be traced further back to the eighth century, closely connected to the very beginning of its history of lexicography. This is because, in a sense, British lexicography began with Latin-English dictionaries, the Epinal Glossary (early 8c.?), which treated 1,186 words, and the Corpus Glossary (early 8c.?), which treated 2,175 words, both compiled anonymously, for the commentaries on St. Augustine’s homily. (Besides, there are facts that the Leiden Glossary (9c.?) and the Erfurt Glossary (late 9c.?), which also were anonymously compiled, followed the two glossaries with the same purpose, and that, in this context, Thomas Elyot compiled the Dictionary of Syr Thomas Eliot Knight (1538), a Latin-English dictionary, quoting from the works of Marcus Tullius Cicero, Publius Vergilius Maro, Gaius Julius Caesar, and so on.) Such a perspective may also be necessary for the future development of the promising and creative research field of the author dictionary.

In line with Samuel Johnson’s maxim, “Lay the foundation, and leave the superstructure to posterity,” with this volume Karpova has opened up and laid the foundation of new research in lexicography – that of the English author dictionary, which seems to be highly significant from the viewpoint of philology and linguistics. There are high expectations that research in the field will significantly develop in the future, and I believe Karova’s volume will provide a good starting point for this.

References

Kusuiro Miyoshi
Soka Women’s College, Tokyo
kusuiromiyoshi@gmail.com

Olga Timofeeva and Tanja Säily (eds.).
Words in Dictionaries and History.
Essays in honour of R.W. McConchie

As print journals are replaced by journals online, readers increasingly click on articles they want to read rather than flip through pages of scholarship in which a fact or a figure, a graph or a quotation, might arrest them for a moment. Scholarly reading today is all about efficiency, but efficiency has its costs — we rarely know all of what we might know, or even what, given our interests, we need to know. The festschrift is inevitably miscellaneous, and so it begs to be read in leisure, with an open mind. Alas, its inefficiency has all but killed it. Though there are exceptions, of course, too many festschriften have gathered too many decades of dust on too many library shelves. Librarians are reluctant to buy them, and most publishers have turned their backs on them. Thankfully, however, some have not, John Benjamins prominent among them, a recent volume of whose series Terminology and Lexicography Research and Practice, titled Words in Dictionaries and History. Essays in honour of R.W. McConchie, edited by Olga Timofeeva and Tanja Säily, is an outstanding specimen of the genre.

The contributions to Words in Dictionaries and History are loosely connected insofar as the volume “aims to represent and advance studies in historical lexis,” as the editors put it. They all also represent areas of particular concern to R.W. McConchie, who has long been a leading scholar of Early Modern English lexis and lexicography, especially medical vocabulary and medical glossaries. He began his career focused on Old English language and literature and is now, among many other things, writing about the language of Jane Austen’s novels. Thus, it should be no surprise that the contributions to his festschrift cover a challenging array of discrete subjects. Patient readers will have gaps in their knowledge filled, for instance, by Anatoly Liberman’s etymology of yeoman, or Samuli Kaislanemi’s discovery of a rare word for sex, as well as unexpected possibilities raised, for instance, by John Considine’s recovery of a lost (or at least very well hidden) dictionary project, or Joshua Pendragon and Maggie
Scott’s skirmish with the *Oxford English Dictionary* over the lexicon of swordplay. It should certainly warm Rod McConchie’s heart that he has inspired work of such breadth and interest, not just lexical but cultural, and of such excellence. In both respects, contributors are simply following his example.

To explain the book’s overall structure, one cannot do better than the editors: “The articles fall into two parts. The first part focuses on the history of dictionaries, analysing them in diachrony from the first professional dictionaries of the Baroque period via Enlightenment and Romanticism to exploring the possibilities of the new online lexicographical publications. The second part looks at the interfaces between etymology, semantic development and word-formation on the one hand, and changes in society and culture on the other.” I know what the editors mean, but the value of the book, I think, is in having the historical, lexicographical, and linguistic material, as well as the social and cultural, all on one and the same hand, or, if separate hands are necessary, with the fingers of those hands intertwined.

