

What does Elias Lönnrot have in common with Vladimir Dahl, Antoni Maria Alcover and the Brothers Grimm? The answer is that all of these folklorists were also lexicographers. And there is much folklore data buried in dictionaries, whether compiled by those who were folklorists or by those who were not. Thus dictionaries represent a notable source of folklore data supplementary to the already familiar field, archival and monographic sources. This book attempts to take the measure of such data with a set of studies ranging from Greece to England, and from Newfoundland to Trinidad and Tobago.

An introductory essay discusses the location of folklore within dictionaries. Then the first of the three main sections of the book deals with the role folklore has played in the formation of certain remarkable dictionaries. This is followed by a series of case studies of the folklore content of particular dictionaries. And the book closes with a set of studies that address the methodological issues that using dictionaries as folklore sources raises.

The authors of these chapters are: Jasmina Dražić, Anne Dykstra, Jeremy Harte, Philip Hiscock, Zoja Karanović, Diarmuid Ó Giolláin, Haralampos Passalis, Jonathan Roper, Timothy R. Tangherlini, and Lise Winer.

Cover image: Photographed by Oksana Palikova during fieldwork for the *Slovar' Govorja Staraverov Estonii* ('The Dictionary of the Speech of Estonian Old Believers'), 2008.

FOLKLORE FELLOWS' COMMUNICATIONS

SUOMALAINEN TIEDEAKATEMIA
ACADEMIA SCIENTIARUM FENNICA

FFC editorial office:
www.folklorefellows.fi

Sold by:
Bookstore Tiedekirja
Snellmaninkatu 13
00170 Helsinki, Finland
www.tiedekirja.fi, tiedekirja@tsv.fi

ISSN-L 0014-5815, ISSN 0014-5815
ISBN 978-951-41-1157-0

Dictionaries as Sources of Folklore Data ● Ed. Jonathan Roper

FFC
321

Dictionaries as Sources of Folklore Data

Edited by Jonathan Roper

ACADEMIA SCIENTIARUM FENNICA

FF COMMUNICATIONS

EDITED FOR THE FOLKLORE FELLOWS

by

SATU APO HERMANN BAUSINGER

THOMAS A. DUBOIS FROG PEKKA HAKAMIES

SADHANA NAITHANI LOTTE TARKKA

No. 321



HELSINKI 2020

SUOMALAINEN TIEDEAKATEMIA
ACADEMIA SCIENTIARUM FENNICA

Folklore Fellows' Communications is part of the publishing cooperation between the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters and the Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters.



SUOMALAINEN TIEDEAKATEMIA

FINNISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCE AND LETTERS

ACADEMIA SCIENTIARUM FENNICA

The Finnish Academy of Science and Letters is a broad-based learned society founded in 1908 with the principal aim of promoting scientific research and acting as a bond between those engaged in advanced research. It currently has over 700 Finnish members and 180 external members, distinguished academics on whom membership has been conferred in recognition of their achievements. The Academy arranges meetings, discussions and educational events, distributes some two million euros in grants every year, chiefly to young researchers, and also produces scientific publications, issues comments on questions of research and researchers with regard to matters of current interest in society at large and makes proposals concerning science and those engaged in it, thus taking an active part in the long-term planning of science policy.

SUOMALAINEN TIEDEAKATEMIA

ACADEMIA SCIENTIARUM FENNICA

Mariankatu 5 • 00170 Helsinki • Finland

FF COMMUNICATIONS

Editor: FROG

Editorial Secretary: PETJA KAUPPI

Dictionaries
as Sources of Folklore Data

Dictionaries as Sources of Folklore Data

edited by Jonathan Roper

SUOMALAINEN TIEDEAKATEMIA
ACADEMIA SCIENTIARUM FENNICA

Helsinki 2020

Folklore Fellows' Communications is part of the publishing cooperation
between the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters
and the Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters

ISBN 978-951-41-1157-0
ISSN-L 0014-5815
ISSN 0014-5815

Tallinn Book Printers, Tallinn 2020

Contents

Preface

Introduction

Dictionaries as a Source of Folklore Data	17
<i>Jonathan Roper</i>	

Folklore in the Formation of Dictionaries

The Irish-English Dictionary of Fr Patrick Dinneen	39
<i>Diarmuid Ó Giolláin</i>	

The Dictionary of Jutlandic Folk Speech by Henning F. Feilberg	59
<i>Timothy R. Tangherlini</i>	

“A Pretty Novelty in a Grammar”	85
The Romani Dictionary of John Sampson	
<i>Jeremy Harte</i>	

Case Studies of Dictionaries

Karadžić’s “Srpski rječnik” (<i>The Serbian Dictionary</i>) and Serbian Culture	109
<i>Zoja Karanović and Jasmina Dražić</i>	

Superstition is Deeply Imprinted in the Human Heart	129
Halbertsma’s <i>Lexicon Frisicum</i>	
<i>Anne Dykstra</i>	

Between and Betwixt the Folklorist and the Lexicographer.....	151
The Case of Some Greek Glossary Compilers at the End of the Nineteenth and in the Early Twentieth Century	
<i>Haralampos Passalis</i>	

Folklore in Dictionaries: Methodological Considerations

Folklore in a Caribbean English/Creole Dictionary 177 Inclusion, Definition and Retrieval <i>Lise Winer</i>	
Folklore in the Glossaries of the English Dialect Society..... 189 <i>Jonathan Roper</i>	
Folklore in the <i>Dictionary of Newfoundland English</i> 209 <i>Philip Hiscock</i>	
Contributors	231
Indexes	233

Preface

It is not uncommon to find brief glossaries towards the end of classical folklore monographs and folktale collections. While the editors and compilers of these folklore works included these glossaries for their own purposes and for the benefit of their readers, resourceful lexicographers have also found them worthy of their attention as sources of otherwise hard-to-come-by linguistic data. It is high time for folklorists to return the complement and use the works of lexicographers as sources in ways these authors did not originally imagine. And so it is that this book attempts to focus on the phenomenon of dictionaries as a source of folklore data, and to present findings and raise questions as to the nature of folkloric data present in those dictionaries. The work is structured as follows. An introduction discusses the topic of folklore and dictionaries in a variety of cultures. These topics include the various locations of folklore data in dictionary entries (and appendices), the different forms of dictionaries, how the nature of monolingual and bilingual (or multilingual) dictionaries may affect the data. The central question raised in the introduction is: *What is the nature of the folklore data we find in dictionaries?* There then follow three sections, each three chapters in length dealing with cases studies, but with a focus also on wider issues.

All of the writers in the first section take a diachronic view, looking not just at specific dictionaries, but also at their precursors, their planning, and their preparation of dictionaries, as well as their afterlife, just as much as the dictionaries themselves. In such a perspective, cases where folklore has been a key feature in the compilation of a dictionary are viewed as part of a broader metacultural and lexicographical tradition. The section's opening chapter by Diarmuid Ó Giolláin discusses a substantial dictionary published in 1904. Authored by the Rev. Patrick Dinneen, the work's object language was Irish Gaelic, its metalanguage English. The volume was published simultaneously by the Irish Texts Society in Dublin and by the firm of David Nutt in London. The choice of Nutt's as a house might be taken as a sign of the folklore-rich nature of this dictionary, as Alfred Trübner Nutt, the only surviving son of the firm's founder, was both a Celtic scholar and a former President of the Folklore Society. Ó Giolláin begins his chapter with a discussion of the position of Irish Gaelic and the history of bilingual lexicography focused upon it, before leading up to

Dinneen's dictionary. And in addition to discussing the kind of material found within the dictionary, this chapter also touches on the folklore of dictionaries (in this case, the relations of Gerard Manley Hopkins and his student informants), and on the second life of dictionaries, i.e. not only their use in their primary function by those seeking folklore data, but also their being drawn upon by creative writers as inspiration, albeit sometimes as inspiration for parodies. To be sure, dictionaries, along with other institutions and monuments, generate their own folklore, and they may be used in ways their creators did not foresee.

In the section's second chapter, Timothy Tangherlini speaks about Henning Frederik Feilberg's dictionary of Danish as spoken in Jutland, a variety that was explicitly described as being *almuesmal* ['folk speech']. Like Ó Giolláin, Tangherlini takes a diachronic view of his chosen dictionary, which encompasses its predecessors, in this case covering the long line of Danish dictionaries that precede Feilberg from Peder Syv in the seventeenth century onwards (Syv was also a collector of ballads), as well as covering Feilberg's successors, and the future of Jutlandic dialect study. Feilberg relied on a network of contributors to compile his dictionary, mostly teachers and priests in the Jutland countryside, but also one of the greatest of nineteenth-century European folklorists, Evald Tang Kristensen. Tangherlini shows us how for one entry Feilberg draws on fifteen records from Kristensen's collection. Such a methodology means his dictionary inevitably has a composite character, and a degree of patchiness corresponding to holes in his network.

While the first two chapters of this section deal with clergyman-lexicographers, the closing chapter by Jeremy Harte features a lexicographer of quite a different cloth, and one who was not afraid of getting his hands dirty with fieldwork, John Sampson. While acknowledging the previous lexicographical work of Charles Leland, Bath Smart, and Henry Crofton, much of Harte's focus is on the interactions between Sampson and his gypsy companions during which the linguistic data emerged that the dictionary would draw upon. The fieldwork-background to dictionaries and such moments of knowledge-creation are often covered up by lexicographers, though often there is more of this visible in those dictionaries which are chiefly reliant upon oral data than there is in, for example, Academy Dictionaries with their reliance on literary monuments as source material. Harte also illustrates one of the potential pitfalls present at the intersection of folklore and lexicography. Sampson often recorded folktales, from which he would abstract words to use as linguistic evidence. If we attempted to construct a Romany worldview on the basis of such material,

we would come up with something unrepresentative and “disconcertingly magical”.

The second section of this book presents case studies of some dictionaries that are particularly rich in folklore data. The first chapter takes up Vuk Karadžić, another of the key nineteenth-century folklorists of Europe. As well as compiling anthologies of folk verse and folk prose, Vuk was a lexicographer. His trilingual dictionary, in which German and Latin gloss the Serbian words, is full of both folkloric and folklife information according to Zoja Karanović and Jasmina Dražić. For example, there are more narratives in the pages of the dictionary than in Karadžić’s first collection of folktales. Karanović and Dražić’s chapter also leads us to consider the losses and gains when a dictionary is published in more than one edition. In Karadžić’s case, the second edition was forced to omit all the obscene words that had been documented in the first, but on the other hand, as a result of subsequent fieldwork, new entries had been added and existing entries had been expanded.

The *Lexicon Frisicum* of Joost Hildes Halbertsma is one of the most remarkable of nineteenth-century dictionaries. It is unfinished, concluding in the middle of the letter “F”, although it does include definitions of some words from later on in the alphabet thanks to its unusual principles of organisation. It documents the minority Frisian language (in all of its varieties and periods!) and takes Latin as its metalanguage. One of the benefits of using Latin was that it allowed the compiler to gloss sexual meanings in a forthright way that might not have been possible in a more widely understood language. The Latin metalanguage is interlarded by fragments in Dutch, English, French, and other languages. Anne Dykstra shows how Halbertsma, who was also a folklorist of a kind, thought that mythology and linguistics were disciplines that should be practiced in combination. His interest in comparative religion led him to compare the Frisian water-lily with the Egyptian (and Indian) lotus. Dykstra also documents the intellectual background to Halbertsma’s period – the exciting early years following the acceptance of the Indo-European premise, and the days of Romantic Nationalism. In Halbertsma’s case these combined in his seeking to prove in the pages of the dictionary that Frisian was the origin of English.

Haralampos Passalis’s chapter also describes the intellectual climate in which dictionaries were created – in his case, the Hellenic thesis, i.e. the idea that there was a tight, ethnic connection between ancient and modern Greek speakers. By contrast to the preceding two chapters which take a single monumental dictionary as their focus, this, the final chapter of this

section, discusses a series of Greek glossaries dating from the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century in which the folklore element plays an important role. The glossaries, often dealing with non-standard Greek, but written in standard (indeed, purist) Greek, attempted to link these marginal communities (e.g. in what is now Turkey) to their ancient Hellenic heritage, with the encouragement of philological societies, who promoted the linguistic work of enthusiastic amateurs with a series of competitions. Like so many of our subjects of interest, including Dinneen, Feilberg, Halbertsma, and Parish, one of the key participants in this trend, P. Papazafropoulos was also a man of the cloth. This played an important role in his research in that he keenly documented customs and beliefs that were “incongruent with the official recognized religious system”, including verbal charms, in the pages of his dictionary.

The writers in the third and closing section also deal with case studies, but do so with more of a focus on the methodological questions that arise both in the compilation and in the consultation of dictionaries. Lise Winer, the author of the first chapter in this section, draws upon her own years of fieldwork for and editing of the *Dictionary of the English/Creole of Trinidad & Tobago* to give voice to her firsthand experience in dictionary-making and the choices it inevitably involves. One of the interesting issues she touches on is that of how to present difficult information. For example, if a plant was often used in popular medicine (and indeed continues to be used) but is now thought by scientists to be harmful, should the lexicographer simply record the belief and practice as cultural data, or should information about the harmfulness of the practice be added to the definition and feature in the citations? Winer also raises another highly relevant question, concerning how the cultural data in the dictionary might be made more accessible. She discusses both sides of the question – the tagging that the dictionary-makers might add, and the retrieval strategies that dictionary-users might follow.

In the middle chapter of this third section, Jonathan Roper writes about a series of dictionaries published at the close of the nineteenth century by the English Dialect Society. Nowadays these glossaries have been eclipsed by the *English Dialect Dictionary*, the monumental work they were intended to both pave the way for and serve as source material for. They are rich in folklore material, but a good portion of this never made it to the *EDD* itself, remaining in their expansive definitions, their generous use of illustrative quotations, and their appendices (on occasion these include oral texts of some length). Roper also looks at the biographical background of a selected number of the Society’s volunteer lexicographers

and examines how this impacted upon the material they documented. He suggests that it was a prior interest in local vernacular speech that was to lead many of these people into the study of local vernacular culture.

The final chapter in this section, and in the book as a whole, is an autobiographical one written by Philip Hiscock. His account encompasses the celebrated *Dictionary of Newfoundland English*, as well as humbler “vernacular lexicons” of Newfoundland English. It also takes up the topic of how to handle words with local “celebrity”, as found in words used as shibboleths or as local emblems. The fact these words may be more for display than everyday use can lead some linguists to ignoring them. Hiscock goes on to reflect on questions of readership when recalling the ways his Newfoundland students reacted to encountering the dictionary as part of his university classes on local culture. And he also pointedly and pungently brings up the “secondhand” character of attempting to do ethnography via dictionaries, a notion he expresses by a striking comparison to smoking leftover tobacco.

Altogether the book covers two centuries of dictionaries from a variety of locations, and there is much more that might have been addressed, even within that space and time. There were, for instance, many other dictionaries created during this period that one might look at, whether they be those created by great folklorists including the Brothers Grimm or Vladimir Dahl or Antoni Maria Alcover, or whether they be dictionaries whose folklore content has arisen more inadvertently. It goes without saying that dictionaries are also produced on languages outside Europe and North America. In the autumn of 2018 it happened that two-thirds of the students in my usual Tartu class on dictionaries and folklore were from north-east India; their choices of lexicons and word-lists to study introduced me to new lexicographical situations. Dictionaries such as those resulting from cross-cultural contact between Europeans and non-Europeans should also prove a fascinating topic of research for those interested in folklore and its documentation. In terms of other developments, folklorists worldwide might also turn their attention forms closely allied to dictionaries, such as grammars and phrase-books, and indeed to the vast data produced by linguistic surveys (especially dialect surveys and dialect atlases). Volumes of *Mundartentexten* [‘dialect texts’], might also be a focus of future research. Linguistic researchers often found it advisable to elicit dialect by having their informants talk about local culture, a subject they were clearly more masters of than the researchers were: it put them at their ease, and gave them a topic for conversation. And this strategy may turn out to have also been a collateral method of folklore-documentation.

The contributions in this book establish that dictionaries can be stores of folkloric and ethnographic data, data which may be poorly witnessed or even absent in conventional sources; at the same time the contributions also raise questions as to the representativity, the reliability, and the completeness of such data. These concerns are not sufficient reason to abandon this source of data, but rather arguments for us to be shrewd in our use of it. If the present book as a whole can be said to have an argument, it is a twofold one: first that dictionaries as sources of folkloric and ethnographic data should no longer be overlooked, and second that when they are used, they should be used critically. The whole question of how to fit lexicographic data together with other data, especially as supplementary, confirmatory, or disconfirmatory material, is one that will continue to require pondering over. Despite its own imperfections and incompleteness, this book represents the first attempt to address the topic of dictionaries as folklore sources comparatively, and will have succeeded if it manages to broaden local discussions and to guide further investigation on this important and little-addressed topic.

I would like to thank here again my fellow authors, my colleagues, my reviewers, and the librarians who all helped me in this endeavour. The research has been supported by the Estonian Research Council (grant project PGR670). I dedicate the work to Frederick Mabor Hodgess Roper (1904–1994), an admirer of Dr. Johnson and his dictionary.

Jonathan Roper
Tartu, November 2020

Introduction

Dictionaries as a Source of Folklore Data

Jonathan Roper

Everyone with an interest in the subject is aware that the word *folklore* was first used in 1846. Yet not everyone may be aware that the first work to use this fresh coinage in its title was a book that was chiefly a dictionary of dialect words (Sternberg 1851). This is just one token of the close link between folklore and dictionaries. Some of the chief early folklorists were also lexicographers: Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, Vladimir Dahl, Elias Lönnrot, George Stephens, and Vuk Karadžić, to give just a few of the more prominent European examples. Indeed it is striking to realize that Lönnrot spent longer on compiling his Finnish-Swedish dictionary (1874) than he did in editing the *Kalevala*. Conversely, many writers on folklore have relied greatly upon dictionaries in their research – to give one example, we might take Greimas’ reliance on the ongoing academic dictionary of Lithuanian, *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, for his *Of Gods and Men* mythological studies (Lithuanian 1979, English 1992). It is in dictionaries that we find some of our earliest historical witnesses of folklore. Almost the earliest mention (and certainly the earliest non-ambiguous mention) of the Russian midday spirit, the *poludnitsa*, comes in a dictionary rather than in an ethnographic monograph or folklore article (Oinas 1982). Sometimes there is so much folklore data in a major dictionary that it can be extracted to make a book of its own. Using the illustrative quotations in Antoni Maria Alcover’s dictionary, Bàrbara Sagrera Antich has compiled a 200-page anthology of song-extracts entitled *Les cançons popular del Diccionari català-valencià-balear* (2007).

The Nature of the Material

In 1851, Vincent Thomas Sternberg published *The Dialect and Folk-Lore of Northamptonshire*. The use of the word “folk-lore” in the book’s title is notable given that it had been coined only five years earlier. Its use here (and by someone other than the coiner of the term) marks the beginning of its entry into the wider language. Two-fifths of the book’s eighty pages are

given over to notes on folklore, while three-fifths of the work is a collection of “local lingualisms” – a dialect dictionary in other words. Nevertheless, the folklore content of the book is larger than such a page-count suggests, as there is also data on folklore within the dialect glossary. In the glossary section, we find descriptions of local games, traditional punishments, and frightening figures, along with examples of local proverbs, rhymes, and excerpts from songs, amongst other things.

This selection of folklore genres is quite typical of the spread we typically find captured in the pages of dictionaries. Brief traditional linguistic items, such as binomial pairs, proverbial comparisons, exaggerations and exclamations, greetings and farewells, forms of address, insults and slurs, threats and warnings, toasts and graces, traditional excuses, weather sayings, onomastic material such as nicknames, the names of fool-towns, and unofficial place-names, and examples of popular wordplay, may be found throughout dictionary entries, in the headwords, definitions, and illustrative examples. In terms of verbal folklore more generally, it is short forms such as proverbs, riddles, tongue-twisters, the shorter charms, as well as lines, couplets or quatrains excerpted from songs, which are the best represented genres in dictionaries. We can find tales, plays, and complete songs, but these tend to figure in the appendices published along with the glossaries (although summaries of and excerpts from such longer forms may also be found within the body of dictionaries proper). Dictionaries may well also provide useful descriptions of customary beliefs, behaviour (such as games and customary actions), as well as of ethnographic objects, and testimony of an ethnographic character about everyday life in the old days.

But what is a dictionary? The term covers a wealth of works on a spectrum from word-list to encyclopedia. At one end, we have a series of single words with their single word equivalents. At the other end, we have complex entries featuring headwords, definitions, notes (on the etymology, pronunciation, linguistic register, geographical distribution, etc., of the headword), cross-references, and illustrative quotations providing examples of the word in use (whether they be fictive, verbatim, or somewhere inbetween). In some cases the illustrative material may even include the pictorial, in the form of drawings or photographs. Typically it is works at the encyclopedic end of the spectrum that contain more folklore data. It is often single-authored, rather than multi-authored, works that can afford to be less academic, more eccentric. Unbuttoned nineteenth-century lexicography in particular tends toward the encyclopedic (and indeed toward the anecdotal), and such works offer particularly rich pickings for folklore

scholars. Consequently, it is chiefly European dictionaries from the long nineteenth century that the following chapters concentrate upon. But the presence here also of late twentieth-century and early twenty-first-century dictionaries of north American and Caribbean varieties of English serves to show that there are other times and places where dictionaries can be useful sources of folklore. Similarly, works such as S. W. Fallon's *New Hindustani-English Dictionary, with Illustrations from Hindustani Literature and Folk-Lore* (1879), to take just one example, reminds us that many dictionaries produced in an extra-European colonial context are rich in folklore data too. The illustrative quotations of that work, for instance, contain many examples of proverbs and excerpts from songs.

