

Broadening Perspectives in the History of Dictionaries and Word Studies

Broadening Perspectives in the History of Dictionaries and Word Studies

Edited by

Hans Van de Velde and Fredric T. Dolezal

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Broadening Perspectives in the History of Dictionaries and Word Studies

Edited by Hans Van de Velde and Fredric T. Dolezal

This book first published 2021

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2021 by Hans Van de Velde and Fredric Dolezal and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-7432-6

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-7432-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	vii
Broadening Perspectives in the History of Dictionaries and Word Studies Fredric T. Dolezal and Hans Van de Velde	
Chapter One.....	1
Lexicographical Planning and Official Ideology: The Case of China's National Plans for the Compilation and Publication of Lexicographical Works Chiara Bertulesi	
Chapter Two	30
Linguistic Features and Literary Value of <i>Almanca Tuhfe / Deutsches Geschenk</i> (1916) Harald Bichlmeier and Güler Doğan Averbek	
Chapter Three	58
Old Frisian Terms in the <i>Deutsches Rechtswörterbuch</i> . The Multilingual Approach of the Dictionary of Historical German Legal Terms Andreas Deutsch	
Chapter Four	76
Jens Christian Svabo's Glossary: The Oral Tradition at the Beginning of Faroese Lexicography Chiara Benati	
Chapter Five	92
A Minor Period of a Major Language: Lexicographical Approaches to Late Old English Rachel Fletcher	
Chapter Six	117
Beyond the "Grimm": German Historical Lexicography after <i>Deutsches Wörterbuch</i> Volker Harm	

Chapter Seven.....	135
Old Onomatopoeia: What Etymological Dictionaries Tell Us About Sound Imitation in Extinct Languages Maria A. Flaksman	
Chapter Eight.....	159
Scientific Eponyms throughout the History of English Scholarly Journal Articles Katrin Menzel	
Chapter Nine.....	194
German Paronym Dictionaries: The Shift from Prescriptive Print Editions to Electronic Corpus-Based Resources Petra Storjohann	
Chapter Ten	223
The Making of the Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek: Problems and Solutions in the Domain of Historical and Dialectal Lexicography Io Manolessou and Georgia Katsouda	
Chapter Eleven	248
The Importance of the Bible Translation for the Old Czech Lexicography Kateřina Voleková	
Chapter Twelve	262
Historical Online Dictionary as a Dynamic Process: Fourteen Years and Three Stages of the <i>Electronic Dictionary of Old Czech</i> Irena Fuková and Markéta Pytlíková	
Chapter Thirteen	276
Latin and Italian Influence on Croatian Dictionaries up to Jakov Mikalja's <i>Thesaurus Linguae Illyricae</i> Ana Mihaljević.	
Chapter Fourteen	302
A Select History of Modern Russian-Tajik Special Lexicography Abdusalom Mamadnazarov	
Chapter Fifteen	317
Lexicography of Frisian Frits van der Kuip, Janneke Spoelstra and Willem Visser	
Contributors.....	331

INTRODUCTION

BROADENING PERSPECTIVES IN THE HISTORY OF DICTIONARIES AND WORD STUDIES

FREDRIC T. DOLEZAL
AND HANS VAN DE VELDE

It goes without saying that history_[narration] is possible only because there are traces of history_[events], usually called “sources”; and it also stands to reason that old dictionaries, being themselves part of history_[events] are eminent sources for history_[narration], or historiography of language. (Zgusta 2006, 5)

Dem Wörterbuch eignet das Wort dann erst, wenn es mit einem Begriff innig verbunden und in gemachter Form in irgend einnem Sprachdenkmal erscheint.

[The word belongs in the dictionary only when it is intimately connected with a notion and when having an established form it occurs in a text.] (Passow 1812, 8; [Zgusta 2006, 27])¹

1. Words, dictionaries, and the literariness of lexicography

Franz Passow claimed that every word has a history, and to this one might add that every word with a history also has a bibliography. From the perspective of literary lexicography, a history of dictionaries becomes an exploration of the bibliographic repository of literary history; by combining the critical literary and linguistic approach the policies and decisions of the lexicographer are embedded in cultural and aesthetic domains. Dictionaries and the word studies found within them are reflections not only of a

¹ (1) *Lexicography Then and Now: Selected Essays*. Zgusta, Ladislav. 2006. Eds. Fredric S.F. Dolezal and Thomas B.I. Creamer. Max Niemeyer Verlag: Tübingen; (2) Passow, Franz. 1812. *Über Zweck, Anlage und Ergänzung Griechischer Wörterbücher*. Berlin: F. Maurer.

linguistic community in the narrowest conception, but also a repository and reflection of the culture and literary communities of the time in which the dictionaries are published. However, print or virtual dictionaries, as all bibliographic texts, can only be incomplete repositories; broadly speaking, some texts and words have been lost over time, just as some words have never been collected from texts that do still exist.

The research found in the following pages of this volume continues developing and expanding previous studies in the series of volumes dedicated to historiographical lexicography and lexicology (see Section 3 below for a list of previous *International Conference for Historical Lexicography and Lexicology* meetings and publications)—for instance, the study of manuscripts and print artifacts; dictionaries and standard varieties; biographies; bibliography and text analyses; dictionary production; a variety of critical literary and linguistic perspectives; and corpus and digital analyses. The proof and demonstration of the joint literary and linguistic basis of lexicography and lexicology is well inscribed in the following pages of this volume.

Broadening Perspectives in the History of Dictionaries and Word Studies represents a selection of papers originally presented at the *10th International Conference on Historical Lexicography and Lexicology (ICHLL)* held on June 12-14, 2019 at the Fryske Akademy at Leeuwarden (the Netherlands). The theme of ICHLL 10 was ‘The history of lexicography and lexicology of smaller languages’ with papers on other topics in the history of lexicography and lexicology also welcomed. Each ICHLL provides a platform for scholars and researchers to present their papers and share their research, their experiences, their ideas, and the practical challenges encountered and/or the solutions adopted concerning the history of dictionaries, the making of historical dictionaries, as well as historical lexicology. Thirty-seven papers were originally presented at the conference. The chapters in this book are expanded and revised, peer-reviewed versions of a selection of those papers that were submitted for publication.

