke who, even when propounding the use of concrete language, could himself not avoid employing figurative language, Stanley considers it a generally sound lexicographical principle that, in accordance with European tradition, concrete usage should precede abstract, figurative and transferred applications of a word in a dictionary. Taking his cue from his exposition of the figurative use of organs such as the heart, Stanley proceeds to discuss outdated theories about the origin of language and supposed superabundant synonymy in "original" languages, propagated by Herder and Müller. Although highly polysemous words may have widely divergent senses, according to Stanley, the single etymology will unify them into one entry. He ends his paper by showing how homonymic confusability may not only lead to misunderstanding, but may also be exploited in paranomasia.

In the article "Culinary Exchanges: An Investigation of the Etymologies of some Loanwords in the Third Edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary*", Tania Styles aims at giving an overview of the key features of the etymological work on OED3, the issues it raises and the results it can yield. As illustration she uses the presentation of the etymological component of one class of lexical item, loanwords, mostly from French, and more specifically culinary terms. For each loanword, she stresses, it is attempted to establish that the immediate etymon offered for it was actually available for borrowing, in the right form, by the first recording date of the English word.

Marijke Mooijaart states in her paper "Citations in the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal*" that about two-thirds of the completed Dutch dictionary consists of citations. As this citation corpus is valuable for different research purposes, it is necessary to evaluate the composition of this collection. She discusses it under three headings: the quality of the citations themselves (length, reliability and correctness), the accessibility and usability of the electronic citations and the non-linguistic information, and the quality of the citations as a corpus (representativeness and diversity). She comes to the conclusion that the WNT citation collection meets the needs of empirical linguistic research.

In the last paper of this section, "Ordering a Historical Dictionary: The Example of Shakespeare's Informal English", N.F. Blake questions whether the alphabetical arrangement of entries is the best way for historical dictionaries. By considering five different cases from Shakespeare's informal English, he illustrates that ordering entries according to those elements, which are semantically the most meaningful results in bringing together words from the same semantic field or with the same morphological composition. Such an arrangement reveals new shades of meaning in words and allows an easier comparison of mutually related words. He therefore advocates putting words in their wider structural context by grouping them according to their morphological endings or listing compounds by their second rather than their first elements.

The collection is rounded off by a selective index, supplementing the Table of Contents.

Apart from the information contained in them, these articles can serve as examples to anybody who wishes to do research on the history and methods of historical dictionaries.

References

- Accademia della Crusca.** 1973. *Tavola rotondo sui grandi lessici storici, Firenze, 3-5 maggio 1971*. Florence: Accademia della Crusca.
- Pijnenburg, W. and F. de Tollenaere (Eds.).** 1980. *Proceedings of the Second International Round Table Conference on Historical Lexicography*. Dordrecht/Cinnaminson: Foris Publications.

J.C.M.D. du Plessis
Bureau of the Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal
Stellenbosch
Republic of South Africa
(wat@sun.ac.za)