Folkloric Dictionaries and Linguistic Dictionaries

There are dictionaries *of* folklore, such as Juhan Peegel's dictionary of synonyms found in Estonian folk verse (2004) or Aimo Turunen's dictionary of vocabulary found in the *Kalevala* (1981), and there are also dictionaries of folkloristics, such as Laurits Bødker's dictionary of terms for use in the study of folk literature (1965) and Maria Leach's well-known "standard dictionary" (1949–1950). The South American folklorist, Paulo de Carvalho Neto, even managed to compile one dictionary of each type – one of Ecuadorean folklore (1964) and one of folkloristic terms and concepts (1977). But such dictionaries are not the set of texts under discussion in this volume, which is attuned rather to the incidental folkloric material found in what one might call *linguistic dictionaries*, i.e. general dictionaries of languages and dialects. Here we outline the main groupings of such dictionaries relevant to those seeking folklore data.

Firstly there are the *codifying multi-volume monolingual dictionaries*. These are dictionaries that were often in the vanguard of language standardization. All the same, the earliest examples of monolingual dictionaries of a particular language or variety tend to be very broad in their coverage. Such pioneering works, such as the Grimms' dictionary of German (1852–1961) or Dahl's dictionary of Russian (1863–1866), often have a great deal of folkloric content as well. This is not only because the compilers are also folklorists, but also because they as lexicographers are trying to draw upon as broad a set of data as possible to show the riches of their native tongue. Even Samuel Johnson, a figure who predates the Herderian Revolution, and who was someone who was (as Douce, Thoms' mentor, noted) "certainly unskilled in the knowledge of obsolete customs and expressions"

(1807, vol. 1: vii), includes citations from English folksong in his dictionary under the entries for “bravado”, “drive”, “flight”, “lamb-wool”, “load”, “offend”, “redbreast” (Johnson 1773), as well as entries for supernatural figures such as “Jack with the lantern”, “Rawhead”, etc. But typically, normatizing dictionaries, especially the latter normatizing dictionaries, whose role is to establish a standard vocabulary and orthography, do not prove to be great sources of folklore. It is frequently the case that it is the more “marginal” dictionaries that are rich in folklore. In Considine’s terms, the works most likely to contain folklore are “small dictionaries” (2017) rather than “academy dictionaries” (2014).

The *dictionaries of lesser-used languages* are frequently full of folklore. Most of the earliest dictionaries of such languages, and indeed still many today, are bilingual. For example, Wiedemann’s dictionary (1869) takes Estonian as its object-language and German as its metalanguage. Halbertsma’s Frisian dictionary (1872) has Latin as its metalanguage — albeit a Latin studded with English, Dutch, and French excerpts. Some of these dictionaries are even trilingual — Vuk Karadžić’s dictionary (1818) of Serbian has definitions in both German and Latin.

Local dialect dictionaries are another fine folklore source, often because they make great use of oral sources. They can be compiled by three classes of person — the outsider now resident in an area, the native now resident far from the area they write about, and the native still resident in their native patch — each class having its own particular lexicographical pluses and minuses. *Specialist dictionaries* of a particular semantic field or walk of life such as sailing, fishing, mining, or even George Richmonds’ *A Vocabulary of Wood, Wood-Workers and Wood Management in Yorkshire* (2017), contain much of both folklife and folklore interest. *Dictionaries of particular social registers* are one more category of dictionary often rich in folklore data. Slang dictionaries have been under-utilized compared with dialect dictionaries, perhaps because of their association with the urban. But there is just as much folklore in the pages of Henley and Farmer’s *Slang and its Analogues, Past and Present* (1890–1904) as in those of Joseph Wright’s *English Dialect Dictionary* (1898–1905). While both are neglected sources, the former has been particularly slighted by anglophone folklorists. It might be noted that the entries on sexual topics in the earliest uncensored version of the English slang dictionary compiled by Grose (1785) were collected and published in *Kryptadia*, that “review of documents to aid in the study of popular traditions”, under the heading of “An Erotic English Dictionary” (Anon 1884).

Finally, we can mention *historical dictionaries*, such as the *Dictionnaire de l'ancien français jusqu'au milieu du XIVe siècle* (Greimas 1969). As Malcolm Jones has noted (1997: 139), the pages of the *Dictionary of Middle English* (1952–2001) contain, for example, important antedatings of May customs. In a historical or period dictionary, the metalanguage will necessarily differ somewhat from the language being described, although they are diachronically speaking, forms of the same language. Likewise, we can note that dialect dictionaries rarely use dialect for their definitions — there is once again an asymmetric form of bi-dialectality in that the headwords (and illustrative quotations) are in dialect, while the definitions (and editorial matter) are in the standard language.

Where is the Folklore?

The folklore data to be found in dictionaries is located in a number of places. Firstly, we can consider the *headwords*. Thus in Sternberg's dictionary we find in a headword, "Jinny Buntail", a local name for an *ignis fatuus*. We also can read that such things as "Morris Dance" and "Lace Song" are known in the geographical area he covers. But to learn what kind of dance a Morris dance is or what kind of song a lace song is (and what local features they might display) we will need further information. So headwords are typically little use without their associated *definitions*. One interesting question is which word classes are typically the richest in folklore data. Though this may differ in different situations, in the European long nineteenth century it is often the entries for nouns that are the richest in data.

Definitions (and associated discussions) vary widely in length and in some cases we find dictionaries drifting into the territory of encyclopedias. In his substantial definition and discussion of *breids-trjinnen* [literally, 'bride's tears'], Halbertsma (1872: 493) makes clear that the reference is not to the tears of brides, but to a particular spirituous drink consumed at weddings. Without the definition, the obvious reading of the headword would have misled us. Definitions may be followed by *illustrative quotations*, examples of the word in use. These examples may be drawn from folklore, just as they may be from literature, from speech, or from the imagination of the lexicographer. Illustrative quotations provide a useful supplement to the definitions of the dictionary-maker, and sometimes a corrective too. They are also one space where much folkloric information, including contextual information, may be found. Finally we can note that

many dictionaries of an earlier era included *appendices*. In some instances an appendix could include the full text of a folk drama (Parish 1874: 136–138) or of a folktale (Salisbury 1893: 73–75). This is in contrast to stories as presented in dictionary entries proper, where they are usually presented in abstract form, maybe retaining some phrases or key words, attempting to preserve at least the salt of the wit. In various lexicographical traditions, such as French regional glossaries, to give one example, it was common to include a list of proverbs in an appendix. As well as appendices, folklore material and insightful ethnographic commentary may also be found in the introductions and other prefatory paratexts of dictionaries.

In many places, the primary location for ethnographic data is the folklore archive. While this work addresses the use of dictionaries as an outside-the-archive source of folklore data, the point needs to be considered that there is a place both archive-related and dictionary-related where folklore data can be found, namely the archives of dictionaries. Not all of the material gathered in the making of a dictionary will be used in that dictionary, and sometimes this material will be preserved. Such archival fonds are an even more neglected resource that could be tapped for the study of folklore. As an example of this, we can take the *Survey of English Dialects* (SED), which was conducted in post-war England amongst the same demographic typically sought out by earlier folklorists, non-mobile older rural males. It is not just the case that “classical” dialect informants are good matches for “classical” folklore informants, at times they were the same person. To give one example, in 1956 Harry Burgess, a retired agricultural labourer living near Lewes, was visited by a folk song and folk drama researcher. Three years later, he was independently visited by a dialectologist working for the SED (Roper 2018: 128). As he has already been identified as a good folklore informant, it would be interesting to know whether any folklore data was recorded by the dialectologist during what was a very substantial inquisition involving over 1300 questions. We cannot find this out using the published *SED Dictionary and Grammar* (Upton, Parry, and Widdowson 1994). And although the “Basic Material” of the survey was published in a very far-seeing move in an openly accessible manner in the 1960s (e.g. Orton and Wakelin 1967–1968), the typically single-word responses written in the International Phonetic Alphabet are no help in this task either. Happily, the University of Leeds’ Archive of Vernacular Culture (LAVC) preserves a yet-earlier stage of the documentation, the so-called “Questionnaire Response Books”, where we can find a wide range of material preserved, including incidental remarks made by the informant, sketches of local tools and utensils, etc. This is an example

of the most folklore-rich elements of a linguistic project that resulted in a dictionary not making their way to publication, but remaining in an archive.

One of the reasons for the neglect of such dictionary archives is that they are often much less easily accessible than printed dictionaries are. Another reason is the not-always user-friendly organisation of these archives. One scholar has spoken to me of having to sort through hundreds of index cards while hunting for a particular word, as the cards were arranged by localities of speaker rather than by meanings. In recent times, there have been projects to digitize the corpora behind dictionaries, as is currently going on with the 100,000 “word files” that were behind the *Dictionary of Newfoundland English*. An remarkable example is presented by the *Dictionary of Old Norse Prose*, the card catalogue for which has now been digitized, as additionally have the text editions that were used by its editors. This enables us to check the original source and context of an entry can be immediately. While other ongoing digitization projects of dictionaries are not digitizing the printed texts that the editors drew on, these works may already be digitized elsewhere, and so links can be provided to these works. Digitization means that we are now in a new research environment where the dictionary and its sources may coalesce into a new whole, or where the dictionary itself may be bypassed by the scholar who prefers to go straight to the sources. Such a move is not a new one of course. Christfried Ganader, as a spin-off from his projected Finnish-Swedish-Latin dictionary, produced a folkloristic dictionary, *Mythologica Fennica* (1785); there is however a long research tradition among Finnish folklorists of not using the dictionary itself (1785), but of viewing it (whether correctly or mistakenly) as secondary to Ganader’s material as found in the archives. And there are also research traditions where the opposite applies – archival material is ignored, as the dictionary has come to be seen as not just the last, but the only, word on a topic.

Thesauri are another way of accessing data, and seeing connections that we might not otherwise come across when labouring under the aegis of alphabetical order: a good example of this is the *Scots Thesaurus* (Macleod 1990), which reorders the material in the *Concise Scots Dictionary* thematically. Unfortunately such dialect thesauri have so far tended to be thin on the ground, though this may be less of a problem in the era of electronically-searchable documents which facilitate ways for scholars to get the data that does not entail reading the volumes from end to end.

Networks and Metalanguages

Dictionary-makers rely on two sets of networks in their work. Both these networks are mentioned in Parish's dictionary of local English (1874). There is firstly, the set of people he mentions by name in the introduction to that work, early professional anglicists such as Professors Bosworth and Skeat, the historian de St. Croix, his fellow clergymen the Reverends Swainson and Egerton, the botanist James Britten "of the British Museum" (Parish 1874: ii), and so on. And secondly, there is a set of people that figure in the entries of his dictionary who remain anonymous, and who Parish (1874) refers to by such type-designations as *cattle boy*, *rat-catcher*, *shepherd*. Presumably these naming and anonymizing practices reflect the nature of how Parish sees the data — expertise is individual, and so the philologists and other experts he consulted should be acknowledged by name, while local words are common property, and thus it does not matter which particular individual uttered them. It may be all too human that in naming these scholarly individuals, he is not just rendering due thanks, but also boosting his own *bona fides* as a dictionary maker. To be sure, both networks are needed in the making of dictionaries, but it seems glaring that the first network, the actual speakers of the dialect, should be anonymised, while the learned and privileged members of the second network, are named and thanked. And quite apart from misgivings related to the ethics of such a practice, knowing the names of the informants, and via this being able to discover more biodata of the informants, and to link this with word use may prove highly informative. For what it's worth, research suggests that some of Parish's chief informants included Ann Adams (b. 1845), Jane Moore (b. 1817), and Michael Moore (b. 1807), his maid, his cook, and his gardener (Roper 2018: 114–115).

But there is more to be said about the nature of the two networks — the first is a *local* network, while the second is *nationwide* (even Parish's diocesan colleagues would have tended to come from outside of the county, as he did himself, so the Sussex words Parish noted would have been new to them). This raises the question of *Who is the readership?* The (nineteenth-century) dialect dictionary is rarely produced for dialect speakers, but is rather intended for a remoter readership. The metalanguage of a dictionary may also limit and reveal its intended readership. Using Latin as a metalanguage (as Halbertsma did in 1872) shows an orientation to an international scholarly audience, rather than to local speakers. Vernacular dictionaries, i.e. those dictionaries produced by amateurs for a local readership, are typically a much more recent phenomenon. The question

of readership is far from an idle one, as a dictionary-maker's idea of their readership will affect the type and extent of folkloric data the work contains. Such a remote readership may need to be told things explicitly that a local audience would take for granted (a practice which happily helps later researchers). On the other hand, details of importance to locals may be glossed over (to the detriment of subsequent research). The duality of a lexicographer's networks echoes too the duality of a dictionary's language: the object-language and the metalanguage, or in other words, the language that is being described, and the language in which the description is done.

Another possible issue is the sometimes-distancing manner the folklore evidence from one network is presented to the other, especially if the material is of a controversial or an embarrassing nature. The lexicographer Joseph Pickett has discussed (2007) the subtle and less-subtle indicators of belief and doubt that may be inserted by dictionary-makers. As Lise Winer, someone who has herself compiled a substantial dictionary, notes that the question of whether the lexicographer should adopt more of an etic or an emic perspective, one closer to the academic discourse or one closer to that of the speech community, is not easily resolved. While we might want to be respectful towards the beliefs of others, what should we do if a plant to which healing powers is traditionally attributed is now thought to be harmful? Even neutrality in such cases of the representation of traditional belief may be taken as endorsement.

All this brings us on to the political fact that many of the dictionaries of interest to us as folklore researchers were and are written with an agenda of promoting the language (and the associated culture) as worthy of attention, and as something distinct. These agendas clash with other agendas, such as those advocating the unity of a set of lects as a single language, and all of this takes place in a post-Herderian context of regionalism and nationalism where the presence of a *distinct* language and vernacular culture could be taken as supporting political autonomy (and their apparent absence, as an argument to the contrary). Linguistic lumpers and splitters have their parallels with lumpers and splitters in the cultural and political sphere, indeed they could often be the same people. But even the documentation of variation from the standard does not have a one-to-one mapping onto the cultural-political sphere: variation can also be presented as part of the wealth and diversity of a single language.

While some lexicographers are content to document something, leaving it to live or die as it will, others are keen to promote and even "revive" languages and language varieties. Might this lead them into lexicographical temptation or even promote what have been termed "linguistic

land-grabs” (Kerrigan 2018: 10) or what Philip Hiscock in his discussion of Newfoundland dictionaries calls “over-inclusion”? The possibility must be kept in mind when we resort to such works as sources. One such trespass, that may be committed accidentally or on purpose, involves the temporal frame data is presented within. Just like scholars of culture, scholars of language are chasing the sun: there is an unavoidable temporal gap between the date of data collection and the date of publication (let alone the subsequent date any reading gets done). Some scholars of culture opt to put forth their historical data in the present tense, a form of linguistic usage termed *the ethnographic present*. The analogous practice of lexicographers might thus be termed *the lexicographic present*. In Wright’s *English Dialect Dictionary*, we find an entry on a particular custom (“owl-catching”) which suggests that it is something that goes on nowadays (i.e. the date of publication of the dictionary, 1898–1905), whereas at least one of the sources that Wright draws on makes clear that this is something that was practiced *formerly*. Here, recourse to the lexicographic present has plastered over the gap between now and then.

All in all, one of the chief difficulties facing researchers dealing with folklore data in dictionaries is the question of whether at the time the dictionary was written the practice or object being described was part of memory culture or living culture. At times there are clues from the verbal tenses used by the lexicographer (although these are not always unambiguously reliable signs). We may be lucky to have a comment on the extent and lifespan of a practice from the lexicographer, such as the following:

Bush-house, n. (at Pershore) a house opened at fair time only (26th and 27th of June), for the sale of beer and cider without licence, indicated by a bush fixed up at the door. Suppressed 1863.

(Salisbury 1893: 6)

Other observations may not have such a firm end-date, as for example with Sternberg’s remark *s.v.* ‘cunning-man’ (“a conjuror, or discoverer of stolen goods”) that “this brand of imposture [is] now pretty well extinct” (1851: 27). “Pretty well extinct” is not nearly so clear cut. And it may also be that contemporary observer’s do not have as full a picture as a subsequent historian, such as in this case Owen Davies, who places the complete extinction of this practice almost a century later (2003: 187). Nevertheless, the lexicographers’ contemporaneous views still constitute valuable data in themselves, even when incomplete or mistaken. In other cases, such as in the Wright example above, we may be able to go back to the lexicographer’s own source to ascertain whether something is part of living culture

or memory culture. But things get complicated when we realize how cannibalistic dictionaries are — they frequently reuse and recycle information from earlier dictionaries (and indeed from other works). This often makes chasing sources down to their origins a non-trivial problem.

Many documenters of marginal and popular cultures, living in eras of urbanization, industrialization, and globalization, have wanted to record as much as possible of things and processes that are on their way out. Parish, for one, makes this explicit, declaring that his dictionary will include “examples of folk lore and proverbial philosophy which are fast becoming obsolete”. And it is not just the disappearing, but also the already-disappeared (things which have “already passed away”) that he wishes to record. He, like many others before and since, justifies this by the claim that if they are “not recorded [they] may in another generation be entirely forgotten” (1874: 9). In other words, the disappearing is documented *precisely because it is disappearing*. But what about the things that are not disappearing? Do dictionaries that focus on the disappearing thereby neglect the majority of contemporary culture, things that may have played as large a role in daily life as the disappearing phenomena?

Lexicographers and Folklorists

While the same historical figure can be described as being a lexicographer and as a folklorist, how often does one of these activities take temporal or intellectual priority? In one of the chapters in this book, numerous examples are presented of local English researchers who first published on vernacular language, before proceeding to vernacular culture, leading to the identification of a research pathway *first language, then culture*, which suggests that the move from lexicographer to folklorist is the typical one, rather than vice versa. And yet this pathway may be one more evident in scholars with local interests; might scholars with supraregional or national interests develop in precisely the reverse manner?

Nevertheless there certainly are plenty of cases where lexicographers were budding folklorists, who eventually become folklorists outright. The botanist John Ray produced the first English dialect dictionaries in the seventeenth century, which remain valuable testimonies though very much at the word-list end of the continuum. He also produced a dictionary of proverbs. In this he was far from alone. Dahl, aside from his dictionary of the “Great Russian” language, also produced a dictionary of proverbs. Likewise, Fallon did the same for “Hindustani”, producing a dictionary

of proverbs as well as his general Hindustani-English and English-Hindustani dictionaries. In the first case, Dahl's dictionaries are bi-dialectal, rendering all sorts of obscure and popular Russian (and indeed more broadly East Slavic) words and sayings in standard Russian. In the second case, Fallon's dictionaries are bilingual. There is an imbalance to his work (and in other such works). While his Hindustani-English work was, as its extended title states, illustrated by excerpts from "Hindustani literature and folk-lore", *folklore* was not mentioned in the extended title of his English-Hindustani dictionary (1883), where the illustrative quotations were from "English literature and colloquial English". Similarly, while he produced a Hindustani-English proverb dictionary (this appeared posthumously in 1886 with the assistance of Richard Carnac Temple), he drew up no equivalent English-Hindustani proverb dictionary. It may be another case of the misguided notion that folklore, like accents, is "something that other people have".

General dictionaries have sometimes included lists of proverbs in their appendices. Here we might give just two bilingual examples. Anton Thor Helle's 1732 work on Estonian, the *Kurtzgefasste Anweisung zur ehstnischen Sprache*, contains not only a dictionary, but also a list of proverbs and another list of riddles, in addition to a grammar and examples of conversation. Anne Dykstra includes a list of Frisian proverbs as an appendix to his twentyfirst-century Frisian-English dictionary (2000). Perhaps such appendices are practical recognition of the fact that learning what Permiakov has termed the "paremiological minimum" (1989), i.e. that basic set of proverbs that a typical adult native speaker would be expected to know, is also a part of learning a language.

And yet once again the to-and-fro between the drive to document language and the drive to document culture may lead linguistically-oriented researchers to seek out verbal genres of folklore for their very atypicality. Such forms could be deliberately elicited by those involved in language documentation, especially with a historical orientation, precisely by merit of the unusual vocabulary or archaic grammatical forms that such traditional genres are often believed to preserve. Evidence of features that might never (or only rarely) occur in everyday conversations might be found in such traditional genres. In such circumstances, folklore would be sought after as linguistic evidence for its very unrepresentativity.