The contributions focused on dictionaries are, of course, no less culturally interested than those focused on words. In “The *Flores of Ouido* (1513): An early Tudor Latin-English textbook,” Ian Lancashire introduces us to a mostly overlooked glossarist, Walter, and the unique copy of the early printed book, in which his “complementary English—Latin and Latin—English glossaries” are preserved. Yet the article is not merely bibliographical or lexicographical, but also about the role of glossaries in sixteenth-century English pedagogy. Jukka Tyrkkö, in “‘Halles Lanfranke’ and its most excellent and learned expository table,” hopes “to provide a description of an early English glossary, as well as shed some light on its compiler John Halle.” Along the way to doing so, he “reinforce[s] the notion that the medical profession was in many ways in the vanguard of English dictionary-making,” a core subject of McConchie’s scholarship. But again, the argument exceeds bibliography and lexicography, for Halle (or as some might know him better, “Hall”) was a poet, a composer, a biblical translator, and a reminder that none of us is just one thing and the variety of our experience informs our cultural productions, so, Tyrkkö suggests, “Halle’s work on religious texts must have informed his medical and perhaps especially his lexicographical work, particularly when it came to appreciating the importance of lexical precision.” John Considine considers the origin and fate of “John Lane’s Verball: A lost Elizabethan dictionary,” which was proposed as an aid to the writing of quantitative verse in English. Though, like Lancashire’s and Tyrkkö’s, focused on a particular book, Considine’s contribution also extends to an intellectual tradition, that of Latin and English guides to prosody.

Each of these articles is excellent, and Considine’s is a perfect specimen of its kind. First, Considine is a master of the note, and each section of his article accomplishes more, this jealous reader observes, than it has any right to do. Second, in trying to discover who the author of the anonymous *Verball* was, Considine explores an array of sixteenth-century genealogical connections with an almost savage zeal. If any of John Lane’s family and other connections had hoped to bury their relationships to the *Verball*’s author, Considine has unearthed them beyond burying again.

This is not to suggest that the articles are without any weaknesses. Lancashire at times seems rather breezy. Can he really know that *The Flores of Ouido* was “the first and only intrusion of Ovid’s Ars Amatoria into sixteenth-century grammar school education”? Sometimes, I would have appreciated a citation or note: “Colet and William Lily ... in a small committee that also included Thomas Linacre devised a grammar textbook, the so-called *Short Introduction of Grammar* (STC 15610.10; Allen 1954; Flynn 1943),” Lancashire informs us, helpful references in place; but then he declares, “Colet and Lily taught English school children for several centuries,” and we are left to rely on his authority, without further explanation. Lancashire has long been a leading scholar, and of course we can rely on his very deep, precise knowledge of Early Modern affairs, yet he might not presume this so easily.

Tyrkkö, on the other hand, does not always write with a sure grasp of his subject: Halle’s *The Courte of Vertue* (1565) was published as a pious alternative to the poetical miscellany called *The Courte of Venus*, first published in 1537 or so, and first attacked by Halle in *Certayne Chapters taken out of the Proverbs of Solomon* (1549/1550) — like Lancashire’s Colet, Halle had no time for *ars amatoria*. We are told in a note that “The *Courte of Venus* is a coterie compilation of poems critical of the church. It has been attributed, in its entirety or in part, to Chaucer (Fraser 1952).” While some poetry of the Chaucer apocrypha does appear in *The Courte of Venus*, the article by Russell Fraser that Tyrkkö cites does not mention those attributions. Importantly, *The Courte of Venus* is certainly not attributed entirely to Chaucer, and Fraser’s article discusses instead Halle’s parodies of poems...
by Thomas Wyatt the Elder. The Courte of Venus is notable, not because it raised Hall’s ire, but because it is the first printed poetic miscellany in English, for proof of which one can consult Fraser’s definitive edition (1955) of the book’s three extant fragmentary copies.