ICHLL 10, proposed by Anne Dykstra, was locally sponsored by the *Fryske Akademy*. The organizers and conveners of the conference were Hans Van de Velde (chair, Fryske Akademy), Rolf H. Bremmer Jr (Leiden University/Fryske Akademy), and Willem Visser (secretary, Fryske Akademy/Rijksuniversiteit Groningen). Since its foundation in 1938, Fryske Akademy has been the lexicographic institute for Frisian.

Each of the meetings of ICHLL is locally sponsored under the aegis of the *International Society for Historical Lexicography and Lexicology (ISHLL)*

and embraces the broad range of topics and disciplinary approaches of the scholarly interests of the members of ISHLL².

2. An Overview

The first contribution, from **Chiara Bertulesi**, opens up a discussion of the relationships between lexicography and ideology (“a specific representation of reality within a given context”) from the theoretical perspective of critical lexicography. She defines this analytical approach as a “research field that falls within the scope of metalexicography”. This article then adds to the growing attention to the development and definition of critical lexicography, and consequently challenges a greater scholarly attention to metalexicography as part of, not distinct from, lexicography as practice.

This interplay of production and reception is framed in the context of how the leadership of the People’s Republic of China has placed importance on lexicographic theory, practice and production within the nation. The emphasis on language reform and lexicographical activities began soon after the founding of the People’s Republic in 1949. Bertulesi offers the reader a “diachronic perspective to identify the changes in the ways in which the political objectives associated to the field of lexicography have changed since the mid-1970s”. More generally, looking at a wider range of dictionary production and history, Bertulesi calls for a perspective that addresses how the production of dictionaries, and all the related activities that entails, support the construction and reception of dominant ideologies within a language community. She performs the specific critical study of lexicography in the People’s Republic of China through a close reading of official documents that show an exchange and contestation of linguistic and lexicographic ideas that guide an assessment of dictionary history and the progress of dictionary production.

Other articles in this collection also ask questions about the relationships between “reform”, “standardization”, and the “prescription of linguistic standards” in the respective vernaculars; we shall see that these notions that seem always present, covertly or overtly, within discussions of grammars and dictionaries deserve a wider perspective than the conventional binary description/prescription formula supplies.

² ISHLL is a society of scholars working on the world history of dictionaries, the making of all types of dictionaries across languages and cultures, critical lexicography, and historical lexicology. It was established as a result of the first *International Conference on Historical Lexicography and Lexicology*, which was organized by Julie Coleman and took place in Leicester, England in 2002. For further information: <http://calepino.uga.edu/wordpress/>

Bertulesi addresses the question by directly placing standards, prescription and common language within a context of “class character” as a reflection of ideological and political necessity. In this way, sociolinguistic and cultural realities are put in the foreground side by side with compiling dictionaries, that show “innovations and quality” which meet the demands of internationally recognized standards of linguistics scholarship, lexicography and lexicology. All of this history comes with passionate debate and political costs and benefits, which Bertulesi documents with clarity.

The end result of this dialectic in the recent history of Chinese lexicography, especially as it produces learners’ dictionaries for speakers from diverse linguistic communities, aims for the “cultural soft power” of becoming a world-class “lexicographic power”. And, as an instance of one history, she also stresses the general importance for investigating and describing the broader cultural contexts as a topic across all traditions and histories that critically reveal past and current practice by the close reading of lexicographic artifacts.

The next article, by **Harald Bichlmeier and Güler Doğan Averbek**, is a description and analysis of the Turkish-German versified dictionary titled *Almanca Tuhfe / Deutsches Geschenk* [German Gift], published by Dr. Şerefeddin Pasha in 1916. They make a case for versified glossaries having relevance and value in the research domains of lexicology, pedagogical scholarship and children’s literature. They are particularly interested in the *Almanca Tuhfe*’s place in the history of bilingual and multilingual glossaries written in verse for the purpose of teaching language learners core vocabulary. These glossaries, or simplified dictionaries, were prevalent in Islamic cultures in order to teach Arabic. The pragmatic purpose of using poetic form as a mnemonic device for learning has been a standard in the history of learning and teaching from the earliest documented times. A comprehensive history of dictionaries reveals their central place in education theory and practice.

The *Almanca Tufhe* follows a well-known formula for writing versified multi- and bilingual dictionaries in the Islamic tradition. A significant feature of the macrostructure features the poet (in this case also the lexicographer) addressing topics about textual sources consulted, a critique of previous versified glossaries, followed by stating the purpose for the writing of the glossary at hand. All of this within a poetic meter and stanzaic form that is familiar to readers of these dictionaries. As Bichlmeier and Doğan Averbek show, Dr. Şerefeddin Pasha did not feel constrained by the poetic tradition. The author did employ the practice of the *aljamiado* literature, that is, the use of Arabic script to write out the target language; in this case, the German words are rendered in Arabic script.

The essential purpose for such a glossary is the result of the cultural and political exchange between the Ottoman and German states. Because Germany sent “missionaries” representing professions such as physicians, clerics, teachers, and scholars and promoted the opening of schools, a knowledge of German was considered of prime importance according to Şerefeddin Pasha because of the growing exchange between Germany and the Ottoman Empire. The use of Arabic script in 1916 for those who are familiar with the founding of modern Turkey by Kemal Atatürk and his romanization of Turkish writing put a time stamp on the usefulness of Arabic script. Bichlmeier and Doğan Averbek through their continuing descriptive and analytical readings of this text offer us an example of how language contact and its consequences on people and cultures can be traced by studying this tradition of versified glossaries.

As we turn to the third selection, **Andreas Deutsch** describes the ongoing work on the *Deutsches Rechtswörterbuch* founded in 1897. Along with his own wide-ranging project on German legal language and related topics, here he also develops the continuing historiographical narrative of Jakob Grimm’s excavation of German language and culture, in this instance, his work on “German Legal Antiquities” (*Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer* 1828). “German” in this telling includes for Grimm languages of the West Germanic language family, Frisian, Dutch, Old Saxon and Anglo-Saxon; and it is in Old Frisian that an essential historical record of German legal terms can be found, because Old Frisian language has been primarily preserved in legal sources. This article among other items of note shows how these sources of technical vocabulary “provide an exciting insight into past living conditions.”