Disadvantages and Limitations of Dictionaries as Sources

While this book is concerned with the hidden value of dictionaries as ethnographic sources, it must be admitted that they possess *disadvantages* as well. One of the first for an interested party is knowing where to begin to find the riches they may or may not contain (although the creation of searchable electronic documents and the conversion of some dictionaries into websites somewhat alleviate the problem). Dictionaries do not come with contents pages or indexes in the way a monograph does, something especially frustrating when, given the atomistic nature of dictionaries, coverage of a particular topic is divided under multiple separate entries. Certain genres (and elements of genres) are not well-covered by dictionaries: while we may find the words of folk-songs in their pages, it is much less likely that we will find the music to those songs there. Then there are the personal predilections of compilers which may focus on some topics and overlook others. Likewise there can be geographical patchiness in coverage, especially (but not only) in single-authored dictionaries. And there is also the fact that dictionaries often remain unfinished, such Halbertsma's dictionary (1872) which only reached "F", or the Romanian researcher Hasdeu's folklore-rich dictionary which only reached "B" (1886–1898). While the Grimms only reached letter "F" of their dictionary, a team subsequently succeeded in bringing the work to completion decades later, over a century after its initiation. But beyond such examples of fragments, even "finished" dictionaries may well be incomplete in their cultural coverage. And while some dictionaries are on their way to becoming encyclopedias in terms of the generosity of their entries, there may often be another form of incompleteness in dictionary data: cases where the dictionary entry is not a stopping point for a researcher, but a bibliographical link to useful material. In other words, some dictionaries do not so much function as sources than as links to sources.

Another problem is with how accurate the definitions are. Often it is a case of not being completely wrong, but rather of being too broad or too narrow, especially in questions of usage. This can be alleviated if there are a variety of works that defined the same term. Variety here may not be a sign of falsity but an indication of the full range that a word, especially a non-standard word, has amongst different speakers. An area where there may be greater difficulties with the reliability of the material is in the case of the illustrative quotations supporting the definitions. Of course, the laconic contexts that accompany the illustrative quotations can, while not extensive, still lead us to revise our existing understandings.

Similarly, examples of proverbs in use can provide information which is just as, if not more, valuable than a supposed definition of a proverb, as well as a source of data about a proverb's pragmatics. Nevertheless, how can we be sure of the illustrative quotations themselves? In research I have made on five local English glossarists, it was precisely the one who claimed that his illustrative quotations were verbatim who most blatantly invented, or at least "improved", his examples (Roper 2007). They were all working before the age of sound-recording, such as has been used for supplying some of the citations in works such as the *Dictionary of American Regional English* or the *Dictionary of Newfoundland English*, so unless the data has been collected by someone skilled at shorthand, there is an inevitable loss of verbatim accuracy. (I sometimes do an exercise with my students where, after speaking a sentence a dozen words in length, I ask them to wait half a minute before writing it down as accurately as they can. Even after such a brief span of time there are always minor differences between what was said and what they have written down). For the pre-sound recording era, it is a question of having *good-enough* data rather than perfect data. Or to put it in another way, historical folklorists have to operate in the way William Labov has said historical linguists must, and "make the most of bad data" (1972: 100).

While data-gathering techniques in general are not often discussed explicitly in early dictionaries, there are sometimes throwaway remarks that can shed some light on how the data was garnered. There are occasions where one suspects the data has been invented, or at the least "improved". We might take this as a hint as to the best way to use lexicographically-sourced data — as a supplement which confirms, questions, enriches and complicates existing data. Oinas' discussion of the poludnitsa spirit reveals an entry in Dahl's dictionary to be a vital source of evidence on the matter, but while the dictionary reference is a key early notice of the belief, he was able to supplement this with data from other sources of information, an early traveller's account, and such luminaries of Russian folkloristics as Afanas'ev, Mansikka, and Zelenin. In fact, none of his seven notices are especially good sources by themselves: Oinas describes them as "old, inadequate sources" (1982: 132). Nevertheless, taken together they provide something more reliable. Use as a supplementary piece of data will often be the role of dictionary-derived folklore information, as indeed is often the case with other forms of data as well.

While the things we come across while browsing in dictionaries can spark thought about things we never considered before, if we have a concrete research goal in mind the hit-and-miss coverage of topics in

dictionaries can prove frustrating. Furthermore, the information that print dictionaries contain is necessarily frozen in time, and often is incomplete. To give an example of a frustrating case, we can turn once again to Parish's *Sussex Glossary*. In this work, *s.v.* 'draggle-tail', we find an excerpt from a traditional song:

Dame Durden kept five serving maids
 To carry the milking pail
 * * *
 * * *
 'Twas Doll and Bet and Sall and Kate
 And Dorothy-draggle-tail.

Likewise, *s.v.* 'frail', there is another excerpt from the same song:

Dame Durden kept five serving men
 To use the spade and frail.

But are these excerpts from an orally-collected version of the song or from a printed version (the song had appeared in print at least half a century before the glossary was published)? And why were no additional examples of spoken usages provided for *draggle-tail* and *frail*? Without them, how can we be sure these words were they also part of the living local language of his day and not just fossils in a song? In other words, are we getting an insight into local folklore here or is it just a spray-on folklore allusion? In a way it is typical of a thoroughgoing problem with dictionary data: its non-originality. Our dictionary may be from 1950, but some of the data it presents may be from 1850.

So, we should be aware that just as with any other source of folklore and folklife data, dictionaries have limitations. What is the nature of folklore data in dictionaries as *a form of data*? In many cases, dictionaries would ideally be supplementary data, complimenting other book data and field data deriving from consulting native informants and outside experts (or indeed from native experts), adding to it, and also confirming or disconfirming it. All such data is an important supplement to archival and monographic data, and is especially relevant where there is sparse archival material. In the case mentioned above, there may be additional sources of evidence (such as twentieth-century sound recordings of 'Dame Durden' made in the vicinity) that can help clarify the situation for us. Dictionary evidence may supply important variants and corrections, just as it can itself supplement other forms of incomplete evidence. It may provide further data about the areal spread of a form or a tradition or supply early or late witnesses of practice, but it is only rarely that we find the

complete texts of a folktale or a folk drama in a dictionary, and when this happens it is almost without exception in an appendix. The fragmentary is the norm when working with dictionary data. And yet fragments can be pieced together: a single illustrative quotation may provide nugatory data, but if the same word (or phenomenon) should re-appears in the same dictionary amidst the quotations illustrating other headwords, then a fuller picture might be drawn (Bartholomew 1995).

In conclusion, dictionaries have been used as a source by writers on folklore, but not as fully as they might have been, and not always with an awareness of the advantages and disadvantages that such a source of data has. We can end this chapter with an observation from one late nineteenth-century local glossarist, Jesse Salisbury. He found it necessary, on occasion, as folklorists themselves often have, to apologize for the triviality of his material. After quoting a local rhyme, Salisbury notes that it is an “absurdity”, but he justifies the inclusion of the rhyme with the remark that “in regard to sayings, &c., as well as in numerous other matters, it is difficult to decide what is, or what is not, a trifle” (1893: 77). In other words, as a dictionary-maker, his coverage of local language (and culture) aimed at being comprehensive, and he left it to others later on to judge how trivial or absurd the details may or may not be. Out-and-out folklorists have often felt it necessary to apologize for the seemingly trivial nature of the things they expend their time and attention on by suggesting that what they are dealing with may not in fact be trivial. Thoms himself said as much several times. But ironically folklorists may *not* be trivial enough in their interests. The defensiveness with which they theorize triviality is already a clue as to that. Folklorists may overlook things, by accident or design. But with dictionaries there is less of a filter as far as triviality is concerned. Recording every non-standard word you come across offers less of an ideological filter than recording everything you identify as folklore does, and as the non-standard words often come with culture attached, we often will find overlooked folklore in such dictionaries. The goal of recording *every* word (or even just, and more typically, every non-obscene non-standard word) will involve crossing the *triviality threshold* that can trip up the researcher of culture. While the themes, paradigms and hypotheses that cultural researchers have followed, both now and then, may blind them to some phenomena, the random omnivorousness of the alphabet can prove to be less of a filter. We should be glad that our lexicographers did snap up these otherwise unconsidered laographic and linguistic trifles, should prize the paradigm-eluding light they shine on

random facets of culture, and should think once again about how we might use this data in our understanding of culture.

References

- Anon. 1884. An Erotic English Dictionary. *Kryptadia* 2: 271–6.
- Antich, Bàrbara Sagrera. 2007. *Les Cançons Populars del Diccionari Català-Valencià-Balear*. Palma: Editorial Moll-COFUC.
- Bartholemew, Doris. 1995. Otomi Culture from Dictionary Illustrative Sentences. In Kachru and Kahane 1995: 3-7.
- Bødker, Laurits. 1965. *International Dictionary of Regional European Ethnology and Folklore, vol.2: Folk literature (Germanic)*. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger.
- Carvalho Neto, Paulo de. 1964. *Diccionario del folklore ecuatoriano*. Quito: Editorial Casa de la Cultura Ecuatoriana.
- Carvalho Neto, Paulo de. 1977. *Diccionario de teoría folklórica*. Guatemala City: Centro de Estudios Folklóricos, Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala.
- Considine, John. 2014. *Academy Dictionaries 1600–1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Considine, John. 2017. *Small Dictionaries and Curiosity: Lexicography and Fieldwork in Post-Medieval Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dahl, Vladimir. 1863–1866. *Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка*. Moscow: Society of Enthusiasts for Russian Literature/Imperial Moscow University.
- Dahl, Vladimir. 1862. *Пословицы русского народа*. Moscow: Imperial Society for Russian History and Antiquities at Moscow University.
- Davies, Owen. 2003. *Cunning-Folk: Popular Magic in English History*. London: Hambledon.
- Douce, Francis. 1807. *Illustrations of Shakespeare*. 2 vols. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees and Orme.
- Dykstra, Anne. 2000. *Frysk-Ingelsk wurdboek*. Ljouwert/Leeuwarden: Frisian Academy, AFÛK.
- Fallon, S. W. 1879. *A New Hindustani-English Dictionary, with Illustrations from Hindustani Literature and Folk-Lore*. Benares/London: E. J. Lazarus/Trübner.
- Fallon, S. W. 1883. *A New English-Hindustani Dictionary: With illustrations from English Literature and Colloquial English*. Benares: E. J. Lazarus.
- Fallon, S. W. 1886. *A Dictionary of Hindustani Proverbs: Including Many Marwari, Panjabi, Maggah, Bhojpuri and Tirhuti Proverbs, Sayings, Emblems, Aphorisms, Maxims and Similes*. Benares: E. J. Lazarus.
- Ganander, Christfried. 1789. *Mythologia fennica*. Åbo: Frenckell.

- Greimas, Algirdas. 1969. *Dictionnaire de l'ancien français jusqu'au milieu du XIVe siècle*. Paris: Larousse.
- Greimas, Algirdas. 1979. *Apie dievus ir žmones: Lietuvių mitologijos studijos*. Chicago: Chicago: AM and M Publications.
- Greimas, Algirdas. 1992. *Of Gods and Men: Studies in Lithuanian Mythology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Grimm, Jacob, Wilhelm Grimm, et al. 1852–1961. *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm*. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Grose, Francis. 1785. *A Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue*. London: S. Hooper.
- Halbertsma, J. H. 1872. *Lexicon Frisicum*. Deventer: De Lange.
- Hasdeu, B. Petriceicu. 1886–1890. *Etymologicum magnum Romaniae*, vols 1–4. Bucharest: Editura Socecu.
- Helle, Anton Thor. 1732. *Kurtzgefasste Anweisung zur ehstnischen Sprache*. Halle: S. Orban.
- Johnson, Samuel. 1773. *A Dictionary of the English Language*. Fourth Edition. London: Strahan and Rivington.
- Jones, Malcolm. 1997. Review of *The Stations of the Sun: A History of the Ritual Year in Britain* by Ronald Hutton. *Folklore* 108: 137–140.
- Kachru, Braj and Henry Kahane. 1995. *Cultures, Ideologies and the Dictionary: Studies in Honor of Ladislav Zgusta*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1995.
- Karadžić, Vuk Stefanović. 1818. *Srpski rječnik istumacen njemačkim i latin-skijem riječima*. Vienna: P. P. Armeniern.
- Kerrigan, Michael. 2018. Meet Me by the Eenog. *Times Literary Supplement* 16 Feb: 10.
- Kruopas, J. 1956–2002. *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto.
- Kurath, Hans, Sherman Kuhn, and Robert Lewis. 1952–2001. *Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Labov, William. 1972. Some Principles of Linguistic Methodology. *Language in Society* 1: 97–120.
- Leach, Maria. 1949–1950. *Funk and Wagnalls' Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology and Legend*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls.
- Lönnrot, Elias. 1874–1880. *Finskt-svenskt lexikon – Suomalais-ruotsalainen sanakirja*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Macleod, Iseabail. 1990. *The Scots Thesaurus*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.
- Oinas, Feliks. 1982. Poludnica: The Russian Midday Spirit. *International Folklore Review* 2: 130–134.
- Orton, Harold and Martin Wakelin. 1967–1968. *Survey of English Dialects, Section B: The Basic Material, vol. 4: The Southern Counties*. Leeds: Edward Arnold.
- Peegel, Juhan. 2004. *Nimisõna poeetilised sünonüümid eesti regivärssides*. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.

- Permiakov, Grigorii. 1989. On the Question of a Russian Paremiological Minimum. *Proverbium* 6: 91–102.
- Pickett, Joseph. 2007. Considered and Regarded: Indicators of Belief and Doubt in Dictionary Definitions. *Dictionaries* 28: 48–67.
- Ray, John. 1670. *Collection of English Proverbs*. Cambridge: W. Morden.
- Ray, John. 1674. *Collection of English Words Not Generally Used*. London: Thomas Burrell.
- Redmonds, George. 2017. *A Vocabulary of Wood, Wood-Workers and Wood Management in Yorkshire*. Donnington: Shaun Tyas.
- Roper, Jonathan. 2007. Sussex Glossarists and their Illustrative Quotations. *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 145: 181–194.
- Roper, Jonathan. 2018. The Clergyman and the Dialect Speaker. In Wright 2018: 110–131.
- Salisbury, Jesse. 1893. *A Glossary of Words and Phrases Used in South East Worcestershire, together with Some of the Sayings, Customs, Superstitions, Charms, &c. Common in that District*. London: J. Salisbury.
- Sanderson, S. F. 1972. Folklore Material in the English Dialect Survey. *Folklore* 83,2: 89–100.
- Sternberg, Vincent Thomas. 1851. *The Dialect and Folk-Lore of Northamptonshire*. London: J. R. Smith.
- Turunen, Aimo. 1981. *Kalevalan sanat ja niiden taustat*. [Words of the Kalevala and their Background]. 2nd edn. Joensuu: Karjalaisen Kulttuurin Edistämissäätiö, 1981.
- Upton, Clive, David Parry, and J. D. A. Widdowson. 1994. *Survey of English Dialects: Dictionary and Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Wiedemann, Johann Ferdinand. 1869. *Ehstnisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. St. Peterburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Wright, Laura, ed. 2018. *Southern English Varieties Then and Now*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Folklore in the Formation of Dictionaries

The Irish-English Dictionary of Fr Patrick Dinneen

Diarmuid Ó Giolláin

The Irish language, or (Irish) Gaelic, is a Celtic language, most closely related to Scottish Gaelic and Manx. The earliest written sources are stone inscriptions in the peculiar writing system called *ogham* from the fifth and sixth centuries. A large body of writing exists for the periods into which the development of the language is divided, Old Irish, c. 600 CE to 900, Middle Irish, c. 900 to 1200, Early Modern Irish, c. 1200 to 1500, and Modern Irish from then on. The disruption caused by the Viking raids from the end of the eighth century and by the much later English conquests of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries explain why so much of the Irish literary record was lost in Ireland itself; most of the earliest sources survived in continental European monasteries with medieval Irish links.

The twelfth-century conquest of much of the country was the basis for the (largely nominal) English Lordship of Ireland, which lasted through the medieval period. Until the seventeenth century, Irish remained a language of high culture, with the patronage of the Church and of the aristocracy supporting literary activity covering the broad spectrum of intellectual life. When England broke with Rome, it saw Catholic Ireland as a dangerous anomaly vulnerable to the machinations of its Catholic enemies and set about fully submitting the country to its rule. The Elizabethan and Cromwellian conquests led to the suppression of the Catholic Church and the dispossession of most of the aristocracy, whose lands were assigned to English settlers. The language, deprived of patronage and excluded from public life, gradually declined as a medium of high culture and was gradually abandoned by the higher social strata. The classical language cultivated in the so-called “bardic schools” until the seventeenth century gave way in the eighteenth century to literary composition that was much more demotic in language, tone and, in the case of poetry, meter. From the eighteenth century, rapid demographic growth partly concealed the decline in the use of the language.

On the eve of the Great Famine of the 1840s, an estimated four million people still spoke Irish, nearly half the population. From 1851, the census enumerated Irish speakers, and showed the obvious decline in their number: in 1851 23.3% of a total population of 6.55 million, in 1861 19.1% of 5.8 million, in 1871 15.1 % of 5.41 million, in 1881 18.2% of 5.17 million, in 1891 14.5% of 4.7 million, and 1901 14.4% of 4.46 million (Ó Tuathaigh 2017: 59). By the end of the nineteenth century, when the language revival began as part of a wider cultural nationalist movement, Irish speakers numbered only 680,000 and, according to the census of population, those under the age of ten represented only 3.5% of their age cohort. The language itself was barely written by then, few could read or write it, very few publications in Irish existed, and the language was marginalized geographically to some of the remotest parts of the country and socially to a remnant of the poorest peasantry, which spoke a variety of distinct dialects.

Early Developments

Owing to the persecution of the Catholic Church in Ireland, from the 1590s colleges were founded in continental Europe in order to train Irish priests. Eventually numbering more than forty, they became important institutions of the large Irish diaspora and valuable supports for Irish learning. The first printed dictionary of the Irish language was published in 1643 in Leuven (Louvain) in the Spanish Netherlands, in the Irish Franciscan College of St. Anthony, a key center for Irish history and hagiography. The dictionary was compiled by Mícheál Ó Cléirigh (Michael O'Clery, c.1590–1643), a famed scholar and Franciscan monk. A monolingual dictionary, it is unclear how many copies of it were printed, though many manuscript copies survived (Mac Amhlaigh 2008: 1–6). The first Irish-English dictionary appeared in Oxford in 1707 as part of the work *Archaeologia Britannica* by the Welsh antiquarian Edward Lhuyd (1660?–1709), which was based on the manuscript Latin-Irish dictionary completed in 1662 by a Franciscan, Richard Plunkett (Ua Súilleabháin 2005: 66; Mac Amhlaigh 2008: 7–24). The first English-Irish dictionary was published in Paris in 1732, compiled by Conchubhar Ó Beaglaoich with help from the poet Aodh Buidhe Mac Cruitín (c.1680–1755). Ó Beaglaoich was probably a Catholic priest linked to the Irish College in Paris (Mac Amhlaigh 2008: 24–33). The first Irish-English dictionary likewise was published in Paris, in 1768,

by John O'Brien (Seán Ó Briain, c.1701–1769), Bishop of Cloyne, also associated with the Irish College (Mac Amhlaigh 2008: 42–50).

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, debates about Ireland's past had a distinctly political tone. Conservative Protestants saw a country saved from barbarism by English intervention, while Catholics and liberal Protestants saw an Irish Golden Age prematurely ended by foreign intrusion. Antiquarian societies implicitly participated in this debate and took on three main functions. They brought a knowledge of the country's past to its recently installed Protestant elite, they sought to recuperate the past, the records of which had been lost or dispersed by conquest and colonization, and they tried to vindicate Ireland's past by refuting the charge of barbarism (see Leerssen 1996a and 1996b; O'Halloran 2004). The debate about James Macpherson's *Ossian* was also important in Ireland and among Irish Catholic emigrés on the continent, of whom John O'Brien was first off the mark in attacking both *Ossian's* authenticity and its Scottishness, which he continued in the introduction to his dictionary (O'Halloran 1989: 81). Leerssen points out that an important consequence of the Ossianic debate was that the defense of the Gaelic past became a national concern, taken up by Anglo-Irish writers as well (Leerssen 1996a: 344). A short-lived Dublin Gaelic Society appeared in 1807, edited a single volume of its *Transactions* and published cheap grammars and primers of Irish. It was the first of a series of such societies. The Ibero-Celtic Society was founded in 1818 to preserve and publish ancient Irish literature and also published a sole volume of *Transactions*, under the editorship of the Gaelic scholar and lexicographer, Edward O'Reilly (1765–1830). The Irish Archaeological and Celtic Society was founded in the 1840s to draw attention to the primary sources for Irish history. The Ossianic Society, founded in 1853, sought, as its name suggests, to publish relevant Irish manuscripts, many of which were late, covering the same material as contemporary peasant traditions.

The first societies for encouraging the use of Irish were American, beginning with The Brooklyn Philo-Celtic Society in 1874, and the first of the modern journals was its organ, *An Gaodhal*, subtitled "The Gael, a Monthly Journal devoted to the Preservation and Cultivation of the Irish Language and the Autonomy of the Irish Nation", which appeared from 1881. In Ireland, the Society for the Preservation of the Irish Language was founded in 1876 to encourage the use of the language by setting up classes, to improve its status (since it was excluded from the educational system) and to promote a modern literature in Irish. Its publication of Canon Bourke's *Easy Lessons in Irish* in small booklets between 1877

and 1879 was its most pragmatic activity. Dissatisfaction with its effectiveness led to the secession of some members – among them Douglas Hyde (1860–1949) – who founded the Gaelic Union in 1879. Especially important was the Gaelic Union’s bilingual journal, *Irisleabhar na Gae-dhilge*, which helped to establish a new literature in modern Irish, and which appeared from 1882. In due course, the Gaelic Union was succeeded by the Gaelic League, founded in 1893 and, under Hyde’s presidency, it became in effect a mass movement and, eventually, the motor for Irish cultural nationalism. Hyde, the son of an Anglican rector with close links to the Anglo-Irish ruling class, was a major and substantial figure, a writer, literary scholar, folklorist, translator and later President of Ireland.