There are a few other lapses. When reporting the entry for chirurgery in Halles’ glossary to Lanfranc, Tyrkkö remarks that the definition there is “rather meaningless,” but I don’t quite see how it is: “Χειρουργία is sayd of euerie arte, whose function consisteth in manuall action or handye operation,” as opposed, say, to the arts of the apothecary, a quite meaningful distinction. Finally, it is hard for me to understand why one contributing to a festschrift for McConchie would refer to Richard Howlet as Huloet, though many others have done so, since McConchie himself has written decisively on the lexicographer and his name (see, for instance, McConchie 2007).

Readers of this review will think I am nit-picking. Really, are these the only criticisms I have of the book as described so far? It says something about the book’s general excellence that I can do no better. None of my niggling concerns really diminishes Tyrkkö’s thorough historical and partly forensic analysis (following Julie Coleman and Sarah Ogilvie in the International Journal of Lexicography, 2009) of the glossary appended to Halle’s translation of Lanfranc. His focus, after all, is not on Halle’s poetry but on his treatment of medical lexis. Very often, too, Lancashire’s magisterial brevity makes for good reading — Lancashire doesn’t get bogged down in learned citations and historiographical controversy, but instead tells a good story and often delights his readers with a clever phrase.

While their scope may seem narrow at first glance, the several contributions actually reach to significant cultural issues. Considine’s central figure, John Lane, aspired to be a lexicographer before lexicography was a plausible target of aspiration. We should look for others who did the same; we should wonder, in historical context, just what sort of aspiration it was, and what it indicates about Early Modern English society. Similarly, Gabriele Stein, in “The linking of lemma to gloss in Elyot’s Dictionary (1538),” focuses on a slight feature of entry structure, but this leads inevitably to interest in the logic and developing rhetoric of dictionary entries in what would prove a rhetorical age, no less relevant today than at the advent of the dictionary genre. Elizabeth Knowles, writing about “Chaos and old night: A case study in quotation usage,” explores quotation, transmission, and alteration of Milton’s famous phrase, raising the question of when a quotation is allusive and when it detaches from its source and is used idiomatically, unallusively, effectually how a language is infused with quoted material once “owned” by authors but finally by speakers. The articles may seem like small hooks of scholarship, but thereby hang some big tales.

In addition to the articles already noted, the volume’s first section includes Giles Goodland’s “Music amidst the tumult,” which considers the ways in which making A Dictionary of the English Language (1755) required that Johnson “repress” his “poetic side,” yet another chapter in the developing distinction of lexicography among the genres of English letters. Julie Coleman’s “Online dictionaries of English slang,” proposes that “online slang dictionaries can be categorized along a spectrum from the static to the dynamic,” the former authored in traditional ways and put online in a more or less finished state, the latter inviting and responding to user contributions, which, while “they do not generally fulfill the requirements of traditional dictionary users in terms of content, quality or reliability,” nonetheless offer information that slang lexicographers can use as material to determine frequency, distribution, origins and semantic development.” All of this signals a newly symbiotic relationship between dictionary makers and dictionary users, and the development of the web as a platform for amateur lexicography, both of whom shifts in our notion of the dictionary nearly as significant as establishment of the dictionary as a pedagogical tool and a target of literary aspiration 400 or so years ago.

From Walter the Almost Anonymous Glossarist to Urban Dictionary — are they really so far apart? After all, aren’t there notable similarities between Walter and someone identified only as Nony, who entered chester ‘pedophile’ (Chester the Molester) in Urban Dictionary on 1 March 2005, in spite of their obvious differences? The first half of Words in Dictionaries and History is not a systematic study of its subject, but it is nonetheless informative and challenging, especially to those already immersed in lexicography and its history, and fully repays an afternoon’s reading. The second half of the book rises to the rather lofty standard set by the first.