Here we see how a critical historical lexicography can also be described as an instance of literary lexicography. As Deutsch points out Grimm’s dictum: “The law book of the old Frisians contains throughout its oldest and best part pure and precious poetry.” And to make the point clearer attention is directed to “the common roots of law and literature”, or in the words of Grimm (see footnote 2 in the article for the original text), “It is not difficult to believe that law and poetry rose from the same bed.”

It is the production of the *Deutsches Rechtswörterbuch* that collects and presents evidence not only for the technical language of the law, but also those linguistic items of everyday language that had legal relevance. Deutsch tells us that at least 1000 new entries will be added each year to the current editions of the legal dictionary, which is expected to encompass 16 volumes and around 100,000 entries. In this present article, the focus is on the special place of Old Frisian from the perspective of historical

research on legal terminology and its parallel relevant lexicographic histories.

The record of another language which in its older form can be found mostly in legal documents is Faroese. **Chiara Benati** brings our attention to the people and circumstances responsible for the survival of the language. An essential and critical person in this history is Jens Christian Svabo (1746-1824). His work on finding and collecting ballads became foundational for the progress of Faroese lexicography. Svabo compiled the first dictionary of the language, *Dictionarium Faeroense*, which was not published for about 200 years after he produced the manuscript. In this contribution to our widening appreciation of a more global historical lexicography, Benati emphasizes the close relationship between the preservation of the poetic language of the ballads—as a trace of the language in other contexts—and the ability to later construct historical and linguistic basis for establishing a standard for Faroese. She points out that up to this time there has been scant attention to Svabo’s work in lexicography and collections of the oral traditions of the people, a circumstance that this present study begins to remedy with her close reading and analysis of the relevant artifacts in manuscript and print.

As with other articles in this collection we are asked to consider the relationships among the emancipation and recognition of a linguistic community (the right and ability to speak and write their own language), the literary traditions of the community and the impulse to establish a standard language. At times this work may seem to be (or actually be) the prescriptive dictate of the producers of dictionaries; and, at other times, it is the effort to bring clarity, mutual understanding and the recognition of a linguistic community that underlies the importance of compiling dictionaries. Benati describes the historical situation of Faroese, with the competing interests of the Danish language alongside the minority Faroese language, as a “a bunch of spoken dialects without any standard norm, while Danish was the official language, used in writing and in every official circumstance.” The simplistic commonplace binary of prescription and/vs. description must give way to a wider linguistic and cultural perspective.

Standard, substandard, corruption of language and marginal category have the sound of earlier epithets of language theorists and critics. And yet, as **Rachel Fletcher** through a careful critical analysis of dictionary texts shows, these terms and their consequences are the keywords in the contested periodization of Old English, namely the use over time of “late Old English” that still has relevance for deciding which words to include in “standard” Old English. The considerations of language contact, dialect and register are

important linguistic factors in the development of the lexicographic tradition of Old English.

Fletcher employs an historical perspective through the study of seven major dictionaries of Old English (seventeenth century to the present day) to describe “the creation and handling of late Old English as a marginal category within a wider lexicographical tradition”. Fletcher makes the point that the liminal character of lateness in the Old English period contributed to the sub-period receiving less scholarly attention and misrepresenting its language and literature, thereby confusing rather than understanding a more neutral description of the period.

In this case, “corruption of the standard” applies to the scholarly and historical assessment of language use rather than a document of attitudes of the language users themselves. The poetic is also of importance here. Fletcher shows that at times the issue of marginality is not a matter of when but a matter of where the linguistic item occurs in the sources available: that is, if an item is only found in the register of poetry. All of this is the result of discrete comparison of a series of dictionaries and their makers. Much of what she finds is the result of a nuanced and close reading of dictionaries as texts, and an exploration of how ideas of periodization of English continue as a point of debate in English lexicography, its theory and practice and historical linguistics. Fletcher emphasizes the variety of descriptive techniques to show the subordinate status of late Old English in this history and how the items being considered are not analyzed synchronically, nor in relation to the period of English that follows, namely Middle English.

As **Volker Harm** tells us in his critical history of Grimmian lexicography and its inheritors, German lexicography has neither a comprehensive national dictionary project, nor “a common reference point within the lexicographic landscape.” In this article, Harm provides a retrospective account of the DWB2, a dictionary that has not garnered the critical attention that one might reasonably consider not only appropriate but essential in the history of German lexicography in particular, and historical lexicography in general. The monumental task of revising the first edition of the DWB can be shown by a simple comparison of citation slips collected for A-Z of the first edition (2.5 million) and the number for A-F of the second (5.5 million). With the publication of the last fascicle of the second edition of the *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, the *Neubearbeitung des Deutschen Wörterbuch*, completed as of 2018 (180 years after the Grimms began their project), broadening perspectives of historical dictionary practice has become a lexicographical imperative.

Sufficient resources for the work to continue with the same quality of scholarship are not available, especially considering the timeline that would

have to be supported. Even the Online (Third) Edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary* is undergoing a consideration of how much of their resources can be given to enhancing and raising the quality of older entries. Harm asks if it is possible to continue historical lexicography in the Grimmian style; that is, with the Passowian emphasis on a positivistic narrative based on each word telling its own story through an accumulation of textual sourcing. And thus, Harm further asks, “Are completely new ways of doing historical lexicography imaginable?”, and, can a new way entail preserving a dictionary in the tradition of the original that has a strong narrative component that connects the present through a documented evolution of meanings through 400 years of German literature and language?

As he lays out in the second major section of his article, the answer is fortunately, yes, there is a way, and it comes in the form of a dictionary, called *Wortgeschichte digital*. The lexicographers intend to produce a dictionary as the Grimms intended that will “make the linguistic past interesting for the audience of their time”. The research team has chosen an onomasiological structure so that with “the words belonging to a common field ... the user gets a far more coherent picture of the lexical developments”. They also hope to appeal to a variety of users, those who are patient readers of the discursive sections of an entry, those who are more interested in finding a word and its history or meaning and those who may want to perform a database search across words and ideas. Harm believes that all these modification and enhancements would have met with the approval of the Grimms, who themselves continually made revisions to their own lexicographical procedures and methods; or as Jakob Grimm once wrote in a letter: “bücher dieser art können erst gut werden bei zweiter auflage” [“books of this kind can only become real good ones with their second edition”.]