The Gaelic League

The Gaelic League inherited the mantle of earlier bodies with an interest in the language. Eventually, after much debate, the spoken language became the basis for the new literary standard promoted by the League, but using the historic spelling that adequately served a “phonemic” function over and above the great dialect variation. One of the priorities of the League was to fill the need for textbooks and reference works, almost completely lacking. At the time, the most influential of the recently published Irish-English dictionaries was Edward O’Reilly’s, which appeared in 1817 and again in 1821. The new edition from 1864 had a supplement that consisted of the notes that the eminent scholar John O’Donovan (1806–1861) had written on the margins of his own copy of the 1817 edition. O’Reilly admitted in his preface that, following earlier lexicographers, he had neglected words in common speech (Ua Súilleabháin 2005: 62; Mac Amhlaigh 2008: 58–65). In 1849 Thomas de Vere Coneys’ Irish-English dictionary appeared, published by the Irish Society for Promoting the Education of the Native Irish through the Medium of their Own Language, a proselytizing body founded in 1818. Considered by later lexicographers to be of a very high standard, the author, who held the chair of Irish in Trinity College from 1841, saw the need for the dictionary in order to read the Irish Bible, which at the time existed only in the Anglican version (Mac Amhlaigh 2008: 66–71).

It was clear that a new dictionary should use the rich literary evidence of the modern language, but it could not afford to ignore the spoken dialects, which learners would inevitably confront, and which were used in the numerous folklore collections that were already a major part of the literature of the language revival, beginning with Hyde’s *Leabhar*

Sgeulaigheachta [‘a book of storytelling’] (1889), *Beside the Fire: A Collection of Irish Gaelic Folk Stories* (1890) and *Abhráin Grádh Chúige Chonnacht/Love Songs of Connacht* (1893). The Irish Texts Society was founded in London in 1898 “to advance public education by promoting the study of Irish literature”, and to do so by “the publication of texts in the Irish language, accompanied by introductions, English translations, glossaries and notes” (Irish Texts Society 2020). It quickly recognized the need for a dictionary.

Initially, in 1898, the language activist and novelist Fr Peadar Ó Laoghaire (Peter O’Leary, 1839–1920) agreed to be general editor, but resigned in April 1901 and was replaced by the medieval historian Eoin (John) Mac Neill (1867–1945). He resigned a few months later, whereupon Fr Patrick Dinneen (Pádraig Ó Duinnín, 1860–1934) was approached to undertake the work. Dinneen was already known to the ITS since in 1899 he had proposed an edition of the work of the Munster poet Aodhagán Ó Rathaille (1670?–1728/9). The edition, *Dánta Aodhgáin Uí Rathaille* appeared in 1900, but the Society had had to seek the assistance of the Celtic scholar Osborn Bergin (1873–1950) to revise Dinneen’s manuscript. Despite the inauspicious nature of this initial collaboration with the Society, Dinneen was to become one of the most distinguished contributors to its work (Riggs 2005b: vi). Because of what he considered to be the amount of work involved, he asked for a substantial payment, a demand eventually accepted (Ó Riain 2005: x–xi). 12,000 entries had already been gathered, mostly from earlier dictionaries, by the time Dinneen took over (Hyde, Mescal and Hull 1904: iv). The dictionary that appeared in 1904 consisted of 783 pages, set in double columns, and printed in the Gaelic script with the meaning in English of about 30,000 Irish headwords (Mac Amhlaigh 2008: 94).

Patrick Dinneen

Dinneen was born in poverty in a cabin on a small holding in Sliabh Luachra in Co. Kerry in 1860, his parents having been evicted from a more substantial farm a few years before. He was one of a family of seven boys and three girls, born between 1851 and 1875, one of whom died in infancy. Irish was the native language of both parents, and was the everyday language of the older children, but the younger children, including Patrick, spoke English, which was spreading rapidly in the decades after the Great Famine. He grew up with the rich oral tradition of his district, and the

poets and their songs were a favorite subject. He first heard of Ó Rathaille, generally considered the greatest poet in the modern language, from his mother's singing. Traditions of Eoghan Rua Ó Súilleabháin (c. 1748–1784), whose life and words delighted the community, outlived those of Ó Rathaille (Ó Conluain and Ó Céileachair 1958: 33–34, 39, 62–63), and were typical of a body of local lore that was very popular. The literary critic Daniel Corkery (1878–1964), for example, told of visits to the Irish-speaking parts of Munster as a young man:

I found there were two subjects which never failed to arouse the dying fires, to bring light into the fading eyes, and a flood of speech to the toothless gums: the Great Famine of '47 was one, and Eoghan Ruadh, the wastrel poet, whose voice had been stilled for more than a hundred years, whose poems they had never seen printed, whose life they had never seen written, was the other.

(Corkery 1967 [1924]: 220)

Dinneen entered the Jesuits in 1880, studying in Dublin and in Drongen (Tronchiennes), in the Jesuit Province of Flanders. He took mathematics (eventually to a masters) and modern literature in University College Dublin, where one of his teachers was the English poet Gerard Manley Hopkins (1844–1889). Hopkins was an informant for Joseph Wright (1855–1930), compiler of the *English Dialect Dictionary*, and legend has it that Hopkins' students gave him fabricated words and locutions to pass on to Wright, asserting that they had heard them in their native districts (O'Neill 1919: 124–125¹; Ó Conluain and Ó Céileachair 1958: 89–90). Dinneen left the order in 1900, but did not leave the priesthood as such, wearing clerical garb until he died, though thereafter he was to support himself from his scholarship. He seemed to have developed an interest in the Irish language by 1899, when he taught it in Clongowes Wood, the leading Catholic private school run by the Jesuits, where James Joyce (1882–1941) had been a boarder a decade before.

In the first few years of the new century, Dinneen had published scholarly editions of the important seventeenth and eighteenth century Munster poets and three of the four volumes of *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn*, the influential history of Ireland written in 1634/35 by Geoffrey Keating (Seathrún Céitinn, c. 1580–1644), as well as other works. This literature had been mostly transmitted through a scribal tradition, though the poetry was transmitted orally as well, being sung. *Foras Feasa* did not appear in

1 My thanks to Jonathan Roper for this reference.

print until the Irish Texts Society's scholarly edition of 1902–1914 begun by David Comyn (an English translation was printed in 1723), though it circulated in manuscript (including in a contemporary Latin translation) and was copied until the second half of the nineteenth century (Morley 2011: 114–119). By Dinneen's time, most Irish people were monoglot English-speakers and ignorant of this literature. When Dinneen undertook the dictionary, he was an acknowledged expert in the literary language but also was very familiar with the spoken language and oral tradition of his own native district, which was also the native district of the two most important eighteenth-century poets, Ó Rathaille and Ó Súilleabháin. Dinneen also wrote the first novel in Irish, short stories, plays, poetry, essays, pamphlets and school books, as well as newspaper articles, though his literary efforts are largely forgotten today. He was an active member of the Gaelic League, and his branch, named after Keating, had a difficult relationship with the League's executive. Its members were later to play an important role in the 1916 Rising (Breathnach 2005: 1).

Dinneen “was gifted, industrious, a formidable controversialist, given to punning and earthy humour, cranky as well, and to be remembered most notably for his Irish dictionary” (MacLochlainn 2002: 68). The cantankerousness seems to be the reason why he left the Jesuits. The Irish Texts Society found him difficult to deal with, though he was a dependable editor once a contract had been agreed according to his terms (Ó Riain 2005: xi). Stories about his miserliness were legion. His biographers write:

People might say, perhaps, that Dinneen was mean or stingy – and it is difficult to give any other judgment on him. He never bought a newspaper but would borrow one from a boy selling papers on the street. Neither would he buy a ticket on public transport. He would sit beside some girl, he would tell her who he was and would say to her that it would be a great privilege for her to buy him a ticket. He was rarely refused.

(Ó Conluain and Ó Céileachair 1958: 246)

He famously entered a children's essay writing competition under the name of a boy he knew. He won the money prize, sent by cheque to the boy, who forwarded it to him, and he shared none of it! (247).

In the Scylla and Charybdis episode of James Joyce's *Ulysses*, set in the same year in which the dictionary was published, there is a scene in the National Library in which a group that includes T. W. Lyster, the head librarian, are having a discussion about *Hamlet*.

- An attendant from the doorway called:
 – Mr Lyster! Father Dinneen wants...
 – O! Father Dinneen! Directly

(Joyce 1998: 202)

One of Lyster's successors, Alf MacLochlainn, was told that one of the duties of boy attendants in the library was to follow Dinneen, picking up the slips on which he had written entries for the dictionary, which he dropped as he left the reading room (MacLochlainn 2002: 68).

Dinneen's Dictionary

The dictionary's full title was *Foclóir Gaedhilge agus Béarla: An Irish-English Dictionary, being a Thesaurus of the Words, Phrases and Idioms of the Modern Irish Language, with Explanations in English*. The reference to "thesaurus" may owe something to Roget's *Thesaurus*, published in countless editions from 1852 onwards, a copy of which was in Dinneen's possession, and the influence of which MacLochlainn detects in the lists of near-synonyms in the English given for Irish words (MacLochlainn 2002: 71). The dictionary was an immediate success. The Council of the Irish Texts Society only planned to print 2,000 copies. "Dinneen, showing far greater foresight, and no doubt mindful of the additional royalties, insisted on 5,000", and within a few months 1,500 copies had been sold and shortly afterwards the initial run was sold out (Ó Riain 2005: xiv). It succeeded in attracting over a thousand new members to the Irish Texts Society.

In his introduction, Dinneen writes of the need for a dictionary:

Nothing but the urgent necessity that existed for such a lexicon could have induced me to abandon more congenial studies and devote my energies to the development and completion of the work so laudably undertaken by the Council of the Irish Texts Society.

(Dinneen 1904: v)

Besides his use of earlier lexicographical sources, in manuscript and in print, he adds:

Not the least valuable part of the work is what I was able to remember from the days of my childhood, the rich vocabulary employed by my father and mother and the inhabitants of my native Sliabh Luachra, the snatches of song, of story, of proverb, the allusions and rhymes and exclamations which mingled with their conversation, as well as

the precise and accurate use of phrase and idiom which distinguished them.

(Dinneen 1904: v)

Among the challenges, he stresses the problem of “an unsettled language like Irish, which has not been cultivated to any extent since the use of print became general”, with resultant orthographical difficulties (Dinneen 1904: iv). He also discusses the problem of loanwords, almost all of which are from English in the modern period, and the distinction he feels necessary to make between those well-established in the language and those he considers barbarous (Dinneen 1904: x).

The list of abbreviations of sources gives a good indication of the materials he worked with, of which the following are some examples: “A. McC.”, Art Mac Cooley [Art Mac Cumhaigh, c. 1738–1773], a poet; “C. M.”, Cúirt an Mheadhón Oidhche, “The Midnight Court”, a long poem by Brian Merriman [c. 1749–1805]; “Don.”, Donegal, from the dialect of that county; “Donl.”, Donlevy’s Irish Catechism (1742), reprinted in the mid-nineteenth century; “Raft.”, Raftery, Antaine Raftery [Raiftearaí, 1799–1835], an oral poet from Western Connacht whose songs were well-known; “T. S.”, Keating’s “Three Shafts of Death” [*Trí Bior-Ghaoithe an Bháis*], a seventeenth-century religious work; “W. M.”, West Munster, from the dialect of that region; “Y. B. L.”, Yellow Book of Lecan, a manuscript written in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. Hence we find numerous words that had been in the literary language for centuries, many of them early loans, such as *feallsamh* [‘a philosopher’] or *díon-bhrollach* [‘an *apologia* for a book; an introduction or preface’], but also words associated with peasant life, such as *sleaghán* [‘a turf-spade; a kind of spade with a wing at one side, or at both sides’] or *poitín* [‘a small pot; whiskey made in private stills’]. The number of words, phrases, explanations and quotations from traditional rural life are such that, in MacLochlainn’s words, “Dinneen’s work is often more like an encyclopaedia of pre-industrial manners, customs, lore, skills and crafts” (MacLochlainn 2002: 72).

The Gaelic League originally had a non-political agenda, or, rather like its predecessors and earlier antiquarian bodies, it eschewed potentially divisive political discussions so that the unionists, nationalists, Protestants and Catholics who were members would not have to take partisan positions. But it succeeded in injecting a strong cultural dimension into existing nationalist movements, both constitutional (in favor of “Home Rule”, autonomy within the United Kingdom, from 1870 the aim of nationalists organized in the Irish Parliamentary Party in Westminster) and

revolutionary (the Irish Republican Brotherhood, a secret, oath-bound society founded in 1858 along with its counterpart, the Fenian Brotherhood, in the United States). The Gaelic League was strongly represented in the Easter Rising of 1916: five of the six signatories of the Proclamation of the Irish Republic were members. The insurgents, members of the Irish Volunteers and the Irish Citizen Army, took over Dublin city centre, the government declared martial law, rushed troops in from England and sent a gunboat up the River Liffey to bombard rebel positions. The bombardment caused fires that destroyed much of the city center and incinerated the stereo-plates of the dictionary. The rising was suppressed after a week, at the cost of nearly five hundred dead. Courts martial quickly sentenced the most prominent leaders to death, and sixteen were executed, three of whom were members of Dinneen's Keating Branch (Uí Chollatáin 2016).

Nationalists won an overall Irish majority in the elections of 1918 and set up their own clandestine parliament, Dáil Éireann, which instituted a Department of the National Language. The War of Independence, a guerrilla campaign, followed and it led to the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921 (which, in turn, led to civil war). The new state implemented a program of promoting Irish in the schools and of preserving the Irish-speaking districts, the *Gaeltacht*.

With the encouragement of the government formed after the treaty, the preparation for a new edition of Dinneen's dictionary was begun, and it appeared in 1927. Greatly enlarged, it now had over 1,344 pages instead of 783, and 45,000 headwords instead of 30,000. Especially in this enlarged edition, in providing literary contexts for particular meanings, Dinneen seems to have followed the *Oxford English Dictionary*, referred to "NED. – The New English Dictionary; ed. Murray, etc.", and cites some meanings from it.

The entries in Dinneen's dictionary normally consist of a headword with numerous English meanings, rarely separated by numbers, leading at times to bizarre entries such as: *Sagairtín* ['a little priest; a small inedible periwinkle']. The meanings of words are often clarified with illustrative phrases, proverbs or extracts from songs or poems, and occasional references to early forms. The accumulation of meanings at times is bewildering; for example:

Caithim, "I pass (as a day, my life, a place, etc.), practice, make a custom of; use (as tobacco, etc.); wear (as clothes, etc.); carry (as a stick, etc.); consume, waste, wear away; spend; eat, drink; take part in (as a festival, etc.); I shed; I throw, hurl, fling, cast; shoot (U[lster], Con[nacht].);"

The fact that he uses the first person singular of verbs as headwords, following the usage of previous Irish dictionaries, sometimes leads to absurdities:

Caithim, “... I give premature or still-born birth to; c. *gamhain*, I give birth to a still-born calf;”

Milsighim, “I dawn”, with the qualification “(as the day);”

gabhlúighim, “I fork as a road;”

clithim, “I copulate, as swine;”

Perhaps because it became a cultural institution, Dinneen’s dictionary was easily mocked. The writer Brian O’Nolan (Brian Ó Nualláin, 1911–1966), better known as Flann O’Brien, wrote a famously humorous and erudite column under the pen-name Myles na Gopaleen in *The Irish Times* from 1940 until his death in 1966. In it he poked fun at the dictionary on more than one occasion. He cites the entry *cur* and its meanings, silently adding his own for good measure:

act of putting, sending, sowing, raining, discussing, burying, vomiting, hammering into the ground, throwing through the air, rejecting, shooting, the setting or clamp of a rick of turf, selling, addressing, the crown of cast-iron buttons which have been made bright by contact with cliff-faces, the stench of congealing badger’s suet, the luminance of glue-lice, a noise made in an empty house by an unauthorised person, a heron’s boil, a leprechaun’s denture, a sheep biscuit, the act of inflating hare’s offal with a bicycle pump...

(Myles 1999: 278)

On another occasion, he found a sentence in an Irish-language newspaper’s review of a musical performance that he inferred meant “It is entirely a new thing that a symphony concert should be held in conjunction with a Gaelic choir”. But tracking each Irish word in Dinneen’s dictionary, he argues that the passage should mean “It is longitudinally a strong anxiety that a wise and generous ancient Irish ale should be in *moderato* time at once with an unsophisticated troop” (Myles 1999: 277–278).

Folklore in the Dictionary

Of most interest to us is Dinneen’s recourse to folklore and folklife to illustrate the meaning and use of words. He gives many proverbs and sayings, and snatches of verse, song and folktale, references to folk belief and to various aspects of traditional rural life. This has been the subject

of an essay by Ó hEithir (1980) and is commented on by MacLochlainn (2002). Often such references are given at great – and lexicographically-unnecessary – length. For example, in the 1904 edition under *Gírlé guairle* [‘hurly burly; confusion’], he states that the word also appears as a woman’s name in a folktale (ATU 500), using 245 words to recount the tale, dialogue and all. In the 1927 edition, this has been reduced to a hundred words or so, but with an additional comment: “her counterpart is a man called *Snaidhm ar Bundún*”. This name he leaves untranslated, most likely out of deference to the sensibility of his readers; it means “knot on posterior”. *-bundún* he gives separately as “the fundament, *esp.* [ecially] in a state of prolapse”.

Proverbs and sayings appear often. Under *Bealtaine*, the May festival or the month of May, Dinneen adds “*idir dhá theine (uisce) lae B.* [literally ‘between the two fires of May Day’], in a dilemma, from the practice of driving cattle between two fires with a view to their preservation”. *Dearbhráthair*, a brother, is followed by the proverb “*d. do’n bhás an codladh*, sleep is own brother to death”. Under *Iomaire*, a ridge, he gives “*i. treabhtha*, a ploughed ridge, as in a tilled field” and cites the saying “*trí i. treabhtha go deireadh an domhain*, when the *i. treabhtha* becomes by lapse of time indiscernable, and this process is repeated a second and third time then comes the end of the world”. Under *Neas*, a potter’s wheel or a moulding block, he gives the proverb “*trí aithgheine an domhain: brú mná, úth bó, n. gabhann*, three sources of the world’s renewal: the womb of woman, the cow’s udder and the smith’s moulding block”.

Oisín is “a fawn; a young seal or sea-calf (Cork)” and also the Irish form of James Macpherson’s Ossian. One of the best-known Ossianic or Fenian tales is of Oisín returning from Tír na nÓg (the land of youth) to find all his companions long since expired, hence the expression, “*táim im’ O. i ndiaidh na Féinne*, I am a lone bird (*i.e.* like O. who returned to find all the Fianna dead)”. Other personal names that appear in sayings include Siobhán and Tadhg. Of the former, Dinneen cites the proverb “*síodaí ar Sh. agus preabán ar a hathair*, Joan in silk and her father in rags”. The latter name is the “personal name Teig, Teague or Thady, Tady (=Thaddeus) and equated with Timothy... the typical Irishman (*esp.* the plebeian type, while *Diarmaid* seems applicable to the upper class)”, an observation drawn from literature rather than folklore. Two sayings are given under *Tadhg*: “*T. ’san mhainistir agus gnó ’san bhaile (dhe)*, T. in the abbey (churchyard) while needed at home” and “*slighe Thaidhg Chaim (or Chaoich) chum an Oileáin*, bandy (or blind) T.’s route to Castleisland (a roundabout way...)”.

There are many references to customs and beliefs. *Aingeal* is an angel; “a burnt-out cinder taken from the fire, sometimes given in their hands as a protection to children going out at night, is called *aingeal*, as it is supposed to represent an angel...”. *Caipín* is a cap or hood; *c. sonais*, of happiness or good luck, is a child’s caul “prized by sailors as a protection from shipwreck”. A derivative of *Cingcís*, Pentecost, *Cingciseach* is “one born within the Pentecost triduum; such a one is fated to slay or be slain or both; the Pentecost days are dangerous for such”. *Cinneamhain* means fate or fortune, but also ill-luck or misfortune. “If one buries the carcass of a cow, horse, *etc.*, that died on his neighbour’s land, the *cinneamhain*, or ill-luck, goes to the neighbour”. *Drúichtín*, a diminutive of *drúcht*, dew, is a species of snail or slug. “On May morning girls discovered the colour of the hair of their future husbands from the shade of colouring of the first *drúichtín* they found”. Dinneen provides references to the custom in lines from two poets, Pádraigín Haicéad (c. 1604–1654) and Dáibhí Ó Bruadair (1625–1698).

Fuigheall is a residue, flaw or bad result; “*f. baistidhe*, effects of imperfect baptism, as a deformity in the child or other calamity”. *Mí* means a month, *Mí na Bó Riabhaiche* March:

the month of the dark-coloured cow, as, according to the legend, a *bó riabhach*, a dark-coloured cow, complained on the first of April of the harshness of March, March borrowed a few days from April, these days were so wet and stormy that great floods came and the *bó riabhach* was drowned, hence March has a day more than April, and the concluding days of March are called *laetheanta na riabhaiche*, the days of the dark-coloured cow.