First in the second half is Matti Kilpio’s “Old English etymologies in Christfrid Ganander’s Nytt Finskt Lexicon (1787),” which evaluates the adequacy of Ganander’s etymologies of Finnish lemmata when they include Old English elements. Ganander comes through this scrutiny well for a
lexicographer working without benefit of the
New Philology, and Kiliaño makes the case
that Ganander’s work on English etymology
should not be dismissed. He is exactly the
sort of lexicographer overlooked by most but
consulted by Anatoly Liberman, who hopes
to balance, if not replace, the “dogmatic”
tendency of most English etymology with an
“analytic” one in his Analytic Dictionary
of English Etymology (or ADEE, 2008—,
one volume to date). Liberman’s “The
etymology of the word yeoman,” which
immediately follows Kiliaro’s piece, is
what W. W. Skeat called a “scorched-earth”
etymology (see ADEE, p. xxv-xxvii): it
accounts, not only for the preferred
solution to the etymological problem at
hand, but also for the relative inadequacy
or outright impossibility of all the alternative
explanations. Liberman’s is a thoroughly
satisfying display of etymological method
and, not incidentally, a compelling solution
to an unsolved etymological crux. Anyone
who doubts the value of festschriften should
consider that Liberman includes citations
from 513 of them in his A Bibliography of
English Etymology (2010)—they prove
more useful than many scholars, librarians,
and publishers imagine.

Samuli KialaJielian’s “Early East India
Company merchants and a rare word for
sex” is at least as interesting as Liberman’s
account of yeoman, though its conclusions
are not quite as sound. The rare word in
question is lapidable, defined in Early
Modern dictionaries (mono- and bilingual)
as ‘stonable [< L lapid- ‘stone’]’ and
‘marriageable’; the OED proposes the first
definition and calls evidence of the second
“a strange mistake ... copied in some
later Dicts.” With the benefit of newly
available digital resources, KialaJielian
provides contextual evidence for the
‘marriageable’ meaning and goes further to
to show, from both dictionary and contextual
sources, that marriageable was code for
‘sexually desirable, available.’ All of this
is a wonderful service to lexicography and
cultural history, admirably executed. The
stones in question, KialaJielian proposes
with good reason, are those of the male
— a lapidable woman is ‘fuckable’ or so
desirable that one “gets one’s rocks off.” But
the argument is not quite scorched-earth.
KialaJielian quotes from Jimmy Carson’s
Collections (1744) as follows: “but if thee
pursuits it farther, to know whether she be
Lapidable, or not, thee art certainly a Tyrant:
For the Hammer of thy Loins, will at length
beat down the Fortress of her Porto Bello;
and the Pillars of her Tabernace, will be
spread abroad, until thee has plundered the
City, and taken the Precious Stones away.”
The alternative to the male stones is the
female lap ‘pudendum’ (OED sv lap n1 in
sense 2b), which KialaJielian dismisses, but
without, tyrant-like, taking the etymological
hammer to the pillars of this very evidence
and hauling the stones away, as it were.
Good as the argument is, the etymology
remains unsettled.

Cynthia Lloyd’s article, “From
denominial to deverbal: Action nouns in
the English suffix -al,” by way of extending
the metaphor, leaves no stone unturned.
In this, however, it’s no different from the
others, but just as excellent. It provides
a useful typology of -al suffixations and
a splendid diachronic account of the
suffix’s semantics, fortified with
persuasive contextual examples culled
from the OED and the Middle English
Dictionary. McConchie is a similarly
scrupulous investigator of affixes (many
of which are strongly associated with
medical vocabulary), and it was doubtless
written to reflect that shared interest.
I was particularly grateful to read the
beginning of Lloyd’s article, at a point
when I thought the volume was drifting
among words without much purpose: “This
book,” she writes, “includes papers on both
Old English and Latinate Renaissance
lexis in English (Liberman and Diller
respectively). It also contains studies of the
transition from Latin to Old English (Hall),
and of the subsequent revival of interest in
Old English during the Latinised English
Renaissance (Karlas-Tarka). Between
these two points, the OE vernacular became
reunited with Latinate culture and lexis
through the medium of the conquering
language, French.” This is exactly the point
from which Lloyd’s argument embarks, all
of the contributions besides Liberman’s are
in front of the reader, and their relations to
one another helpfully anticipated.