“Old Onomatopoeia: What Etymological Dictionaries Tell us About Sound Imitation in Extinct Languages” by **Maria Flaksman** opens up a well-sourced and discretely descriptive and explanatory discussion on etymological dictionaries as a source for information about the historical development of phonetically imitative words (English *plop!*, or Russian *жуужать* ‘to buzz’). She points out that identifying “the imitative origin of a word” is a primary concern for establishing a diachronic approach to iconicity studies. Flaksman provides an historical overview of the terminology that can be found in the literature going back to Charles Peirce (‘iconic’), through Ferdinand de Saussure (‘symbolic’) up to the present day (‘phono-symbolic’; ‘sound symbolic’; ‘expressives’). The other concern addressed in this article covers the question of whether an imitative system remains stable over the course of its evolution.

Flaksman clearly shows how historical-comparative research and etymological studies are important for current studies in phonosemantic analysis. The methodology she engages relies on current linguistic methods and practice combined with a wide-ranging and resource-rich diachronic perspective of sound change. Her research has found that imitative words can lose the “iconic link”, that is the relations of form and meaning, as a language changes semantically and by way of regular sound changes over time. The process of newer expressive words, sometime replacing, sometimes adding to the existing lexicon of imitative sounds, makes the diachronic analysis difficult to assess even with access to an etymological record. In other words, “regular” patterns of sound change can obliterate the obvious iconicity of a word and leave it with the well-known linguistic attribute of the arbitrariness of sound-meaning. Fortunately, Flaksman has found that etymological dictionaries are good resources that provide evidence for establishing phonemic inventories. Her acutely developed quantitative and qualitative analysis of dictionaries over time and the use of current linguistic methodologies broaden our perspective of a distinctive feature of language change.

With the availability of the Royal Society Corpus with its finely tuned metadata that comes with 48,000 digitized texts from the early days of the Royal Society to the present day, we have new and enhanced possibilities for well-motivated database searches in tandem with qualitative linguistic analyses to support historical research in lexicography and lexicology. **Katrin Menzel** shows one such intriguing possibility with clear implications for others as she presents the significant outcomes of textual study and prospects for future lexicographical production in her chapter on “Scientific Eponyms throughout the History of English Scholarly Journal Articles”. Existing reference works that treat eponymous words can be complemented with a more systematic exploration of not only historical and present-day trends in eponymization, but also a critical understanding of why particular eponyms were coined and how they spread within the scientific community.

With the availability of digitized scientific articles covering a few hundred years, using textually based analysis and explication Menzel provides insight into cultural and scientific developments that affect meanings of eponyms; she also shows how a balance of quantitative and qualitative resource-based analysis can underwrite lexicological investigations that consider the “literal” and “metaphorical” and the establishment of scientific consensus. Menzel believes that the use and addition of “natural and authentic” illustrative quotations will broaden the usefulness of the information available in existing dictionaries of eponyms, or entries treating eponyms in non-specialized dictionaries. A dictionary user interested in

eponyms will have a wider perspective with more and clearer access to multiword expressions and frequent or significant collocations.

In the course of her article, Menzel also considers the formation of scientific consensus, the identification of regularities of linguistic change and word formation, lexical ambiguities (one proper name appearing in more than one term), the contribution to translation studies, the male dominant naming choices and current trends in eponym formation, among other insights that lexicographers and historians of science will find useful, even necessary in their own methods and practices. It is still the case, notwithstanding a move away from the use and formation of eponyms, that the impulse to eponymize can still be found in new articles across the scientific disciplines covered in the Royal Society Corpus.

The next chapter also emphasizes a resource-based lexicological study that makes significant contributions to a widening study of dictionary history and historical lexicography. **Petra Storjohann** develops her historiographical and linguistic analysis in “German Paronym Dictionaries: The Shift from Prescriptive Print Editions to Electronic Corpus-based Resources.” The study of paronyms, or “confusables”, explores the sort of words that people mix up with other words that are brought to mind because of their semantic and/or morphological similarities. Storjohann provides a perspective framed by considering how lexical items may be stored in the mental lexicon; her investigation begins with a look at the lexicographic treatment of paronyms over the past years in German dictionaries, challenging critiques of past and present dictionaries treating easily confused German words, produced mostly for the benefit of the uneducated and the foreign language learner. She finds in some cases a prescriptivism apparent in the choice of illustrative quotations that is revealed by the dependence on a narrow range of “literary” sources. Yet, as Storjohann makes clear, “[t]oday, rather than consulting dictionaries, or possibly because users encounter dictionary problems, people turn to online forums and ask the language community for advice”.

It is important to note that even as the research is initially based on the digital faculties available for sorting and compiling, organizing the work will depend on the natural faculties of the human operator, that is, the analysis will not be automated but qualitatively described and explained by a research team. The challenge for lexicographers will be to “make dictionaries more appealing to users” by broadening lexicographic possibilities through historical contemplation of dictionary artifacts leading to “imaginative approaches.”

Historical research has led her to conclude that “new lexical approaches” are necessary and that there is also a need for the production of

empirically based reference guides to present-day German paronyms. And, as new perspectives are formed by a critical study of prior studies and dictionaries, a working definition of ‘paronym’ must be developed to provide a foundation for the historical and also contemporary research.

Io Manolessou and Georgia Katsouda provide a contrasting perspective on historical lexicography with their article that describes the long-term project publishing *The Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek, both of the Standard Language and the Dialects* starting in 1933. In many ways the project reflects work on other historical dictionaries in the familiar nationalist and romantic ideologies of the nineteenth century; naturally, a historical dictionary of Greek from that perspective would be fulfilled by showing a direct linguistic and cultural lineage with Ancient Greek civilization. However, simplifying matters somewhat, Greek developed an increasingly divergent linguistic history from the first centuries AD which requires attention to the dialectal developments as sources for the internal reconstruction of Modern Greek. Therefore, the standard would be complemented with a record of all its dialects. As Manolessou and Katsouda point out, “it was and remains a necessary decision [including the dialects], rendered inevitable by the special sociolinguistic circumstances of Greek linguistic history.”