This extended explanation is from the 1904 edition. In that of 1927, under *riabhach*, brindled, striped, a shorter version of the legend is given. *Trócaire* means mercy, pity, compassion; *trí coiscéimeanna na t.* are “the three steps taken with a funeral met adventitiously”.

There are also references to various mythological personages and locations. *Glas* means grey or green and, as a substantive, an object or animal so coloured; *an Gh. Ghaibhleann* is:

the name of a celebrated cow in mythology and folklore, stolen by *Balar* from *Ceann-fhaolaidh* and giving an inexhaustible supply of milk (*hence Port na Glaise*, the harbor of the Grey Cow), luxuriant, milk-producing grass, from the legend that if the *Gh. Gh.* slept in a field it gave some of its virtue to the grass... *chodail an Ghlas Ghaibhneach ann*, the G. G. slept there (said of rich pasture).

Síodh is:

a tumulus or knoll, a fairy hill, an abode of fairies, arising from cairn or tumulus burial, “subterranea habitacula et aliquando ipsi colles” (*Onom[asticon Goedelicum*, ed. Hogan, 1910).) ... *an sluagh sídhe*, the fairy host, the shee, described in *folk[lore]*. as riding on the blast and occasionally carrying off mortals leaving a changeling behind called *iairlis* or *corpán sídhe* (a fairy corpse); *bean sídhe*, a woman of faery, depicted as keening as she combed her hair (usually red) and foreboding death or calamity; ... *ceol sídhe*, a fairy music luring the unwary to their doom, *al[so]*. any entrancing music.

Síodhbhradh means:

a fairy-child or changeling, *fig[uratively]*. an ailing, old-fashioned, impish or mischievous child; ... *meathacht an tsíodhbhraidh*, decline or ill-health (imagined as induced by fairy influence).

Objects and items of material culture include *buarach* [‘a spancel’]; *b. bháis* [‘death spancel’] is:

[an] unbroken hoop of skin cut with incantation from a corpse across the entire body from shoulder to footsole and wrapped in silk of the colours of the rainbow and used as a spancel to tie the legs of a person to produce certain effects of witchcraft (*Con[nacht]*. folk tales).

Fóidín is the diminutive of *fód* [‘a sod’]:

foth, foth, gheibhim bolath na hÉireann ar an bhf. bhfírinneach ([fee-fi-fo-fum I get the smell of Ireland on the truthful little sod] a phrase occurring in folk-tales meaning I detect an Irish person present); *f. mearaidhe*, a little sod on which if one tread he is led away and has to keep walking aimlessly till moonrise unless he turn his coat inside out, a cause of confusion or error like will o’ the wisp (*Con[nacht]*).

Maothachán is:

an emollient liquid for steeping; *esp.* suds and urine stored for the purpose of steeping or washing new flannel, tucking frieze, *etc.* (the consumption of cabbage affected its emollient qualities).

Roideog means myrtle:

an infusion of the tops of its branches is used for tanning and as a yellow dye; it is used locally for palm on Palm Sunday; *al[so]*. supposed to have been used to scourge Our Lord, and hence it is considered unlucky to strike cattle with (*folk*).

Saileach is the the willow or sally; “on St. Patrick’s Day, a sally root is charred and crosses are marked on the shoulder (*E. [Co.] Ker[ry]*).

custom)”. *Tuathal* is an anti-clockwise or wrong direction, and Dinneen draws on both medieval literature and contemporary folklore to give examples of its use:

driving a chariot withershins (ansols) round a fort was taken as a sign of hostility, cursing stones (*clocha breaca* [lit. speckled stones]) at Inishmurray, Sligo, are turned to the left to effect a curse, the prayer stations being visited in the direction of the sun (*deiseal*)....

Scrios is the act of scraping or removing a surface:

prátaí do chur fá s., to sow potatoes covering them in the beds with a light coating of soil (the first step in sowing potatoes the third consecutive year, the old furrow is made the middle of the new bed, and the surface of the middle part of the old bed constitutes the *scrios* for the new bed; this method of tillage is called *aith-riastáil*, while the tillage of the previous year is called *ath-romhar*, “re-digging”).

Sop is a wisp or a handful of hay or straw:

s. i mbéal doruis, a pad of straw at the door (on which tailors and other craftsmen used sit to avoid window-tax); *s. Sheáin*, a May Day fire ([lit. John’s wisp] a pagan survival in connection with the protection of cattle; *folk*[lore]., *Tip*[perary].) ... *Sor Sop*, Sir Wisp, a personage in the Wren-play [of St Stephen’s Day] in straw suit, masked and armed with a wooden sword or bladder fastened to a rod, he represents the Englishman and is defeated by an Irish knight similarly armed called *Seán Scot*....

Conclusion

Dinneen’s dictionary used the historical spelling, which has since been significantly simplified (e.g. the words *dearbhráthair*, *fuigheall* and *síodh* discussed above are now written *deartháir*, *fuíoll* and *sí* respectively) and the Gaelic script, which is now largely obsolete. Notwithstanding the consequent difficulties for modern readers, the dictionary remarkably continues to be in print and consistently outsells the other publications of the Irish Texts Society. The authoritative dictionaries of Irish today are de Bhaldraithe’s *English-Irish Dictionary* (1959) and Ó Dónaill’s Irish-English dictionary, *Foclóir Gaeilge-Béarla* (1977), while the project of a historical dictionary of Irish, proposed in the 1970s, is still a long way from fruition (Ní Bheirn 2005; see <www.ria.ie/about-focloir-na-nua-ghaeilge>). De Bhaldraithe’s and Ó Dónaill’s dictionaries are necessary reference works,

prescriptive insofar as spelling, grammar and choice of variant forms are concerned. But for a language that has no standard spoken form and in which the main dialects – Ulster, Connacht and Munster – differ significantly in pronunciation, vocabulary and inflection, the lack of acknowledgement of dialect can be an obstacle to advanced learners. The majority of those who read and write in the language since the time of the foundation of the Gaelic League have been second-language learners, who tended to choose one Irish-speaking district (*Gaeltacht*) above others, to visit it frequently and to establish relationships with its inhabitants, who, in the past at least, mostly depended on subsistence agriculture or fishing.

De Bhaldraithe gives three different words for “spade”, *láí*, *spáid* and *rámhainn*, without indicating that they are peculiar to Connacht, Ulster and Munster, respectively. Ó Dónaill, without referring to dialect, explains them respectively as “Loy [the common Hiberno-English term], spade”, “spade”, and “spade”. To further confuse the learner of the language, each of these words refers to a very different tool from a typological and technical point of view (Ó Danachair 1963). Dinneen makes some dialect and technical distinction, at least, and does acknowledge that *spád* (a variant of *spáid*) is used in Leath Cuinn (an old term for the northern half of Ireland). He explains *láighe* (the earlier spelling for *láí*) as “a mattock, a spade, a ‘loy’; the blade of a spade (*Don*[egal].)”. Under the headword *Rámhainn*, Ó Dónaill’s entry is:

1. Spade. ~ aitinn, spade for chopping furze. 2. Spade-length. I ngiorracht ~e dó, within a spade-length of him. 3. ~ (talún), a piece of land measuring a spade in length and breadth.

Under *Rámhan* (a variant form), Dinneen gives the following:

A spade, a spade-length (5 ½ feet or two paces) – a common unit of measurement in tillage, *r. talmhan*, *id.*; *r. chré*, a light spade, for clayey soils; *r. bhogaigh*, a heavy spade for boggy soils; *feac na rámhainne*, the spade-handle; *i ngiorracht trí rámhainní dó*, three spade-lengths from him; *ó rígh go rámhainn*, from prince to peasant; (*al*[so]. see *Hist. of Irish State*, Green, p. 70); *al. ramhan*, *g[enitive]*. –*aimhne*, *rán*, *g. ráine*, *pl[ural]*. –*a*; *pron[ounced]*. *rán* or *rún*.

The addition of the poetic phrase *ó rígh go rámhainn* [‘from king to spade’] is a good example of the richness that the reader finds in Dinneen, and helps to explain his dictionary’s continued popularity.

While the language revival movement and independence led to the practical recognition of the language in education and its symbolic recognition in political and administrative life as the country’s first official

language (according to the 1937 constitution), it remained for all intents and purposes a minority language, spoken mostly in impoverished districts beset by heavy emigration. A small Irish-speaking intelligentsia developed, usually employed by state institutions, in Dublin especially. Some of them were native speakers of the language from a rural background, though more were learners, educating their children in Irish-medium schools and benefiting from the state infrastructure of support for the language in education, the information media and book publishing, which grew after independence. In every generation, this support system has nurtured new Irish speakers. Those who read and write Irish today come mostly from this largely urban group and are in their majority second-language speakers. Employment for Irish speakers is mostly in the state-supported sectors of education, administration and media, with the recognition of Irish as a working language of the European Union in 2007 providing further opportunities.

It became a rite of passage for generations of Irish schoolchildren and university students to take courses in “Irish Colleges” in the Gaeltacht, where they were usually exposed to practitioners of the traditional arts, storytellers, singers and musicians. The small coastal and island communities of Donegal, Galway, Mayo, Kerry, Cork and Waterford that traditionally depended on small farming and fishing formed the heartland of the Gaeltacht. Their speech was comprehensively described by dialectologists and their rich oral tradition was extensively documented by the Irish Folklore Commission (1935–1970; see Briody 2007). Amhlaoibh Ó Loingsigh (1872–1947) from West Cork was typical of the gifted exponent of traditional culture that students and scholars came into contact with. He was one of the best-known Irish storytellers of his time and was also the main informant for the standard study of his West Cork dialect (Ó Cuív 1944). Donncha Ó Cróinín, editor of the two volumes of rich material recorded from him by Seán Ó Cróinín, describes him in the following terms:

It is unlikely that there is a longer lasting or more fundamental connection than that between a person – or any animal – and his native sod. Amhlaoibh had exact knowledge about every fragment of his native district and he liked it as much as if it were part of the Fertile Plain of Munster. He knows what kind of soil is in certain river valleys on the eastern edge of the parish, because he cut hay there and he played football there. He is exact in judging the quality of land and in explaining fifty different terms for types of land. He is highly knowledgeable in matters concerning peat and wood. He knows about rivers and fishing. One might imagine that there was nothing beneath his responsibility, not even household utensils (1980: 10).

Another well-known exponent of the rich folk culture of the Gaeltacht was the storyteller Peig Sayers, whose autobiography, *Peig* (1936), dictated to her son, was a prescribed text for generations of Irish school-children.

As the way of life that sustained that linguistic wealth declined, the vocabulary of native speakers of the language contracted; after all, how many need fifty terms for types of land in the era of the Common Agricultural Policy? Almost all native speakers today are fully bilingual, and the vocabulary of modern life used in everyday speech is more likely to be taken from English than from the official lists of neologisms. The Irish language is obligatory in the school curriculum, which makes no distinction between native Irish speakers from the Gaeltacht and English-speaking learners, with the result that it does not significantly enrich the language of the former with the literary resources of the language. The paragon of eloquence and linguistic richness in Irish has more often been the storyteller than the writer, while the greater part of the most highly accomplished writers themselves have drawn on a rich oral culture. Much of the attraction of Dinneen's dictionary then is in invoking and recording the linguistic wealth of the spoken language that up to relatively recently was met by learners. At the same time, Dinneen's is definitely not a dialect dictionary. What it accomplishes in a perhaps unexpectedly rich way is the drawing together of the diachronic and the synchronic dimensions of the language, the neglected old literary legacy and the vividness of colloquial and dialect speech.

References

- Eugenio F. Biagini and Mary E. Daly, eds. 2017. *The Cambridge Social History of Modern Ireland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Breathnach, Diarmaid. 2005. *Dinneen in the Gaelic League: Trouble and Strife*. In Riggs 2005a: 1–13.
- Briody, Mícheál. 2007. *The Irish Folklore Commission 1935–1970: History, Ideology, Methodology*. Studia Fennica Folkloristica 17. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Corkery, Daniel. 1967 [1924]. *The Hidden Ireland: A Study of Gaelic Munster in the Eighteenth Century*. Dublin: Gill.
- Dinneen, Rev. Patrick S., M. A. 1904. *Foclóir Gaedhilge agus Béarla – An Irish-English Dictionary*. Dublin: Irish Texts Society and London: David Nutt. <<https://archive.org/details/irishenglishdict011837mbp/page/n6/mode/2up>>, accessed August 14, 2020.

- Dinneen, Rev. Patrick S., M. A. 1927. *Foclóir Gaedhilge agus Béarla – An Irish-English Dictionary: New Edition, Revised and Greatly Enlarged*. Dublin: Irish Texts Society. <<http://glg.csisdmsz.ul.ie>>, accessed August 14, 2020.
- Hyde, Douglas, Daniel Mescal and Eleanor Hull. 1904. Council's Preface. In Dinneen 1904: iii–iv.
- Irish Texts Society. 2020. Home Page. <<http://irishtextssociety.org>>, accessed August 14, 2020.
- Joyce, James. 1998 [1922]. *Ulysses*. Ed. Jeri Johnson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leerssen, Joep. 1996a. *Mere Irish and Fíor-Ghael: Studies in the Idea of Irish Nationality, its Development and Literary Expression prior to the Nineteenth Century*. 2nd ed. Cork: Cork University Press.
- Leerssen, Joep. 1996b. *Remembrance and Imagination: Patterns in the Historical and Literary Representation of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century*. Cork: Cork University Press.
- Leerssen, Joep. 2002. *Hidden Ireland, Public Sphere*. Galway and Dublin: Arlen House.
- Mac Amhlaigh. 2008 *Foclóirí agus Foclóirithe na Gaeilge* [Irish-Language Dictionaries and Lexicographers]. Dublin: Cois Life.
- MacLochlainn, Alf. 2002. Father Dinneen and His Dictionary. *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* 91(361): 68–77.
- Morley, Vincent. 2011. *Ó Chéitinn go Raiftearaí: Mar a cumadh stair na hÉireann* [From Keating to Raftery: How the History of Ireland was Composed]. Dublin: Coiscéim.
- Myles na Gopaleen (Brian Ó Nualláin). 1999. *The Best of Myles*. Normal, IL: Dalkey Archive Press.
- Ní Bheirn, Úna. 2005. Dinneen's Legacy: The Present State of Irish Lexicography. In Riggs 2005a: 102–113.
- Ó Conluain, Proinsias, and Donncha Ó Céileachair. 1958. *An Duinníneach* [Dinneen]. Dublin: Sáirséal agus Dill.
- Ó Cróinín, Donncha and Seán Ó Cróinín (ed. and collector). 1980. *Seanachas Amhlaoibh Í Luínse* [The Lore of Amhlaoibh Ó Loingsigh]. Dublin: Comhairle Bhéaloideas Éireann.
- Ó Cuív, Brian. 1944. *The Irish of West Muskerry, Co. Cork: A Phonetic Study*. Dublin: The Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Ó Danachair, Caoimhín. 1963. The Spade in Ireland. *Béaloideas* 31: 98–114.
- O'Halloran, Clare. 2004. *Golden Ages and Barbarous Nations: Antiquarian Debate and Cultural Politics in Ireland, c.1750–1800*. Cork: Cork University Press.
- Ó hEithir, Ruairí. 1980. Geanncanach, Glagarnach agus Gírlé Guairle [despite the title, the essay is in English]. *Sinsear: The Folklore Journal* 2: 109–114.
- O'Neill, George. 1919. *Essays on Poetry*. Dublin: The Talbot Press and London: T. Fisher Unwin.

- Ó Riain, Pádraig. 2005. Introduction: An Duinníneach agus an Cumann/Dinneen and the Society. In Riggs 2005a: x–xv.
- Ó Tuathaigh, Gearóid. 2017. Languages and Identities. In Biagini and Daly 2017: 53–67.
- Riggs, Pádraigín (ed.). 2005a. *Dinneen and the Dictionary 1904–2004*. London: Irish Texts Society Subsidiary Series 16.
- Riggs, Pádraigín. 2005b. Foreword. In Riggs 2005b: vi–ix.
- Ua Súilleabháin, Seán. 2005. Dinneen’s Dictionaries of 1904 and 1927: Background, Use of Historical Dictionaries and of Contemporary Informants. In Riggs 2005a: 62–77.
- Uí Chollatáin. 2016. Ó Chéitinn go Conradh: The Revivalists and the 1916 Rising. *Studies in Arts and Humanities* 2,1: 52–66.

The Dictionary of Jutlandic Folk Speech by Henning F. Feilberg

Timothy R. Tangherlini

In January 1914, Henning F. Feilberg (1831–1921), a Danish school-teacher and autodidact dialect researcher finished the final proofreading for his dictionary of Danish peasant speech, a project he had begun nearly four decades earlier. Recalling this event, he wrote in the afterword to the four-volume dictionary, “Ja, så blev enden da så omsider nået! Den første ordseddel blev skrevet 6/1 1877, sidste korrektur på 3die bind læst 7/3 1912 og Tillæggets sidste korrektur læst 14/1 1914” [‘And so the end has finally been reached! The first word card was written January 6th, 1877, the last proofreading on the third volume was completed March 7th, 1912, and the last proofreading of the appendix was completed January 14th, 1914’] (1886–1914, vol 4: i). Feilberg’s dictionary, with its broad coverage of the various dialects of the Danish Jutland peninsula, and his emphasis on a consistent orthography, stands as a model of the intersection between folklore collecting, the documentation of dialects, and the development of modern resources for the study of both. While current work on Jutlandic dialects is focused on developing more substantive online resources for the documentation of historical and living dialects as well as language usage throughout Denmark, Feilberg’s dictionary continues to be an important resource for the study of Danish folk narrative, particularly narratives collected during the long nineteenth century, a period of intense folklore collecting throughout Scandinavia (Tangherlini 2013).

Feilberg’s dictionary brought several important approaches to bear on the writing of dictionaries. First, he relied greatly on a broad network of local collectors, such as the folklorist Evald Tang Kristensen, for authentic language material, making use of hand-written recordings of spoken language rather than printed works as a primary source. Second, he spent considerable time on aligning various word forms from different dialects into a single dictionary entry. Feilberg was also sensitive to the need for a consistent orthography and phonetic representation of the broader range of sounds found in these dialects than in standard Danish.

A Brief History of Danish Dictionaries

Feilberg's work developed out of a burgeoning interest among publishers and academics during the nineteenth century in describing the Danish language. This interest was motivated in part by both real and perceived dangers to Danish sovereignty. The kingdom's disastrous alliance with Napoleon at the end of the eighteenth century led to the state bankruptcy of 1813. The later calamity of the second Schleswig war in 1864 led to the loss of the southern regions of the country, many of them Danish speaking. The rising democratic tides attendant on the promulgation of the Democratic constitution of 1849 represented an opportunity to consolidate the imaginings of the nation with language as a keystone, while broad scale literacy, increasing industrialization and urbanization, and the emergence of the folk high school movement all increased pressure on language standardization to the possible detriment of local dialects. Elsewhere in Scandinavia, particularly in Norway, there was a similar attention to the documentation of the language.

Danish dictionary writing can be traced back to Christiern Pedersen's sixteenth-century Latin-Danish glossary, *Wocabularium ad usum dacorum* (1510). With this work, Pedersen provided not so much a dictionary as a glossary of Latin words accompanied by their most likely Danish translation. Along with morphological detail about the word class and important inflectional forms of an alphabetized list of Latin lemmata, Pedersen also provided Danish glosses. From his foreword, it is quite clear that the work was intended to help Danish learners of Latin, and thus had as its audience a relatively small and elite group of readers.¹ The brevity of the work renders it of little use to dialect researchers, but does provide intriguing insight into Danish language use of the time, and marks the beginnings of scholarly attempts to describe the Danish language.

More important in the context of the development of modern Danish dictionaries is Peder Syv's *Prøve paa en dansk og latinsk ordbog* ['Test for a Danish and Latin Dictionary'] (1692). Since it was intended purely as preparatory work for a much larger project, the *Prøve* is deliberately incomplete. Nevertheless, it gestured toward a more Danish-oriented dictionary as opposed to the Latinate focus of glossaries such as that of Pedersen. Syv's work also differed from earlier attempts at creating

1 Pedersen was already deeply involved in the documentation of Danish history and culture, as reflected by his translation into Danish of Saxo's history of the Danish kingdom, *Gesta Danorum*.

a Danish dictionary in its considerations of word use and orthography. Daniel Dodge, in his late nineteenth-century evaluation of Danish and Swedish dictionaries, noted that Syv had begun the process with the *Prove* of moving toward a modern understanding of the role of dictionaries in providing both a sound etymological and philological grounding for word descriptions as well as providing a consistent orthography that would make the language broadly accessible:

In [*Prove*], Syv displays an acumen and common sense, especially in his treatment of etymology and orthography, that stamp him as the real founder of Danish language-study. After commenting upon the difficulty in tracing the derivation of many words, he passes to the consideration of foreign words in the Danish language, comparing their changes to the adaptation of plants to the soil in which they are placed. He also notes dialectic divergences.

(Dodge 1890: 282)

This latter consideration of regional variation and dialect is of particular importance in the context of Feilberg's much later dialect dictionary.