Alaric Hall’s “A gente Anglorum
appellatur: The evidence of Bede’s Historia
ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum for the
replacement of Roman names by English
ones during the early Anglo-Saxon period”
immediately follows Lloyd’s contribution.
Hall argues that the inherent instability
of place names accounts for the gradual
shift from Roman to English place-names,
leaving Celtic names behind in spite of
considerable demographic continuity, and
that Bede’s Historia provides indirect
evidence to support that model. It is a subtle
and learned argument and will undoubtedly
lead to future research on the issue. Leena
Kahlas-Tarkka’s “William Lambarde and
Thomas Milles in search of the golden
past,” is one of the most elegant accounts
I have ever read of Early Modern English
antiquarian interest in Anglo-Saxon language
and culture as a means of throwing off the
so-called Norman Yoke and establishing ancient national identity. It, too, is subtle work, and it is an excellent model for young scholars.

The penultimate contribution is Hans-Jürgen Diller’s “Contempt — The main growth area in the Elizabethan emotion lexicon.” Diller acknowledges that “Contempt is not a nice topic for a Festschrift,” but his article about the lexical field “Contempt” is a generous gift to McConchie and to other readers, as well. Diller takes material on “Contempt” and “Disrepute” from the database underlying the Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary (Kay, Roberts, Samuels, and Wotherspoon 2009) and examines it rigorously from literally every direction with vertical bar graphs and horizontal line graphs that contrast features, field size, growth of the field relative to the whole lexicon of Emotion terms, and much more — it is a tour de force, very demanding of readers, and, as such, I think the editors realized, probably not the best piece on which to end the volume. Cleverly, they end instead with Joshua Pendragon and Maggie Scott’s “A lexical skirmish: OED3 and the vocabulary of swordplay,” which is itself not light fare, but is appealingly written and, given McConchie’s published interest in the subject, a very palpable hit.

Just as we must admire the editors’ astute arrangement of the various contributions, we must also praise the care authors and editors have taken preparing the text for publication. Of course, innocuous errors occasionally survive even the most diligent proofreading. Some errors, however, are potentially more confusing, even to specialists. So, when Liberman writes “The ODDE is entirely dogmatic,” ODDE may represent a text accidentally omitted from his references, but probably is meant to be ODEE, the Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology (Onions 1966), which one does find among them (and is, indeed, entirely dogmatic). The unwary (or less phonologically minded) reader may have more trouble with “A few early forms of yeoman listed in the OED are spelled with -nn-, and they presuppose assimilation from *-n(<ng)>m-.” However, variants with -nn- are in the minority and can be explained in more ways than one (for example, by the analogical shortening of the root vowel in other words ending in -man or by the erratic habits of Middle English scribes).” The scribe would be erratic indeed who wrote -nn- rather than -nn-, for only the latter cluster would be evidence of the assimilation required to get from yongman to yeoman. It seems unfortunate, too, that the title of McConchie’s great work, Lexicography and Physicke (1997) has been truncated accidentally to merely Physicke in David E. Vancil’s amiable and informative preface to the festschrift, a brief account of McConchie’s career and interests that helps to justify the volume’s range of subjects. These are all small matters, but the last, at least, is perhaps not the best sort of error to make in a festschrift.

The first responsibility of Words in Dictionaries and History is to honor R. W. McConchie, which it does by the uniform excellence of the articles included in it, the way those articles respond to McConchie’s varied interests, and their frequent citation of McConchie’s works, which merely underscores the significance of his work in the history of English and English lexicography. The same excellence appeals to its fortunate readers, and I hope the next festschrift I pick up is half as good as this one.
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