Manolessou and Katsouda stress the importance of the project’s use of primary sources rather than secondary lexicographic ones. This marks the contrasting perspective of the lexicographic account of Modern Greek being published by the Academy of Athens in that other Modern Greek dictionaries avoid “literary” language because it is considered “deviant” or “artificial”. Of course, the task at hand is magnified by the collection and sorting of primary sources that record a multiplicity of dialects. As the two authors emphasize, citing the words of Henry and Renee Kahane, part of the benefit of this method has the consequence of presenting “the wealth of forms and meanings, of derivations and metaphorizations which a given lexeme underwent in the many dialects, [which is] turned into an impressive display of linguistic variation and creativity.” Of course, all that linguistic variation and “exhibition of the genius of the Greek language” creates challenges and opportunities not generally encountered in other historical lexicographic projects. Manolessou and Katsouda do, however, call our attention to the unfortunate similarity to other ambitious lexicographic endeavors of our time in the shortfall of required funding and personnel to undertake a painstaking and time-consuming adventure in the linguistically based excavation and presentation of cultural heritage.

Kateřina Voleková in her article, “The Importance of the Bible Translation for the Old Czech Lexicography,” provides a detailed

biobibliographical account and critical commentary on how the history of translations of the Bible and related liturgical texts form an indispensable record for the historical lexicography and lexicology of the Czech language. In support of her description of the methods and procedures established for the serial production of the *Electronic Dictionary of Old Czech*, (*Elektronický slovník staré češtiny* 2006), she reminds us of the essential relationship between critical editions of literary artifacts and an evidence-based lexicography, and the unique challenges of textual and lexicographical scholarship attendant to particular linguistic and literary communities. In this case, collaborative editorial work on Old Czech and Early Modern Czech within the Czech Language Institute supports the work of their colleague lexicographers. Because there is a rich tradition associated with Czech translation of the Bible, the first one being completed in the middle of the fourteenth century, it is possible to trace linguistic change over the centuries.

The history of the translations shows attempts to find Czech equivalents for expressions in the Latin editions of the Bible. In this way, morphological, phonological and semantic evidence can reveal a shift from older, even obsolete forms of the language to the contemporaneous language of the time, but with the proviso that the equivalents may represent the influence of the source language on word formation rather than principles of Czech morphology. Because there is a multiplicity of translations, of the whole Bible, books of the Bible, psalters, and the like, and that much of this output is only available in manuscript or photocopy, there is a commitment to digitizing the data, piece by piece, for the greater ease of identifying, collecting and analyzing the linguistic evidence. Voleková describes the variety of studies—digital, textual and linguistic studies—of the history of Czech editions of the Bible that have been undertaken previously and that are part of the ongoing painstaking effort of producing digital critical editions, both of the texts themselves, the history of the *Dictionary of Old Czech*, and for the resultant and continuing work on the *Electronic Dictionary of Old Czech*.

The next article provides another perspective on collaborative research and text production by scholars from the Department of Language Development of the Czech Language Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences. **Irena Fuková** and **Markéta Pytlíková** offer a critical overview of the developmental stages of the *Elektronický slovník staré češtiny* (*Electronic Dictionary of Old Czech*). Fuková and Pytlíková provide pertinent and supporting evidence drawn from textual and linguistic analyses of the painstaking work collecting and recording data on index cards performed by the earlier research team of Jan Gebauer that underwrote

Slovník staročeský (Dictionary of Old Czech), 1903-1916. They add a critical description of the lexicographic depth of *Staročeský slovník (Old Czech Dictionary)*, 1968-2008, and discuss the limited usefulness of *Malý staročeský slovník [Little Old Czech Dictionary]*, 1978, which covers parts of the vocabulary untreated by the other two.

In this article we see the alignment and reconfiguration of principles and lexicographic guidelines across more than a century of scholarship and dictionary production. Partly this is necessary because the history of historical dictionaries of Old Czech is shown to be a combination of unfinished lexicographic work of rich descriptive quality along with dictionaries that can either sometimes provide unreliable entries or in another case relatively minimal lexicographic documentation.

The current effort balances the need to produce a completed record of Old Czech that will be useful for scholars and will also be accomplished in a timely fashion. The research and lexicographical work on the *Electronic Dictionary of Old Czech* combined with the digitized *Old Czech Dictionary* has the object of providing a complete lexicographically sound historical accounting and description of the vocabulary of Old Czech from the twelfth to sixteenth centuries.

Ana Mihaljević in her contribution, “Latin and Italian Influence on Croatian Dictionaries up to Jakov Mikalja’s *Thesaurus Linguae Illyricae*” fore-grounds what for some may seem a controversial point, or at least an opportunity for a reconsideration of conventional knowledge regarding what types of dictionaries occurred first. It is not so much what is a first, or second dictionary type, but more a case of what are the cultural and societal pressures that call forth a dictionary of any type.

And since we have an incomplete record of manuscript and even print artifacts that we would consider as part of a history of dictionaries, making pronouncements about firsts of any extant text is always fraught with speculative provisos. Is it the monolingual tradition in lexicography or the bilingual tradition in lexicography (including multilingual lexicography)? A global perspective, as yet not fully realized or familiar, suggests further questioning of the more localized historical certainties, or at least conventions, about the history of lexicography.

Another interesting point in this history of Croatian lexicography is the influence of non-first language speakers on the recording of a variety of Croatian that has become important in its historical dictionary and word study. And that multi word expressions find their way into a dictionary history is not a later occurrence but an early occurrence, a result of producing multilingual dictionaries for students. We also see another way of looking at the succession of dictionary editions, as additions, and not

simply dismissed as a kind of plagiarism; however, we may misunderstand the dissemination of knowledge across time and geography if a change of word order or reformatting an entry is overlooked as a source of linguistic value. Some of 20th century historical research into dictionaries has this tendency to overlook the dictionary as a continuous text; that is each individual dictionary, particular artifact, of a larger possible (but not printed) abstract dictionary. “The dictionary” is abstract and virtual in the sense that it is an unprinted, unwritten dictionary which can only be accessed in discontinuous and particular instances, not in any one printed or written production.