Syv's affiliation with the early dictionary project began the long-standing relationship between the study and documentation of Danish folklore and the development of language resources such as dictionaries. Syv is far better known for his work on Danish folk ballads, which extended the work of Anders Sørensen Vedel (considered to be the first folklore collector in Denmark), than he is for his investigations of the preconditions for a Danish dictionary (Tangherlini 2013 44). Yet already at the start of his career, Syv was interested in the history of the Danish language, as evidenced by his, *Nogle betænkninger om det Cimbriske sprog* ['Some Thoughts on the Cimbric Language'], a work that made use of his broad knowledge of Nordic legend and heroic ballads (Syv 1663).

Two decades later, Syv began in earnest to explore the structure of the Danish language with *Den danske Sprogkunst eller Grammatica* ['The Art of the Danish Language or Grammar'], the first grammar for Danish (1685). This work was one of Syv's first works in his role as the Royal philologist (*Philologicus regius lingvæ Danicæ*), a position that his benefactor, the Royal chancellor Matthias Moth, had secured for him. At the time of Syv's appointment, Denmark had only recently emerged from a bloody battle with Sweden, and the new absolute monarch, Frederik III, was eager to support various projects that would lead to a clear conception of the reach of the kingdom, including a modern and sophisticated documentation of the language. Moth's ultimate goal with the appointment of

Syv was to have him develop a comprehensive Danish dictionary, since he believed that Syv's initial work with folklore, including his compendium of Danish proverbs, would prove instrumental to this work. Appointing Syv to this position, and charging him with the development of the Danish dictionary, inadvertently solidified the connection between folklore, everyday language usage, and the documentation of Danish in dictionaries.

Syv was never able to make much headway on his dictionary despite the substantial groundwork that he had laid for future scholars with his *Prøve*. After the death of Christian V in 1699, Moth was relieved of his administrative post and, with no governmental duties to distract him, he turned his efforts to the dictionary project which Syv had, for all intents and purposes, abandoned. Unlike Syv, Moth made a great deal of progress on the work, leveraging his unfettered access to numerous collections, including works with a folkloric slant, such as Peder Lolle's proverbs; and *Rimkrøniken*, a fifteenth-century Danish language chronicle of Danish history. Moth also activated the large network of priests that lived in widely scattered parishes across both Denmark and Norway (which at the time was under Danish rule). In an early version of the time-honoured tradition of ethnographic questionnaires, the Danish priests were encouraged to send collections of local word usage to their bishops, which Moth subsequently gathered from them. In all, Moth was able to compile sixty-two folio manuscripts, with approximately eighty thousand entries covering nearly one hundred and ten thousand words (many of the articles included compound words). While each of the definitions of the Danish words ultimately pointed to a Latin gloss, the dictionary articles, including the descriptions of words and their definitions, were entirely in Danish.

Moth's work is surprisingly comprehensive and can be used in many different ways. In an effort to align his work with earlier work, for example, he included a Latin-Danish glossary, as an inverse index to the far more substantial Danish dictionary with appended Latin glosses. Moth's entries were consistent in structure, illustrated by the entry for the word *døbe* ['baptize']. This entry starts with the lemma, includes a word class annotation, here the article *at* indicating that the word is a verb, which is followed by information on present and past tense inflections. These are followed by a definition in Danish, and then a Latin gloss, along with a source for that gloss. The word has multiple definitions, with these additional definitions marked by a numeral:

Døbe *at* p[ræsens]. ieg, vi døber. i[mperfekt]. døbte. p[erfekt]. har døbt. p[assiv]. bes tes, er døbt. Er at øse vand på ens hoved, i gud faders søns og helligånds navn. *Baptizare. Cyprian.*

¶. 2. lignelse víð, at overslæe en med vand. *Aqua perfundere*. Cic[ero].
at døde vin. *Vinum aquâ miscere*. Cic[ero].

Moth's dictionary was inclusive, covering not only foreign loanwords but also many dialect words and words from everyday speech. The elaborate cross-referencing apparatus, intended to allow users to find articles related to alternate forms of various words, provides modern readers with an intriguing glimpse into everyday speech practices at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries. Unfortunately, Moth's dictionary was never printed and was not widely available; it is only recently that it has become available as an exemplary digital edition presented by the Danish Language and Literary Society (<http://mothsordbog.dk/>).

At approximately the same time that Moth was engaged in his dictionary project, the Oxford-trained Royal archivist, Frederik Rostgaard, had begun planning for a separate comprehensive dictionary of the Danish language. His approach was largely antiquarian and classicist in orientation, the main goal being a glossary of Latin and French words with their corresponding Danish glosses. Rostgaard realized quickly that the task was larger than one person could handle, and enlisted the help of Jacob Langebæk. Together, the two developed an overarching plan for the dictionary that rested largely on academic principles, representing a sharp departure from the broadly descriptive and lexicographical work of Moth and Syv. In the view of Rostgaard and Langebæk, "alle grove, plumpe og liderlige Oord og Talemaader, som stride imod ærbarheden" ["all of the crude, rude and raunchy words and expressions, which are inconsistent with virtuousness"], were to be eliminated from the dictionary (Jacobsen and Juul-Jensen 1918). The work proceeded up through the 1740s, but stalled in 1748, with the dictionary only reaching the letter N (Langebæk and Rostgaard: n.d.).

The need for a Danish dictionary became increasingly acute as print culture developed in Denmark. In 1755, *Det Kongelige Videnskabernes Selskab* ['The Royal Society of Sciences'] considered the growing need for a resource that could standardize orthography and word use. Langebæk appealed to the Society for support to develop an authoritative Danish dictionary, and his request was granted. In its new form, the dictionary was supposed to align Moth's work with the work that Rostgaard and Langebæk had already completed. Unfortunately, since the project was assigned back to Langebæk himself, who had already indicated that he was not up to the task, it was never completed. Once Langebæk died, Henrik Hjelmsstjerne, the director of the Royal Society, revisited the problem, and

by 1777, work was restarted on the dictionary. In its new incarnation, the dictionary was supposed to be an exclusively Danish work, dropping the glosses in the Latin and French that Langebæk and Rostgaard had considered essential.

The administration of the dictionary was assigned to Ole Strøm, a Norwegian living in Roskilde, who was now tasked with integrating his own historical linguistic work, Moth's handwritten dictionary, and Rostgaard and Langebæk's work into a coherent whole. It took nearly four years for the first letter to appear, and Strøm died shortly after the letter "B" was completed in 1782. The first complete volume of the dictionary, A–E, did not appear until 1793. Additional volumes appeared with significant delay: F–H (1802); I–L (1820), delayed in part by the sharply rising cost of paper; M–O (1826); and P–R (1829). It was not until 1848 that S appeared, followed by T–U in 1863, and the final volume, V–Z, in 1905. The rapid development of the Danish language and conflicting ideas as to the underlying philosophy of the dictionary meant that, even with the publication of the dictionary's last volume, the work was not only incomplete but also hopelessly out of date, marred by the intellectual schisms that characterized the various work-groups that had been assigned to the project over the years.

Christian Molbech, a librarian, historian, aspiring writer, and part-time spy for Frederik VI, was one of the early staff members of this dictionary effort, eventually becoming part of the editorial board. As part of the effort to expand the scope of the dictionary, the Royal Society had sent a circular to priests throughout the country, asking them to collect words from the general population, an echo of Moth's earlier use of a similar collecting network.² The results of the Royal Society's circular inspired Molbech, who had a fledgling interest in regional variation in Danish language, to begin work on his own small dialect dictionary. In 1811, he produced a short article, *Om Dialekter eller Mundarter og Samling af danske Landskabsord* ['On Dialects and the Collection of Danish Rural Words'], an initial attempt to describe the various challenges confronting the creation of such a dictionary (Molbech 1811). Never one to say no, when he was approached two years later by Jacob Deichmann, the head of the Gyldendal publishing house, and asked to compile a

2 The use of networks of priests and later teachers became a common feature of dialectology, folklore collecting, and language projects throughout Scandinavia. Feilberg's more informal appeal to schoolteachers and priests in his efforts to collect resources for his dialect dictionary, for example, was a key aspect of his project.

single volume dictionary of Danish, Molbech embraced that project as well.

Molbech was torn over his numerous dictionary projects. He felt that a single volume could hardly do justice to his developing ideas of what a comprehensive Danish dictionary should include. At the same time, he felt that a formal Danish dictionary and a dialect dictionary were two distinct projects. His close connection to the Royal Library, and his own literary aspirations, made it imperative that the formal dictionary articles include citations to literary works. He was also committed to the idea of orthographic standardization, bothered as he was by the wide variation that characterized the increasingly broad range of print materials that were flooding the market. The public school legislation of 1814 coupled with the burgeoning folk high-school movement meant that there were many more readers in Denmark than just a few decades earlier, and publishing houses were rushing to fill this growing demand.

Despite Molbech's relatively modern notions of dictionary writing, he was still mired in the academic conception of formal dictionaries. In the introduction to the *Ordbog over det danske sprog* (Danske sprog- og literaturselskab 1919–1956), Jacobsen and Juul-Jensen note that:

I Molbechs ordbog er akademiprincippet eneraadende; er ord indkommet, som gør brud herpaa, er det ikke med forfatterens gode vilje; thi formaalet med ordbogen var, efter hans egne ord: 'at være en Tolk for det rene, det dannede Skriftsprogs rigtige Brug i vor nærværende Alder'; med disse ord er ogsaa ordbogens begrænsning fastslaaet: den giver ikke, og skulde ikke give, en skildring af sproget, som det var paa forfatterens tid, men af hvorledes det burde være.

(Jacobsen and Juul-Jensen 1919: xx)

In Molbech's dictionary, the academic principle is absolute; if a word appears that breaks this principle, it is not due to the author's good will. The goal of the dictionary was, according to his own words: "to be an interpreter for the pure, the learned written language's proper use in our current age"; with these words, the boundaries of the dictionary are also established: it does not give, and was not intended to give, a representation of language as it was during the author's time, but as to how it ought to have been.

Molbech saw a clear division between the academic orientation he felt was preferable for a Danish dictionary, and the more descriptive work that could include the broad diversity of living Danish for a dialect

dictionary. His small formal dictionary was, nevertheless, far more successful than the on-again/off-again comprehensive dictionary of the Royal Society, and became on its publication in 1833 such an important reference work that a second edition was edited and released just two decades later, nearly half a century before the completion of the Royal Society's dictionary (Molbech 1833; repr. 1859).³

Molbech's side-project on Danish dialects, which he published as *Dansk dialektlexikon* over the course of several years (1833–1841), was not comprehensive, but it did include numerous features that became essential for a proper dialect dictionary. These features included regional variants of particular words, and whenever possible, references to similar words in other Nordic languages or other Danish language resources.⁴ Molbech, in his foreword, explained his superorganic view of languages and their development, likening language to a living organism, paying particular attention to the differences between written and oral languages. Turning to local variation in spoken language, he posited:

Det er saaledes Sprogculturen, der efterhaanden uddanner og fæster en Nations Skriftsprog og det hermed nær beslægtede, forældede Talesprog, hvis Former og hvis Udtale faae en almindelig Gyldighed og Forstaaelighed for Folket; uanseet at dettes Tale mangen Gang i Forskiellige Landskaber og Landsegne er og vedbliver at være meget afvigende, saavel fra Skriftsproget, som indbyrdes, naar de forskiellige Provindsers Mundarter sammenlignes. Det er disse, der baade lexikographisk (ved særegne Ord), og grammaticalsk, (ved afvigende Ordbøininger og syntactiske Forhold) udgiøre et Lands Dialectsprog, har en fra Skriftsproget meget forskiellig Udvikling, og en ulige mere statarisk, eller uforanderlig Charakteer, end dette.

(Molbech 1833–1841: viii)

It is the language culture that gradually creates and solidifies a nation's written language and, with the closely related, antiquated

3 The impact of Molbech's dictionary was enormous, although it was eventually supplanted by the ODS, a comprehensive undertaking initiated by Verner Dahlerup in the early 1900s. Once completed, ODS was recast as a historical dictionary, and considered to be a comprehensive resource covering the Danish language from 1700 through the end of the twentieth century. The contemporaneous language is documented in *Den Danske Ordbog*, a more modern approach that recognizes and documents daily language use and the dynamics of a living language.

4 Thiele's press printed the lexicon, a publishing house partially owned by Just Matthias Thiele. Thiele, who had been Molbech's former assistant at the Royal library, distinguished himself as the first modern folklorist in Denmark, undertaking significant fieldwork and printing multiple versions of the variants he collected.

spoken language, the forms and pronunciation of which receive a general acceptance and create understanding for the people; regardless that the language spoken in many areas and regions is and remains divergent, not only from each other but also from the written language, which is evident when the dialects from various provinces are compared. It is these, that both lexically (with peculiar words) and grammatically (with divergent inflections and syntactic constructions) constitute a country's dialects, which have a significantly different development from that of the written language, and an uneven, more static or unchanging character than the former.

Molbech feared that under the modernizing pressures of literacy that these aspects of national character might disappear:

Disse Forandringer i vor Tidsalder, med vort Aarhundredes tiltagende Afslibning, og med en ogsaa blandt Bondestanden mere udbredt Læsning, efterhaanden ville skride hurtigere frem. Derfor ogsaa vil man saa hyppigen møde den Erfaring eller Underretning, at Folkesprogets særegne Ordforraad aftager; eller at mange Ord og Betegnelser, som endnu for en Menneskealder siden kiendtes og brugtes blandt denne eller hiin Egns Almues, sieldnere og sieldnere høres, tilsidst kun benyttes af ældre Bønder; og omsider reent glemmes og bortdøe.

(Molbech 1833–41: viii–ix)

The changes in our time, with our century's ongoing grinding down of language, and the widespread reading among the peasants will gradually accelerate. Therefore one will encounter more and more often that the peculiar vocabulary of folk speech will decrease; or that many words and referents which were used but a generation ago by an area's peasantry are heard less and less frequently, finally only used by older farmers; and later are completely forgotten and die off.

Molbech's concerns about the threats to the persistence of dialects at least partially contradicted his own view of the dynamic nature of languages, a tension that also informed the folklore collecting of the nineteenth century. On the one hand, Molbech proposed that languages were dynamic and always changing, with dictionaries offering an opportunity to document those changes. On the other hand, his position situated the dictionary as a preservationist project, saving the vanishing remnants of a soon-to-be-lost way of life. As with many early nineteenth-century folklore collections, Molbech placed emphasis on the latter part of the equation, ultimately proposing a historical motivation for documenting the dialects as survivals of a hypothetical long-forgotten language:

Naar vi nu lægge Mærke hertil, og til den stærke Vedholdenhed, hvormed Almuen, mangengang i smaa, undertiden kun ved svage Naturgrændser adskilte Districter eller herreder, bevarer saadanne Sprog-Egenheder, som tilhøre Udtalen og Ordbejningen: maa det ogsaa blive os end mere klart, at vi netop i disse Egenheder besidde meget gamle historiske Sprog-Elementer.... Disse Elementer... kunde medeele og kunskab om, hvorledes man for fire, fem hundrede Aar siden, eller endnu tidligere, talte i Jylland eller Fyen. Man henviser vel, og med Rette, til et gammelt fælles Stammesprog for Norden... og maa ved sproghistorisk Induction sættes tilbage i en Periode, der neppe kan have vedvaret længe efter den indvandrede Folkestammes Udspreddning og Forgrening i Landets Indre.

(Molbech 1833–1841: ix)

When we now notice this, and the strong persistence with which the peasantry, often in small districts and regions and some times in areas set off from others only by the weakest natural boundaries, preserve their language characteristics in regards to pronunciation and inflection: then it must be more than clear to us that these specific features incorporate extremely old speech elements... these elements... could provide knowledge about how people four or five hundred years ago—or even longer—spoke in Jutland or on Fyn. One can refer then, and quite rightfully so, to an old common language for the Nordic region... and with historical linguistic induction return to a period that must not have been much later than the original folk migration and settlement period in the country's interior.

Even with these historical documentary motivations, Molbech ultimately concluded that creating a comprehensive dictionary was impossible:

For at opsatte og fremstille hiin, f. Ex i en jysk Ordbog, maatte man optage og omskrive saa godt som ethvert dansk Ord, der bruges i den jydsk Almuesmands Tale; men dette vilde i sig selv næsten være en Umuelighed for hele Jylland under eet; da det samme Ord luder saa hvist afvigende i mange forskellige Egne af denne betydelig Provinds.

(Molbech 1833–41: ix)

To draw up and present these, for example in a Jutlandic dictionary, one must record and rewrite just about every Danish word that is used in the Jutlandic peasant's language; but that would be essentially impossible for all of Jutland, since the same word sounds so differently in the many different regions of this considerable province.

Nevertheless, the suggestions of how one might go about creating a useful dictionary, such as including not only words and their meanings, but also methods for rendering alternative inflections and pronunciations had a profound impact on later dialectologists, not least Feilberg.

Henning F. Feilberg

Feilberg came relatively late in his career to his work on the dialect dictionary. His father was a parish priest and his mother the sister of one of Denmark's most famous painters. At the age of three, his family moved from the well-to-do Copenhagen suburb of Hillerød to the untamed west coast of Jutland. His childhood far out in the countryside, immersed in peasant life and west Jutland dialects, shaped his later ideas about dialects and everyday language use. He received his gymnasium diploma from Ribe Skole and, after completing his theological degree in 1855, he became a chaplain in southern Jutland under the direction of Eiler Hagerup at Store Solt (Großsolt).

Hagerup's interest in southern Jutlandic dialect and folklore was also considerable. His study of a local dialect, *Om det danske Sprog i Angel*, provided the model for Feilberg on how to document regional dialects (Hagerup 1854). Indeed, Feilberg later provided a foreword to the second, expanded edition of the work in 1867, which was edited by another noteworthy dialect scholar, Kristen Lyngby (Hagerup 1867). In this relatively short work, Hagerup provided a clear overview of both phonetics and morphology, and attempted to align these with standard Danish. Given the location of Angel in a linguistic contact area where both Danish and German were prominent, his overview of German loanwords was an important innovation with which he attempted to tease out the impact of German in daily Danish usage. Finally, Hagerup provided a dictionary of Danish words that were either peculiar to the region, or reflected regional use of standard words; for each entry in the dictionary he also included notes about inflection, and provided examples from daily speech of the word in context.

Feilberg soon left his position with Hagerup and, after a brief trip to Scotland and England in 1856, he was appointed parish priest in Valsbøl, west of Flensborg. He later moved to a similar post in the slightly larger town of Store Vi (Großenwiehe), a few kilometres to the south. It was here that Feilberg began his folkloric and ethnographic work, completing his ethnographic debut, *Fra Heden*, a rich view of folklore and folk life in the

southern most reaches of Denmark. Importantly, as he noted in his foreword, he also tried to capture aspects of folk speech in this short collection:

Jeg haaber, at den, der er noget fortrolig med den jyske Mundart, vil let kunne finde sig til Rette med den brugte Betegnelse af Tone- og Lydforholdene, og kan den ikke gøres fuldstændig og nøjagtig, saa jo simplere, jo bedre.

(Feilberg 1863: ii)

I hope that those who are familiar with the Jutlandic dialect will easily come to grips with the system employed here for representing the tone and sound qualities, and if it cannot be done completely and accurately, well, then the simpler the better.

Unfortunately, soon after he published the work, the German government relieved him of his parish post, and he returned across the shifting border back to his family's home in Odense.

Feilberg spent several years teaching in Odense before he returned to southern Jutland to take up a post as a priest in Brørup, between Kolding and Esbjerg. Several years later, he moved further west to Darum, and later Bramming, just south of Esbjerg, a region marked by the pronounced west Jutlandic dialects of his childhood. During this time, he continued to document the local folklore and folklife of his immediate surroundings, publishing the book *Fra vester-Jylland. Et Kulturbillede* (1882), and his well-received two-volume ethnography of Danish peasant life, *Dansk Bondeliv* (1889–1898). In 1891, however, he resigned his post as priest due to health issues, and moved to Askov, where he became closely affiliated with the folk high-school. While convalescing at Askov, he began to work in earnest once again on his dictionary, which he had started during his time in Darum.

Feilberg's folkloric and ethnographic work was instrumental in his ongoing dictionary work. In part, the importance of this work lies in the rich series of contacts he made with like-minded school teachers and priests throughout the country on whom he could rely to send him accounts of local practice as well as explanations of local word use. Over the years, he wrote six increasingly substantive folkloric works, all largely related to domains of folk belief or aspects of folklife, the first of which, *Drager, lindorme, slanger i folkets tro* (1894), relied mostly on his own thorough research of published legend collections. His 1904 two-volume work on Christmas traditions, *Jul*, solidified his place among folklore and folklife scholars, and also captured the attention of the academic elite in Copenhagen. Importantly, the work relied heavily on reports from Feilberg's

far-flung network of correspondents, yet still reflected his strong belief that folklore and folklife were largely survivals of much earlier practices (and thus echoed Molbech's musings on the ability of Danish dialects to preserve ancient forms, harkening back to an earlier proto-Scandinavian). Feilberg's *Bro-brille-legen, en sammelignende studie* (1905), *Bjærgtagen* (1910), *Sjæletro* (1914), and *Nissens historie* (1918) all continued this general approach, wedding local collections to a broader comprehensive overview of the domain.

Feilberg's Dictionary of Jutlandic Peasant Speech

Feilberg had long harbored plans to write a dictionary of Jutlandic dialects. In 1883, he wrote a short piece, *Plan for en Ordbog over jysk Folke-maal* ['Plan for a Dictionary of Jutlandic Folk Speech'], which received enthusiastic support from academic circles, and gave him access to Lyngby's collections. Lyngby (1829–1871) had spent seven years traveling throughout Jutland starting in 1854. During that time, he compiled a series of thirty grammars describing the vast range of Jutlandic dialects, as well as amassing a huge collection of Jutlandic dialect words and usages. His goal was to create a work encompassing a comprehensive view of everyday language in each of these dialect areas, with the ultimate goal of detailing the interdependencies of the dialects, organizing them under the larger umbrella of Nordic language dialects. As part of this effort, Lyngby insisted on including place referents for all the words he collected. He also developed a flexible notation system for creating unambiguous and easily understood phonetic representations of the words; it was this system that Feilberg later adopted for his dictionary.⁵ Unfortunately, Lyngby died before he was able to begin work on his own dictionary, yet his collections provided a crucial foundation for Feilberg's dictionary.

In his 1883 plan for the Jutlandic dictionary, Feilberg explained the motivation for his work, writing:

Under det i andre lande optagne arbejde at indsamle og bearbejde folkemålene, har vi her i Danmark stået langt tilbage både for Norge og Sverrig. Skal der gøres noget, er det ganske vist på tide, da den uniformerende kulturstrømning, der efterhånden trænger ind i de inderste og ensomste kroge, arbejder på, til fordel for rigssproget,

5 By the time he began his dictionary, Feilberg was already well aware of Lyngby's work on dialects, since it was Lyngby who had edited the second edition of Hagerup's work on Angel for which Feilberg provided the foreword.

mere og mere at udlette sprogarternes ejendommeligheder; jeg skal nedenfor give eksempler herpå, som maatte kunne øges med mange flere, og når jeg, med min kundskab til almuens liv, søger efter grunden hertil, tror jeg at finde den i skolens langt større indflydelse nu end tidligere, samt i det hele åndelige opsving, som i så høj grad skyldes højskolebevægelsen: der læses meget mere; rundt om stiftes der sogne-bogsamlinger, som flittig benyttes; hver en lille hytte har noget nær sin avis, som bliver læst og lånt ud; så dannes der foredragsforeninger, man søger fra nær og fjært at få mænd til at holde oplysende foredrag; der er besøget på højskolerne, hvorfra de unge karle og piger jævnlig medbringer en lille bogsamling og stor læselyst; endelig højskolemøderne, hvortil der tit samles mennesker fra vide kredse. Ad alle disse veje når rigssproget ind på almuesmålene, der i længden ej kan stå imod, da de altid må føle deres armod overfor et rigt udviklet kultursprog. Det er derfor på tide, skal der gøres noget, og det vilde være såre ønskeligt, om andre mænd kunde optage omålene til behandling, inden alt for meget af det gamle prægt sporløst forsvinder.

(Feilberg 1882: 1)

While in other countries work has been under way to collect and document the different forms of folk speech, we here in Denmark stand far behind both Norway and Sweden. If something is to be done, then it is about time, as the homogenizing cultural currents that are gradually forcing their way into the innermost and solitary nooks of peasant life, work on behalf of the standard language to eliminate the singular characteristics of the various dialects; I will provide some examples below, which could be supplemented with many more, and when I, with my knowledge of peasant life, try to find the reason for this, I believe I find it in the much greater influence of the schools, along with the spiritual awakening which, to a large degree, can be blamed on the high school movement: people are reading more; small local book collections are being set up, which are eagerly used; even each little hut has a newspaper that gets read and lent out; then there are speaking societies that get formed, and speakers are sought from near and far to hold enlightening lectures; there are high school visits, where the young farm hands and farm maids frequently bring their own little book collections along with a love of reading; finally, the high school meetings where people from a broad range of backgrounds gather. Standard Danish encroaches into the peasant dialects from all these directions, and it cannot in the long run resist this, as these dialects must always feel their poverty in the face of a rich culture language. Therefore it is time that something be done, and it would be helpful if

others could collect and work on the island dialects before too many of the old features disappear without a trace.

His plan also included an overview of how the articles were to be structured, adopting many of Lyngby's ideas. While pointing out the wide range of errors that had crept into Molbech's dialect lexicon, he shared an eight point plan for the dictionary:

1. Hele det jyske ordforråd indsamles og optages såvidt muligt; altså ikke blot de ejendommelige eller sjældne ord og talemåder, som glossariet indeholder, men lige så fuldt de mest dagligdags. 2. Stamordene, så rigt behandlede som muligt med angivelse af deres former i de forskellige sprogarter og ligeledes med redegørelse for de forskellige betydninger med tilhørende eksempler. 3. Med hensyn til sammensætninger og afledninger har jeg ikke bekymret mig om at opsøge alle mulige, men blot om at samle så meget stof, at bøjninger, selvlvlyds- og medlydsovergange i de forskellige sprogarter blev tydelige. 4. De kultur minder, sproget gæmmer, fremdrages og forklares, såvidt jeg evner det. 5. Oplysning om ordenes afstamning indlader jeg mig ikke på at give med undtagelse af en henvisning til et sideordnet isl., norsk, svensk, plattysk ord til oplysning for dem, der forstå mindre end jeg. 6. Ordene henføres til rigssprogets form. For ord, der ere fælles, er sagen simpel nok; hvor formen derimod må dannes efter analogi, kan den i enkelte tilfælde blive vanskelig nok, da ordet enten kan blive monstrøst i formen, eller formen kan være vanskelig at træffe... 7. Jeg er opdragen og har tilbragt den største del af mit liv i vestjyske sprogegne, medens tilmed de rigeste og pålideligste samlinger, det hidtil er lykkedes mig at tilvejebringe, ere vestjyske; derfor er jeg i det hele og store gået ud fra den vestjyske sprogform, hvori jeg selv bedst er hjemme. 8. Jeg har ikke i angivelse af den jyske ordform vovet at gå ud over Lyngbys tegnsprog, der synes fuldtud at passe for vestjysken, men mindre fuldkomment for østjyske sprogarter.

(Feilberg 1882: 4)

1. The entire Jutlandic vocabulary is collected to the greatest extent possible; not just the unusual or seldom words and expressions that are included in the glossary, but just as importantly the everyday words. 2. The root words are as richly described as possible with the inclusion of their forms in the various dialects as well as the various definitions with accompanying examples. 3. In regards to compound words and derivatives, I have not worried about finding all possible ones, but have instead simply collected enough material that inflections, and the vowels and consonants are clear. 4. Those cultural

features, that the language hides, are brought forth and explained as well as I can. 5. I do not include information about the word's origin except for references to coordinate words in Icelandic, Norwegian, Swedish, or Low German as information for those who understand even less than I. 6. The word is referenced to its form in standard Danish. For common words, this is simple enough; when the form needs to be created through analogy, this can be quite difficult, since the form can become unnatural or difficult to find... 7. I was raised and have spent the majority of my life in areas where west Jutlandic is spoken, while the richest and most accurate collections that I have been able to use have been west Jutlandic; therefore I have generally started with the west Jutlandic form, where I am myself most at home. 8. I have not dared go beyond Lyngby's phonological notation in my presentation of Jutlandic word forms, as the system seems to work completely for west Jutlandic, although less so for the east Jutlandic dialects.

Importantly, Feilberg avoided the pitfall of attempting to be all things to all people. By sidestepping etymological debates, yet providing references to closely related Nordic and German languages (or dialects), his approach had a broad regional orientation. The emphasis on the everyday use of language gestured towards a modern understanding of dialect and language, while the decision to include references to folklore, folk belief and folk life situated the work in a rich ethnographic tradition. He limited his scope to Jutland, thereby sidestepping the attendant feuds and criticisms that would have followed along with the difficult task of documenting the dialects of the Danish islands.

Feilberg, by his own admission, was neither a highly trained philologist nor a linguist. Instead, he relied on his own experiences growing up and living in west Jutland. Of course, his many years living in southern Jutland also provided him significant experience with those dialects. He readily recognized his own shortcomings with the east Jutland dialects but, since those dialects had been documented in numerous printed sources and by his network of collectors, he was able to cover the entire peninsula. Consequently, his dictionary was not so limited in scope as to be a description of a single local dialect, such as Hagerup's work on Angel, but not so large as to be unwieldy.

The dictionary, when finally completed, consisted of four volumes, each approximately eight hundred pages in length, with volumes covering A–H (1886–1893), I–P (1894–1904), R–S (1904–1908), and T–Å together with

a supplement (1910–1914).⁶ Taking a cue from contemporary dictionaries and reference works, the dictionary was printed in a two-column format with lemmata printed in bold, followed by a comma, and an abbreviated notation for word class. The word class notation was immediately followed by an italicized phonetic transcription of the word using Lyngby's notation with the geographic location of that pronunciation noted in parentheses. If there were multiple pronunciations, a semi-colon followed the location information, and the additional phonetic transcriptions with their locations were presented in an order from west to east and north to south. In the case of similar words from other languages, these references were printed at the end of the list of the Jutlandic dialect attestations. The pronunciations and their geographic identifiers were immediately followed by a definition of the word. In the case of multiple definitions, the pronunciation was followed by a numbered list of definitions, each with their own series of examples illustrating word use. In this manner, Feilberg was able to not only identify dialect words, but also provide divergent dialect pronunciations and various word usages that diverged from standard Danish.

An example from the dictionary illustrates these organizational principles:

dask, no. *dask æn* (Vens., D., Lild; itk. Sundev.) — 1) et slag; *gi jæ̃n æn dask* (Andst h.); *æn dask i møsæn* (Vens.); *Nils fæk æn kâq, Mæræn fæk æn*
 40 *kreŋæl, mæn hwa fæk do? æn dask fo rövæn!* (Agger) ∴ du måtte gå tomhændet; en kjole kan slå dask om kroppen; „*do gi dask i dask, så cæræn hopør å spræŋør som i i dåjs*“, Grb. 77. 29, du slår dask på dask, så kærvene hopper og springer som i en dans; „*høj mat ha e stø̃ plæjlværk, om di skul̃ få no dask åpå tøski*“, Grb. 77. 35, han måtte have et større plejlværk, om de skulde
 50 få noget slag på tærskningen, ∴ ende.
 2) noget, der dasker: en klud, pjalt (Agger). 3) *slør å dask* (Vens.) sludder og vrövl. 4) *dask æn dask* (Agger) urenlig, pjaltet kvinde; se Kalk. dask; döv.

Here a word that means ‘a blow or slap’ in standard Danish, is contextualized in dialect usage from the Andst district near Vejle, from Vendsyssel

6 The entire dictionary was supported by the Universitets-Jubilæets Danske samfund, and printed at Thiele's press.

in the North, and from Agger, a town in Thy. Several examples are then presented from O. L. Grønberg's collections from Vendsyssel. The second definition indicates the word could also be used to describe something that one can use to make a slapping sound, such as a washcloth, while the third definition indicates the word can also be used in conjunction with the word *sludder*, a word that means 'nonsense', and is often used in the expression *sludder og vrøvl*. The final definition indicates that the word can also be used to describe an unclean, raggedly dressed woman.

Feilberg was deeply reliant on collections of Danish folklore for many of his examples. These collections included Svend Grundtvig's collections of folklore (although it is worth noting that Grundtvig was not himself a collector), Jens Kamp's collections of fairy tales, Fr. Fischer's collection of legends from Schleswig, and J. P. Møller's collection of legends from Bornholm (as comparative material). Feilberg was also able to make use of various collections both those sent to him by private individuals (these included a collection of words provided by Laurids Bollerup, a farmer from Holmslands Klit on the west coast of Jutland, and another collection provided by Lavst Røjkjær, a teacher from the same region) and a broader collection of west Jutlandic words sent to Grundtvig by P. Kr. Madsen and thence made available to Feilberg by Grundtvig. Pastor J. Kjær developed a word-list for Søvind along the central east coast of Jutland, and A. Grøn and J. A. Jensen provided Feilberg with a long list of Vendsyssel words.⁷ Finally, C. M. C. Kovlsgaard from the eastern side of the Limfjord provided Feilberg with important lists and examples related to both fishermen and farmers in the area (Feilberg 1886: vi–vii).

Feilberg's articles were comprehensive and, in certain cases, could run for many columns—to wit the entry on *heks* ['witch'] which covers five columns with its definitions, examples, and external references. Common to nearly all of Feilberg's articles is reference to folklore collections, with Tang Kristensen's comprehensive collection of Danish folklore being the foremost among them. In an article on the word *tønde* ['barrel'], Feilberg makes reference to no less than fifteen records from Tang Kristensen's published collections, along with stories printed in the journal *Skattegraveren*. Tang Kristensen also supplied Feilberg with hundreds of examples of words, pronunciations, and usage; their correspondence comprises dozens of letters and covers the entire period during which Feilberg was working on his dictionary.

7 In his memoirs, Tang Kristensen described a visit to Grøn's widow and expressed his concern with the utterly destitute conditions in which she lived (MO 3: 447).

The relationship between Tang Kristensen and Feilberg was somewhat strained, with Tang Kristensen describing their first contact in his memoirs as follows:

Allerede mens jeg boede i Gjellerup, kom jeg i Forbindelse med ham, idet han d. 13de Nov. 1873 skrev til mig og begyndte sit Brev saaledes: "Som Deres Fælle i Syslen med Almuens Liv er jeg saa fri, skjøndt ukjendt, at henvende mig til Dem med Anmodning om lidt Bistand. . . Turde jeg i Haab om nærmere Bekjendtskab herefter bede Dem om Oplysning om følgende Punkter (her fremsætter han Spørgsmaal om Former for Hilsener hos Almuen og om Bygningsskik paa Landet)"... Jeg svarede jo paa Brevet og omtalte de gamle Aashuse, men dem kjendte han ikke noget til, ej heller havde de gamle, han talte med, hørt det Navn.

(MO 2: 406)

Already while I was living in Gjellerup, I came into contact with him as he, on November 13, 1873, wrote to me, and began his letter as follows: "As your comrade in work on peasant life, I have taken the liberty, even though I am to you unknown, to ask you for your assistance... In the hope for closer acquaintance with you, I turn to you for information about the following points (here he lists questions about the forms of greetings and leave-takings among the peasantry and building customs out here in the countryside)"... I answered yes to his letter, and discussed the old post houses, but he knew nothing about those, nor had the old people with whom he'd spoken heard that name for these houses (*åshus*).

Tang Kristensen's annoyance grew as he realized that Feilberg had little experience as a fieldworker:

Fremdeles skriver han i Brev af 20de Nov.: "Her synes kun lidet gjemt af Sagn og Sang og Æventyr. Jeg er ganske god til at spore sligt op, men har her saa at sige intet kunnet opdage". Denne hans Udtalelse er det værd at lægge Mærke til. Netop paa den Egn har jeg mange Aar efter fundet rige Kilder at øse af, og mens han var der, maa der have været grumme meget af den Slags. Men hans Interesse gik nu i en lidt anden Retning, og han fik ikke fat i de rette Folk. Ret betegnende er den Kjendsgjærning, at jeg, den Gang Feilberg var kommen til Dårum, sad der i Præstegaarden og fik Præstens Røgter Morten til at fortælle baade Sagn og Æventyr for mig, hvilke F. selv ikke havde optegnet en Tøddel af... .

(MO 2: 406)

Further, he writes in a letter from the 20th of November: “It seems there are only few legends, songs, and fairy tales saved here in this area. I am quite good at tracking that kind of thing down, but I haven’t been able to discover anything here.” It is worth taking note of what he says. Precisely in that region many years later I found rich springs to draw from, and while he was there, there must have been lots of that kind of thing. But his interests went in a slightly different direction, and he never got ahold of the right people. A good example of this is the time when I visited Feilberg after he’d gotten to Dårum, and I sat there in the parsonage and got the priest’s stable hand Morten to tell me both legends and fairy tales, of which Feilberg hadn’t collected a jot.

Feilberg’s inability to collect—and therefore contribute to Tang Kristensen’s work—became even more problematic in what Tang Kristensen saw as an asymmetric relationship, wrapped in Feilberg’s pleasantries:

Derimod vilde han gjerne have noget fra mig, og alle hans Breve er fulde af Spørgsmaal, som jeg skulde besvare. Det var først i 1877 han havde fundet sit egentlige Virkefelt og faaet sat sig den Opgave, der i alle hans senere Aar optog hans Interesse, nemlig Indsamlingen af jyske Landskabsord. Jeg var jo da kommen til Faarup, og i de Aar jeg var der, bankede han meget tit paa min Dør, som han selv bruger Udtrykket i Brev af 4de Juni: “De maa ikke tage mig det ilde op, at jeg atter banker paa Deres Dør. Efter strenge Aar i mit forrige Embede (han var nemlig nu flyttet til Dårum) har jeg faaet større Frihed her med mere Tid til boglig Sysse og har atter begyndt at sysle med gamle Tanker og nye Opgaver. Efterhaanden har jeg samlet en Del ind til Oplysning af det jyske Landskabsmaal, og jeg har i Vinter gjort Alvor af at begynde en planmæssig Indsamling af jyske Ord til en ny Udgave af Molbechs Dialekt-Lexikon for det jyske Maals Vedkommende... Dem faldt mine Tanker straks paa... og jeg vilde derfor bede Dem om en Haandsrækning, ligesom jeg vilde sætte Pris paa at kunne raadspørge Dem”

(MO 2: 406)

On the other hand, he always wanted something from me, and all of his letters are filled with questions that I was supposed to answer. It wasn’t until 1877 that he found his own field and set himself that project which consumed his interest in all of his later years, namely the collecting of Jutlandic dialect words. I’d moved to Faarup by then, and during the years I was there, he knocked frequently on my door, an expression he used himself in a letter dated June 4th: “Please don’t be annoyed that I knock once again on your door. After some difficult

years in my previous post (he'd at this point moved to Dårum), I now have greater flexibility with my time to futz about the house and have begun once again to mull old thoughts and new projects. I have gradually collected a great deal of information about Jutlandic dialects, and this past winter began in a serious manner to collect systematically Jutlandic words for a new edition of Molbech's dialect lexicon focused on the Jutlandic dialects... My thoughts immediately turned to you... and therefore I want to ask you for a hand, just as I would be grateful if I could ask you for advice."

Fortunately, Tang Kristensen was impressed with Feilberg's work ethic, and decided to contribute to the dictionary project to the extent he could. Nevertheless, Tang Kristensen felt that Feilberg's methods—particularly his reliance on others to do his collecting—introduced unfortunate gaps in the dictionary, writing:

Dog var der visse Egne, hvor han ikke havde Arbejdere og aldrig fik... Derfra fik han altsaa ikke Meddelelser, og det er for saa vidt ret beklageligt... Dette er hans jyske Ordbog da kommen til at lide noget under. At han ikke selv kom til at gjæste disse Egne, var jo ogsaa ret kjedeligt.

(MO 2: 409)

Yet there were certain regions where he didn't have collaborators and never found any... He never received any reports from there, and that is quite regrettable... His Jutlandic dictionary has suffered because of that. That he himself didn't visit these regions is also quite unfortunate.

The relationship became particularly strained when Feilberg sided with others in the *Dansk samfund til indsamling af Folkeminder's* decision to cease the publication of *Skattegraveren* in 1899, and supplant it with a new journal, *Dania*. Of this development, Tang Kristensen wrote:

Bestemmelsen om, at Jespersen og Nyrop skulde udgive det nye Tidsskrift, faldt mig særlig meget for Brystet. Jeg saa grangivelig, at de Mænd ikke kunde magte at føre Sagen videre i det af mig givne Spor, og det var sikkert ikke alene Bågø, men ogsaa Feilberg, der havde undfanget den Tanke. De slog nok lidt ud om, at Indsamlingen af Folkeminder skulde have en fremtrædende Plads i Bladet, men de fremhævede ogsaa, at det nu var godt og rigtigt, der fremkom Artikler med sammenlignende og videnskabelige Undersøgelser paa Folkemindernes og Sprogets Omraade, og til at fremme dette Formaal maatte disse Mænd være særdeles egnede. Hertil kunde jeg ikke sige noget, men det viste sig jo strags, da Tidsskriftet "Dania"

fremkom, at Folkeminderne ikke alene kom til at træde i Baggrunden og Indsamlingen allermest, men og at mit Formaal aldeles blev tilsidesat. Jeg kunde da skjønne, at Indsamlingsarbejdet nu var standset.

(MO 2: 363)

I resented greatly the decision that Jespersen and Nyrop were to edit the new journal. It was clear to me that these men couldn't carry out the work according to the tracks I'd laid for them, and it was certainly not only Bågå, but also Feilberg, who had come up with that idea. They said a little bit about how the collection of folklore would have a prominent place in the journal, but they also emphasized that it was both good and proper that there be articles with comparative and scientific explorations in the areas of folklore and language, and these men were particularly suited to further these goals. I couldn't say anything to that, but it became evident as soon as "Dania" was published, that folklore wouldn't just move to the background, collecting even more so, but that my ideas had been completely set aside. I recognized now that all collecting had been stopped.