Mihaljević shows us how a nonstandard variety of Croatian can influence the development of a history of ideas as part of pan European literary production. A *Lingua Franca* becomes the vehicle of vernacular diaspora. And we also note the early occurrence of lexicography in a non-romantic linguistic community, a case of language contact through commerce and the influence of administrative and intellectual registers of Greek and Latin. It is important to be reminded always that we really cannot say with any certainty that there was not already a lexicographic tradition in manuscript form that would record one or another variety of Croatian before the records of which we are now aware.

The next article also explores the variety of societal and political dimensions of finding local translation equivalents, in this case, Tajik for Russian. The lexicographic decisions of producing technical vocabularies for a linguistic community are described and reflected upon by **Abdusalom Mamadnazarov** in his “A Select History of Modern Russian-Tajik Special Lexicography.” His study focuses on bilingual Russian-Tajik terminological dictionaries, also calling attention to the much more complex and rich tradition of tracing the borrowing of terms through the influence of Russian technical register from other historically developed technological vocabularies such as French, English and German. Currently, with a gradual shift of the *lingua franca* from Russian to English the history of Tajik lexicography holds great interest for studies of word-formation and translation equivalents. Mamadnazarov explains that “[a]ccording to the majority of Tajik linguists, in the first years of the Soviet period the words and expressions of the Russian language were borrowed, very often, without any effort to find their translation or equivalents.”

It is clear that the standardization of terminology in the Tajik language requires both a synchronic and diachronic approach to producing dictionaries for comprehension and for writing which includes not only following current texts that may abandon Russian influenced borrowings for a less widely understood Arabic influenced expression. Mamadnazarov calls

attention to the variety of explanatory and descriptive specialized dictionaries produced through the successive eras of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries with explications of the strengths and shortcomings of the micro- and macrostructures of some of the more important contributions to Russian-Tajik lexicography of technical terms. He asserts the importance of these standardizing technical dictionaries in the wider effort to promote an impetus to augment the production of a more comprehensive Tajik bilingual tradition of dictionary production and use.

Frits van der Kuip, Janneke Spoelstra and Willem Visser present a detailed historical overview of the development, successes and trials of the lexicography of Frisian. One area, historical lexicography, remains relatively underdeveloped and thus is a research obstacle to not only the history of Frisian but also as a basis for considering the linguistic description of present and past varieties of Frisian. As the authors say, "...interest in Frisian studies appears to have shifted to synchronic linguistic research..." Even so, Frisian has a richly developed lexicographic tradition. As a minority language in the Netherlands, it is not surprising that bilingual lexicography of Dutch-Frisian has been a main occupation of dictionary makers. Perhaps, the influence of the current work on a digital Frisian dictionary will aid in raising the level of consciousness among funding agencies for more historical work.

Though for many years Frisian was mostly a spoken language, as we have already seen in the paper by Deutsch it can be found in legal documents up to the end of the Middle Ages. Furthermore, the attempt at establishing a standardizing dictionary as noted in articles included in this collection is not uncommon for minority languages and for dialects, or the common vernacular, to have not supplied enough of a historical record to support the production of a standard or standard influencing dictionary of the languages. With that effort comes questions of whether the lexicographical project may be helping to create a new standard; trying to revive a language; elevating a variety of a language into a standard; obstructing linguistic change; or emphasizing description of an existing standard (see Zgusta 2006, 2 and 186-95).

This state of affairs of the lesser support for historical lexicography, duly noted in a variety of chapters in this volume—not confined to minority languages, but also at work in the editorial rooms of comprehensive national dictionaries of world languages, the OED for example—tells us that at the moment scholarship on the history of dictionaries and word studies is in a time of broadening perspectives and narrowing possibilities.

3. A List and Associated Bibliography of Previous ICHLL Meetings, 2002-2021

- ICHLL 1 – Leicester, England (2002)
 ICHLL 2 – Gargnano del Garda, Italy (2004)
 ICHLL 3 – Leiden, The Netherlands (2006)
 ICHLL 4 – Edmonton, Canada (2008)
 ICHLL 5 – Oxford, England (2010)
 ICHLL 6 – Jena, Germany (2012)
 ICHLL 7 – Gran Canaria, Spain (2014)
 ICHLL 8 – Bloomington, Indiana, USA (2016)
 ICHLL 9 – Santa Margherita Ligure, Italy (2018)
 ICHLL 10 – Fryske Akademy, Leeuwarden-Ljouwert, Netherlands (2019)
 ICHLL 11 – University of La Rioja, Logroño, Spain (2021)
 ICHLL 12 – The Université de Bretagne Sud, Lorient, France (2022)

Julie Coleman and Anne McDermott, eds., *Historical Dictionaries and Historical Dictionary Research* (De Gruyter, 2002)

John Considine and Giovanni Iamartino, eds., *Words and Dictionaries from the British Isles in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007)

Marijke Mooijaart and Marijke van der Wal, eds., *Yesterday's Words: Contemporary, Current and Future Lexicography* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008)

John Considine, ed., *Adventuring in Dictionaries: New Studies in the History of Lexicography* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010)

John Considine, ed., *Current Projects in Historical Lexicography* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010)

John Considine, ed., *Webs of Words: New Studies in Historical Lexicology* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010)

Charlotte Brewer, ed., *The Fifth International Conference on Historical Lexicography and Lexicology* (Oxford University Research Archive, 2010)

Bettina Bock and Maria Kozińska, eds., *Weiland Wörter-Welten – Akten der 6. Internationalen Konferenz zur Historischen Lexikographie und*

Lexikologie (Jena, 25. – 27. Juli 2012). Whilom Worlds of Words – Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Historical Lexicography and Lexicology (Verlag Dr Kovac, 2014)

Victoria Domínguez Rodríguez, Alicia Rodríguez Álvarez, Gregorio Rodríguez Herrera, and Veronica C. Trujillo González, eds., *Words across History: Advances in Historical Lexicography and Lexicology*, (Servicio de Publicaciones y Difusión Científica de la Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, 2016)

Michael Adams, ed., “Problems of Chronology in Historical Lexicography and Lexicology”, (*Dictionaries*, 39:1, 2018)

Chiara Benati and Claudia Händl, eds., *From Glosses to Dictionaries: The Beginnings of Lexicography* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2019)

CHAPTER ONE

LEXICOGRAPHICAL PLANNING AND OFFICIAL IDEOLOGY: THE CASE OF CHINA'S NATIONAL PLANS FOR THE COMPILATION AND PUBLICATION OF LEXICOGRAPHICAL WORKS

CHIARA BERTULESSI

Abstract

In the history of the People's Republic of China, the country's political leadership has always attached great importance to developing its lexicographical sector and to the role of dictionaries within society. Since the mid-1970s, the Chinese government has issued and implemented three National Plans in the field of lexicography (1975-1985; 1988-2000; 2013-2025), intended to promote the compilation, revision, and publication of reference works in the country.

Adopting the theoretical framework of critical lexicography, the present article addresses the topic of the interplay between lexicographical activities and ideology. Specifically, it proposes an analysis of three official documents that were issued by relevant Chinese organizations to introduce and announce the implementation of each lexicographical Plan. The key purpose of the article is thus to discuss, through the analysis of the selected documents, the ways in which the official ideology and the leadership's goals participate in framing the guiding principles and objectives of lexicographical activities in the People's Republic of China.

1. Introduction: Theoretical framework and main objectives

Chinese language lexicography can draw on an ancient and well-established tradition. Studies in the field show that proto-lexicographical works existed in China in pre-imperial times, mainly in the form of primers compiled for the purpose of learning characters. Works dating to the Han Dynasty (206 BC-220 AD), like the *Erya* 尔雅 (third century BC) and the *Shuowen jiezi* 说文解字 (second century AD), are generally acknowledged as the oldest-known dictionaries of the Chinese language establishing the principles of Chinese lexicography (Xue 1982; Creamer 1986, 1991; Ming 2006; Yong and Peng 2008). From the Han Dynasty to the twentieth century, lexicography blossomed in China, with the compilation, among many others, of monumental works like the *Kangxi zidian* 康熙字典, the eighteenth-century dictionary commissioned by Emperor Kangxi of the Qing Dynasty (1644-1911) (Yong and Peng 2008).

After the founding of the People's Republic of China (1949) (hereinafter PRC), the new political leadership guided by the Chinese Communist Party engaged in a national project for language reform. Also relying on the efforts already put forth by Chinese intellectuals in the previous decades, in the second half of the 1950s the leadership defined the three main objectives of such reform: the standardization and popularization of the 'common language' or *putonghua* 普通话, the simplification of the Chinese characters to boost literacy, and the creation of a new romanization system for the Chinese language (*pinyin* 拼音) (De Francis 1950; Yin and Baldauf 1990, 282). With language standardization, lexicographical activities acquired even greater importance in the country: language dictionaries, in particular, took on a central role in the definition and prescription of the linguistic standards of the common language (Guowuyuan 1956).

The present article addresses the topic of lexicographical planning in the PRC. Specifically, the article examines the three National Plans issued since the mid-1970s by the Chinese government to boost and regulate the compilation and publication of lexicographical works in the country. Through the analysis of three documents published by the relevant governmental agencies to introduce the publication of the Plans, I focus on the interplay between lexicography and ideology. Foregrounding the role of the official ideology within a specific political and historical context, the theoretical framework of critical lexicography is here adopted. By critical lexicography, I refer to the research field that falls within the scope of metalexigraphy and which aims to study and assess the function that lexicographical activities and works play in the reception, consolidation,

and reproduction of the dominant ideology (Fairclough 1989) and, generally speaking, of a specific representation of reality within a given context (Benson 2001; Hornscheidt 2008; Rodríguez Barcia 2012; Chen 2015).¹ As Joshua Fishman (1995, 34) puts it, “we must interpret dictionaries in context and see them both as resultant of and constructive of their contexts”.

Following Hodge and Kress (1979, 6), ideology is defined as “a systematic body of ideas, organized from a particular point of view”, a concept that in the two scholars’ view also includes political ideologies. Moreover, relying on Reisigl and Wodak’s (2009, 88) definition of the concept, ideology—and, in this case, official ideology—is understood “as an (often) one-sided perspective or world view composed of related mental representations, convictions, opinions, attitudes, and evaluations, which is shared by members of a specific social group”. Thus, in this article I define official ideology as the “systematic body of ideas” intended as contributing to the maintenance and the (discursive) legitimization of the leadership’s political power in the PRC, organized from the point of view and shared by members of the Chinese political leadership.

Therefore, the main purpose of the article is to discuss the ways in which the official political ideology participates in framing both the guiding principles and the objectives of lexicographical activities in the PRC. In the paragraphs that follow, I will show how dictionaries, and reference works in general, are always presented in the documents analyzed both as tools in service of and influenced by not only cultural, linguistic, and social needs, but also ideological and political needs. Given the different historical moments in which the Plans were issued (1975, 1988 and 2013), the analysis also adopts a diachronic perspective to identify the changes in the ways in which the political objectives associated to the field of lexicography have changed since the mid-1970s. In this regard, I argue that the analysis of the selected sources can contribute to the discussion on the functions that the political leadership of the PRC has attributed to the compilation and the publication of reference works both in the past and in the present time.

As will be shown below, despite the different historical periods in which they were published, the language employed in the documents introducing the National Plans can, in many respects, be considered a manifestation of what Michael Schoenhals (1992) has defined as “formalised language”, considered as a “form of power managed and maintained by the state”. This refers to the consistent use of a “restricted code” by Party

¹ Critical lexicography should here be understood as related, but different in purpose and approach, to lexicographical or dictionary criticism, the latter being mainly concerned with the qualitative analysis of lexicographical works (Hornscheidt 2008; Rodríguez Barcia 2012; Nielsen 2018).

officials and in Chinese official political discourse in general. A distinctive feature of Chinese formalized language, which was largely shaped during the Maoist period, is the recurrent resort to “formulations”, or *tifa* 提法, fixed formulations and slogans that represent the correct and prescribed “ways of putting things”, or terminology, to be employed in political discourse (Schoenhals 1992, 1 ff.; Link 2008, 274-278).

Although it is beyond the scope of this article to discuss the meanings and the ideological implications of the official formulations included in the documents, their presence in the selected resources will be analyzed in relation to the function that these assume in framing, in the Plans, the role of lexicographical activities in the country. Specifically, these official formulations will be regarded as the manifestations, on the discursive and linguistic level, of the official ideology (as defined above in this paragraph) in the different historical and socio-political contexts in which the Plans were drafted and issued.

2. China’s national lexicographical plans: An overview

Since the founding of the PRC and, specifically, since the mid-1970s, the Chinese government has promoted three National Plans in the field of lexicography. The purpose of the Plans has been to boost activities aimed at the compilation and the publication of lexicographical works in the country and they have been issued by governmental agencies in charge of the administration and regulation of the country’s publication and media activities.

2.1 *The First (1975-1985) and Second Plan (1988-2000)*

The first Plan was issued in 1975, following a significant symposium held in Guangzhou between May 23 and June 17 of the same year. The event was convened by the State Publishing Administration (*Guojia chuban shiye guanliju* 国家出版事业管理局, “SPA”) and the Ministry of Education (*Jiaoyubu* 教育部), with the approval of the State Council (*Guowuyuan* 国务院) and was given the title of “Symposium for the Planning of Compilation and Publication of Chinese and Foreign Language Dictionaries” (*Zhongwai yuwen cidian bianxie chuban guihua zuotanhui* 中外语文词典编写出版规划座谈会)² (SPA 1975, 251). The symposium gathered more than a

² In modern Chinese there is not a unique term that corresponds to the English words “lexicography” and “lexicographical works”. Based on the common usage of

hundred people, including members of China's cultural and educational circles, publishing houses, scholars, and experts in the relevant fields, as well as ordinary citizens, or, as stated in the document, representatives of "workers, peasants and soldiers" (*gong nong bing* 工农兵) (SPA 1975, 251). The first Plan stipulated the compilation and publication of 160 language dictionaries, including both monolingual Chinese dictionaries and bilingual and foreign language dictionaries, to be published between 1975 and 1985. This ten-year Plan was expected to be carried out in two phases: the first (1975-1980) was intended to lead to the publication of 25 Chinese language dictionaries and 78 foreign language dictionaries, while the second (1980-1985) was aimed at the publication of 6 Chinese language dictionaries and 50 foreign language dictionaries (SPA 1975, 253). Among the 160 dictionaries to be published, new dictionaries outnumbered those which were only to be subject to revision. Moreover, the number of foreign language dictionaries expected to be published during the implementation of the first Plan (1975-1985) was considerably higher than the number of Chinese language dictionaries (SPA 1975, 256-265; Wei 2015, 2-3).³ Wei Xiangqing (2015, 2-3), who has conducted extensive research on the Plans and the development of contemporary Chinese lexicography (Wei et al. 2014; Wei 2015), argues that the leadership's choice to plan more foreign language dictionaries than Chinese language works should be assessed in relation to the political and historical situation of China during that period. China's political instability had a negative influence on lexicographical activities and the publishing sector, and the number of foreign language dictionaries was extremely limited at the time. The decisions adopted during the 1975 symposium were thus aimed at reducing the gap in the different types of dictionaries available to Chinese users. It should also be noted that the 1975 symposium was held at a time of strong social and political instability, also due to the negative impact that national political campaigns like the Cultural Revolution and the "Criticize Lin, Criticize Confucius"

lexicographical terminology by contemporary Chinese scholars, in the present article I use the word "dictionary" to translate the Chinese *cidian* 词典 (or "word dictionary", which is mainly to refer to language dictionaries) and "lexicographical works" to translate the more general term *cishu* 辞书.

³ Among these, the main foreign languages involved were English, Russian, French, German, Japanese, Spanish, along with North Korean language, Arabic, Vietnamese, Indonesian, Hindi, Greek, and even Esperanto. The languages are listed in decreasing order, based on the number of dictionaries planned for each language and according to the data collected by Wei (2015).

movement (1973-1974)⁴ had on the political arena and the cultural and publishing sectors.

The lexicographical sector was, therefore, also affected by the political climate in the PRC. In this context, in the spring of 1974—one year before the Guangzhou symposium was held—the lexicographers engaged in the compilation of the *Xiandai hanyu cidian* 现代汉语词典 (an authoritative prescriptive dictionary of modern standard Chinese, or *putonghua* 普通话)⁵ were subject to a flood of harsh criticism promoted by some of the most extremist political figures within the Chinese Communist Party (later known as the Gang of Four), due to the allegedly reactionary contents of the so-called trial edition (*shiyongben* 试用本) of the dictionary, which had been previously distributed in 1973 for review purposes. The criticisms eventually evolved into a denunciation campaign which gave rise to a heated debate among intellectuals and politicians on the tasks and functions of lexicographical activities. As will be shown in more detail in the following paragraphs, although not officially mentioned in the documents, some of the decisions adopted at the 1975 symposium had a direct impact on the activities for the revision and the publication of the first edition of the *Xiandai hanyu cidian* 现代汉语词典 (1978) (Cidian bianjishi 2004, 192; Lee 2014, 431-432; Bertulesi 2019, 60-70 and 2020).

⁴ The so-called “Criticize Lin, Criticize Confucius” (*Pi Lin pi Kong* 批林批孔) movement was a political campaign launched by Mao Zedong in 1974 and promoted by the so-called ‘ultraleftists’ (Jiang Qing, Yao Wenyuan, Wang Hongwen and Zhang Chunqiao, also known as the Gang of Four). The campaign officially targeted former vice-chairman of the Chinese Communist Party and Minister of defence Lin Biao (1906-1971), connecting his ideology to Confucianism, which, according to Mao, represented the backward, reactionary, and oppressive legacy of China’s past. However, the campaign was also a less-explicit offensive against prime minister Zhou Enlai (1898-1976). See Goldman (1975), Gregor and Chang (1979).

⁵ The *Xiandai hanyu cidian* is a middle-size dictionary of modern standard Chinese compiled by the Institute of Linguistics of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. Its compilation was originally planned by the Chinese government as part of the project for language standardization in the second half of the 1950s. During the 1960s and the 1970s, trial editions of the dictionary were printed for a limited circulation to collect reviews and opinions. The events occurred in 1974 and the decisions adopted during the 1975 symposium on lexicography heavily interfered with the publication process. The first official edition of the dictionary was thus not published until 1978. Since then, it has been subject to several revision processes. In 2016, its 7th edition was published by the Commercial Press (*Shangwu yinshuguan* 商务印书馆) and the dictionary continues to be regarded as one of the most authoritative dictionaries of modern standard Chinese (Bertulesi 2019; Lee 2014).