Tang Kristensen continued to harbour ill feelings for Feilberg for the next decade, referring to him as a *Syllerpotte* ['whinger'], and questioning Feilberg's reputation for his deep knowledge of Jutlandic dialects (cf MO 4: 422). Ultimately, however, Tang Kristensen decided that he had had a productive relationship with Feilberg, noting, "Mit Forhold til og Samarbejde med H. F. Feilberg og Axel Olrik havde altid været godt og blev ved at være det" ['My relationship and collaboration with H. F. Feilberg and Axel Olrik had always been good, and continued to be so'] (MO 4: 232). The comprehensiveness of Feilberg's dictionary—and the extraordinary support for the dictionary he found in Tang Kristensen's collections and, begrudgingly, in the man himself, attest to that.

Examples of Folklore in Feilberg's Dictionary

Feilberg's dictionary entries are marked by a compactness that, despite their occasional length, do not include lengthy examples describing the context-based usage of the term in question. Instead, the folklore in Feilberg's dictionary largely take three main forms: (1) specific dialectal words that often have correlates in both standard Danish and other dialectal regions; (2) words or expressions that are presented in a brief context with few or no additional references to other sources; and (3) words

or expressions that are briefly explained but for which references to outside sources such as Tang Kristensen's published collections constitute the main contextual information about usage of the word. The entry for *heks* discussed above illustrates this incorporation of folklore into the dictionary well.

For specific dialectical words, the entry for *buddipotte* and the numerous cross-references provide a clear example of the use of folkloric material as a means for explaining the term. The term is defined as

en rumlepotte; en alm. lille lerpotte el. krukke overtrækkes med et stykke blære, som i midten er bundet fast om et rør el. en pennepose, der altså står lodret ud fra blæren; når man væder fingrene og gnider op og ned ad røret, giver potten en ejendommelig brummende lyd, se Fb. Fra Heden s. 76; kaldes gufepåt i Harlev

(Feilberg 1886: 137)

a rumbling pot; a normal little clay pot or jar that has been covered with a piece of bladder skin the middle of which tightly surrounds a pipe or the barrel of a pen, which sticks vertically out from the skin; when one wets one's fingers and rubs up and down on the pipe, the pot produces a remarkable rumbling sound, see Feilberg "From the Heath" p. 76; also called a guffepot in Harlev

The term *futtipotte* (to which there is no cross-reference) from Søvind, is defined as a *buddipotte* (Feilberg 1886: 387), with the cross-reference *guffepotte* expanding on the definition, referring to it as "et legetøj, som børn bruger ved nyårstide; se vokkepotte" ['a toy, which children use at New Years'] (Feilberg 1886: 512). *Vokkepotte*, from Røgen parish, is, in turn, defined simply as a *rumlepotte* (Feilberg 1914: 1081). Consequently, by following these entries, one can reconstruct a seasonal children's custom as well as a piece of material culture, and develop a broader sense of the various dialectical words used to refer to this instrument.

The entry for the word *forundringsstol* provides a clear example of a word for which Feilberg provides considerable context but few additional outside references. The entry describes a folk game that is so common that the term is also used in an apparently well-attested expression:

no. i udtr. 'sidde på f—', alm. leg; folk sidder som de vil, A. i midten på forundringsstolen, B. går rundt til hver og spørger: hva sæddr do o fãro-ñrør dæg öwær? — der svares hviskende, og når B. har gået kredsen rundt, går han hen til A. og siger: a hãr såmanø fãroñdreñør te dæ! og fortæller nu op, hvad den ene og den anden har forundret sig over hos A.; denne skal gætte, hvem der har fremsat en af de

enkelte 'forundringer' og må forsøge sin lykke tre gange; slår det fejl for ham, skal han atter sidde; træffer han den rette, skal denne sidde; jfr. Blichers Novelle : Juleferierne, Saml. Nov. III. (Hansens udg.) 153.

(Feilberg 1886: 362)

subject of the expression “sit in the hot seat” [lit. sit in the wonder chair], common game; people sit as they please, with A in the middle on the wonder chair, B walks around to each person and asks, “what are you sitting wondering about?” –they answer in a whisper. Once B has gone around the circle, he walks up to A and says: I have so many surprises (wonders) for you; he has to guess who has presented each of the ‘wonderings’ and gets three tries; if he fails, he has to stay seated there; if he guesses correctly, that person has to sit; compare with Blicher’s short story, “Christmas vacation”, New Collection, vol. III (Hansens edition) 153.

While the description is adequate to play the game, the reference is to a largely literary work. For more elaborate descriptions of folkloric expressions, however, Feilberg much more commonly referred to the rich collections of folklore on which his dictionary is based.

The Future of Jutlandic Dialect Dictionaries

Feilberg’s dictionary remains an important resource for folklore researchers, particularly those working with the underlying collections that provided data for it. Dialectology has developed considerably over the past century, particularly with the advent of modern recording technology and more consistent methods for documenting real world language use. Currently, several projects in Denmark are focused on the documentation of historical and contemporary dialects throughout the entire Nordic region.

While the University of Copenhagen’s Department for Dialectology has a relatively broad mandate that includes the consideration of dialects throughout the Nordic region, the Peter Skautrup center at Aarhus University is exclusively focused on Jutlandic dialects, with the goal of developing a Jutlandic dictionary. The center, originally founded as the Institute for Jutlandic Language and Culture Research by Peter Skautrup (1896–1982) had as its main goal the development of a more comprehensive replacement for Feilberg’s dictionary. During the 1930s and 1940s, the project was supported by a network of voluntary collectors from across Jutland, thus mirroring Feilberg’s own collecting methods. In the 1950s, additional support allowed the centre to employ professional language researchers to

ensure higher quality recordings, resulting in a card collection of three million entries, and over one thousand hours of sound recordings. By 2004, the collection had been systematized and a clear publication plan was developed, with the goal of a dictionary by 2020. And this will complete in some way what Christiern Pedersen started five hundred years ago.

References

- Bricka, Carl Frederik, Povl Engelstoft, and Svend Dahl, eds. 1933–1944. *Dansk biografisk leksikon*. 27 volumes. Copenhagen: Schultz.
- Dansk biografisk leksikon*. 1979–1984. 3rd Edition. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Danske sprog- og litteraturselskab: Ordbog over det danske sprog*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1919–1956.
- Dodge, Daniel Kilham. 1890. *A Bibliography of Danish and Swedish Dictionaries: Together with a Brief Account of Danish Lexicography*. New York: Modern Languages Association.
- Feilberg, Henning F. 1863. *Fra heden: Folkelivsskildringer fram mellemslesvig ved aar 1860*. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad.
- Feilberg, Henning F. 1882. *Fra Vester-Jylland: Et kulturbillede*. Copenhagen: Thiele.
- Feilberg, Henning F. 1883–1884. Plan for en ordbog over jysk folkemaal. *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Filologi (ny række)* 6: 1–22.
- Feilberg, Henning F. 1886–1914. *Bidrag til en ordbog over jyske almuesmål*. 4 volumes. Copenhagen: Universitets-Jubilæets Danske Samfund.
- Feilberg, Henning F. 1889–1898. *Dansk bondeliv, saaledes som det i mands minde førtes navnlig i Vestjylland*. Folkelæsning 168. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad.
- Feilberg, Henning F. 1894. Drager, lindorme, slanger i folkets tro. *Naturen og Mennesket* 6: 164–196.
- Feilberg, Henning F. 1904. *Jul*. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde og Bagger.
- Feilberg, Henning F. 1905. *Bro-brille-legen: En sammenlignende studie*. Bidrag till kännedom om de svenska landsmålen ock svenskt folkliv 12,4. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt.
- Feilberg, Henning F. 1910. *Bjærgtagen: Studie over en gruppe træk fra nordisk alfetro*. Danmarks folkeminder 5. Copenhagen: Schønberg.
- Feilberg, Henning F. 1914. *Sjæletro*. Danmarks folkeminder 10. Copenhagen: Schønberg.
- Feilberg, Henning F. 1918. *Nissens historie*. Danmarks folkeminder 18. Copenhagen: Schønberg.
- Hagerup, Eiler. 1854. *Om det danske sprog i Angel*. Copenhagen: H. Hagerup.
- Hagerup, Eiler. 1867. *Om det danske sprog i Angel*. 2nd edition. Ed. Kristen Lyngby. Copenhagen: H. Hagerup.

- Jacobsen, Lis and Harald Juul-Jensen. 1919. Indledning. In *Danske sprog- og litteraturselskab 1919–1956* I: xi–lii.
- Kristensen, Evald Tang. 1871–1897. *Jydske folkeminder, især fra Hammerum herred*. 13 volumes. Copenhagen: Various publishers.
- Kristensen, Evald Tang. 1884–1889. *Skattegraveren: Et tidsskrift*. 12 volumes. Kolding: Dansk samfund til indsamling af folkeminder.
- Kristensen, Evald Tang. 1891–1894. *Gamle folks fortællinger om det jyske almu-eliv, som det er blevet ført i mands minde, samt enkelte oplysende sidestykker fra øerne*. 6 volumes. Kolding: Sjødt and Weiss.
- Kristensen, Evald Tang. 1892–1901. *Danske sagn, som de har lydt i folkemunde, udelukkende efter utrykte kilder*. 7 volumes. Århus: Århus Folkeblads Bogtrykkeri.
- Kristensen, Evald Tang. 1900–1902. *Gamle folks fortællinger om det jyske almu-eliv, som det er blevet ført i mands minde, samt enkelte oplysende sidestykker fra øerne: Tillægsbind*. 6 volumes. Århus: Forfatterens forlag.
- Kristensen, Evald Tang. 1923–1928. *Minder og oplevelser*. 4 volumes. Viborg: Forfatterens forlag.
- Kristensen, Evald Tang. 1928–1939. *Danske sagn, som de har lydt i folkemunde, udelukkende efter utrykte kilder saml. og tildels optegnede af Evald Tang Kristensen*. Ny Række. 7 volumes. Copenhagen: Woels Forlag.
- MO = Kristensen 1923–1928.
- Molbech, Christian. 1811. *Om dialekter eller mundarter og samling af danske landskabsord*. Copenhagen: s.n.
- Molbech, Christian. 1833–1841. *Dansk dialect-lexicon: Indeholdende ord, udtrykt og talemaader af den danske almues tungemaal ... Med forklaring og oplysninger*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Molbech, Christian. 1833. *Dansk ordbog indeholdende det danske sprogs stammeord: Tilligemed afledede og sammensatte ord, efter den nuværende sprogbrug forklarede i deres forskellige betydninger, og ved talemaader og eksempler oplyste, af Christian Molbech ...* Copenhagen: Gyldendalske boghandling. Reprinted 1859.
- Pedersen, Christiern. 1510. *Wocabularium ad usum dacorum*. Paris. Edited by Inger Bom and Niels Haastrup. Reprinted 1973. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.
- Langebæk, Jacob and Frederik Rostgaard. n.d. Bearbejdelse af den danske ordbog. Unpub. manuscript. Royal Library, Copenhagen.
- Syv, Peder. 1663. *Nogle betænkninger om det cimbriske sprog*. Copenhagen: s.n.
- Syv, Peder. 1685. *Den danske sprogkunst eller grammatica*. Copenhagen: Borkenhoffer.
- Syv, Peder. 1692. *Prøve paa en dansk og latinsk ordbog*. Copenhagen: s.n.
- Tangherlini, Timothy R. 2013. *Danish Folktales, Legends, and Other Stories: The Danish Folklore Nexus*. Digital Materials. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

“A Pretty Novelty in a Grammar”

The Romani Dictionary of John Sampson

Jeremy Harte

The Roma, or Gypsies, are a people of Indian descent living in Europe. The ancestral population left the north-west of the subcontinent in or before the eleventh century and migrated through Asia Minor to the Balkans and Greek-speaking regions, where they are recorded in 1322. Continued expansion westwards is witnessed by reports from France and Germany in the fifteenth century, and the first references to Gypsies in Britain come from 1505 in Scotland and 1515 in England (Fraser 1992: 85–129).

That is the commonly accepted narrative – what might be called “the Wikipedia version”. But nothing is simple in Romani studies, and a note of caution should be sounded. To speak of “the Gypsies” doing this or that carries a risk of essentialism. It implies that today’s community carry some intrinsic Gypsiness, that one constant soul has animated the people through their long travels. No-one thinks this consciously, of course. It is not as if the ur-Roma left Rajasthan in brightly painted living-waggons, polishing their crystal balls as they whistled *Stand By Your Man*. But in dwelling on the long road that led from the Ganges to the Thames, we tend to gloss over those episodes of stopping, regrouping, and ethnogenesis which have punctuated the route.

If we are to look for a single, defining moment for Roma identity, it might come much later than the first journeys westward. It could be the time when scattered communities from the Indian diaspora joined together in the Anatolian highlands between Byzantium and Armenia, united by the realisation that they could never go back and would always be travelling on (Hancock 2010: 54–94). In any case, the Roma, like every other self-identifying ethnic group, must have some point of origin for their shared identity, and this is the most plausible. Ever since then there have been further turns in the road which have created regional

sub-identities: the Kalderash of the Balkans, the Sinte of Germany, the Manouche of France, and in England, the Romanichals.

Acknowledging these episodes of self-fashioning has its value, but it can be taken too far. Whatever the local peculiarities that different groups might have, scholars have taken it for granted that the language, lineage and culture of the Gypsies in Britain were simply a local episode in the broader history of the Roma: at least, they did so until 1983. But the publication in that year of Judith Okely's *The Traveller-Gypsies* cast doubt on the accepted narrative. Okely had lived with Gypsies from 1971 to 1973 on the borders of Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire, and wrote about these experiences as an anthropologist. She felt that the conventional story of Romani origins was a myth; far from coming from India, the Gypsies had not come from anywhere at all. They were "a self-reproducing ethnic group with an ideology of travelling" (Okely 1983: 5) which had come together on English soil in the sixteenth century as part of the uprooting of the medieval peasantry.

Credible or not, this argument served Okely's purpose by creating an anti-history which, by setting aside the search for normative Gypsiness in some remote past, set her free to analyse the way people talked and thought and acted in the ethnographic present. But that strategy came at a heavy cost – the exclusion from serious consideration of works written by those who had lived with Gypsies before her. Focussing only on the cultural and intellectual expectations which framed the studies of these researchers, it disregarded the possibility that some of their conclusions might have been right after all – and why not, given that these people had given up decades and in some cases lives to practicing what, if it had been done by an anthropologist, would have been called participant observation. Today, research into the cultural construction of the Romany Other (as opposed to the lives of real historical Gypsies) has become a kind of cuckoo discourse, swelling and aggrandising itself until it begins to push out the original direct line of research.

So examining the world of British Gypsies through the medium of the Romani language is not the theoretically innocent undertaking which a non-specialist might imagine. The project would be worthless unless there was some truth in the traditional paradigm – that a branch of the international Roma people settled in England in the first half of the sixteenth century, that the language of the Arrival was passed down through successive generations, and that Gypsies today at Stow and Appleby and Epsom are descended from these first ancestors (and, of course, from a great many other people as well). In fact all the philological evidence makes sense

within this paradigm: languages do not migrate without a migrant community of people to speak them. From the viewpoint of linguistics, to talk about Indian origin as a “myth” defies the evidence: you might as well deny the Scandinavian origins of Icelandic (Matras 2004b: 63–68).

Like the other languages of northern India, Romani came into being when Sanskrit split into a number of daughter languages, the Prakrits. As often in the history of Indo-European languages, the original inflectional structure was much simplified after the classic period: in the declension of nouns, Romani like the other dialects lost the neuter gender, the dual number, and most of the case-endings, which had been reduced in the archaic period to nominative, vocative and oblique. This is easily understood by an English-speaker, since Old English saw its inflections reduced in much the same way. But whereas English has continued to be a morphologically streamlined language, pre-Romani (like Hindi and the other Prakrits) adopted a fresh set of affixes to the oblique which are in effect new case-endings. Thus in most branches of Romani a noun has a nominative, vocative and oblique/accusative form along with genitive, dative, ablative, instrumental and prepositional. The conjugation of verbs has retained the original present tense and developed a new imperfect and perfective. The grammar of Old British Romani has been summarised by Ian Hancock (1984) and the international variations of the language are set out by Yaron Matras (2004a).

Romani was being spoken in Britain by 1548, when the encyclopedist Andrew Boorde published a selection of “Egipt speche”. From the examples which he gives – *Besh tale, pi! Chai, de ma lovina!* [‘Sit down and have a drink! Miss, give me some ale!’] – it appears that language contact took place in a pub, as it has often done since. Boorde’s selection is the earliest contemporary record of Romani anywhere in Europe, and although brief it shows most of the known morphology of the language (Crofton 1907).

It is not clear how many Gypsies came to Britain in Tudor times. The community was banned by Acts of Parliament from 1530 to 1563, followed by attempted round-ups and deportations from southern and eastern ports; these prevented further Gypsy immigration from the Continent, though unable to evict the resident population (Cressy 2018: 62–76). Estimates by magistrates put the population at two or three dozen in each county, and since authority was prone to exaggerate this is unlikely to fall short of the real position (Winstedt 1913–1914). Since these people were scattered over England and Wales, the effective speech-community in any one area must have been very small indeed. Certainly the lexicon of British Romani shows signs of having passed through a demographic

bottleneck: much of what must at some point have been common vocabulary was lost because no-one could remember the appropriate word, and terms were later reconstituted by combining and extending the surviving lexis. This was greatly helped by the way in which the genitive inflection of nouns (singular *-esko/-esker*, plural *-enger*) also serves as an adjectival form. Thus *petalenger* is formed from *petale* ['horseshoes'] (itself a loanword from the Greek) in the sense 'him of the horseshoes', 'farrier', and by extension, 'smith'. When the first signpost was seen indicating the road, it became a *phukavimaskero* ['him of the telling'], from the abstract noun *phukaviben*.

As the original words for fauna and flora were lost, Romani speakers came increasingly to rely on periphrasis, using standardised descriptive phrases in lieu of distinct words. Thus they would speak of the *bita* and *bāri basavi machka*, the little and large wicked cat, when they meant a weasel or a stoat – one of a dozen *bāri/ bita* pairings where in each case English has two separate words for the corresponding terms (Sampson 1926: *s.v.* 'bāri'). This method of word-formation is found in all languages – English has *blackbird*, Romani *kāli cheriklo* which is semantically and referentially the same – but in Romani it accounts for a much larger proportion of the lexicon. Whole areas of vocabulary had been wiped clean in the generation following 1550 and reconstituted by creative embellishment. You would have thought that a people sheltering in the open air and continually in need of firewood would have retained words for oak, ash, and elm but in fact this semantic field was stripped back to *ruk* ['tree'] and then enlarged again by various adjectival devices (Sampson 1926: *s.v.* 'ruk'). *Develesko ruk* ['the holy tree'] is the holly, clearly a pun, and a reminder that British Romani was developing in the shadow of English. From the Arrival onwards, all Gypsies must have been bilingual since fluency in English was necessary if they were to survive in the host country.

Gypsies in Britain were a small community, cut off from the wider Romani world, habitually doing business in English, and living alongside native itinerants. These were all predisposing factors for language death and by the 1790s, when scholars began to notice it, English Romani was in a bad way. The record is not helped by the clumsy methods of enquirers, who would find a Gypsy grandmother, bellow words of Hindi or Bengali at her, and pay a penny for each one translated back into English via its Romani equivalent (Crofton 1928).

By the 1870s, when more scholarly linguists began to look for the English form of Romani, the lexicon survived but the grammar was almost lost. Old Gypsy gentlemen, the inheritors of a rich vocabulary, would

strain memory to recall the inflected forms of *to be* or *to go* that were current in their youth (Smart and Crofton 1875). And there the matter would have rested, had it not been for the chance meeting of two men in 1894 beside the fire on a hillside near Bala. One of them was Edward Wood (1838–1902), peripatetic harpist and representative of what local people called the *teulu Abram Wd*, the Welsh Gypsies. The other was John Sampson, self-taught polyglot and librarian of the University of Liverpool (Sampson 1997: 53–54).

It was one of the most astonishing linguistic encounters of the age. The Woods¹ – a small family, perhaps a few dozen in number – turned out to have preserved in all its purity a language which was some two centuries old; they had kept themselves to themselves in an isolated region of the country, and now one of them had blundered into the only man in England who could and would abandon his regular employment for weeks to sit by the fire and listen, as only a trained philologist could listen, to the talk of the road.

The first ancestor of the clan, Abram Wood, was Edward's great-grandfather; he had travelled into Wales in the mid eighteenth century and established his family there (Jarman and Jarman 1991: 46–56). From that time, Old British Romani diverged into two dialects, Welsh and English, although these versions remained in contact for some time. Several shared formations in the genitive refer to novelties of the late eighteenth century – *phūviengero* ['potato'], *muterimangeri* ['tea'], and the less welcome *prastimangero* ['Bow Street runner']: so that a common vocabulary seems to have existed down to about 1800. After that, Welsh Romani continued to exist as a fully inflected language, while English Romani entered a decline. Contemptuous of the intermarriage which was common further east, the Woods spoke and thought of themselves, not as Romanichals, but as *Kāle* ['the dark ones']. As for their English relatives, they dismissed them as *hāchiwiche*, from the word they used for 'hedgehog' instead of the more authentic *urchos* (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'hāchiwichi').

These aristocrats – for so they thought themselves – used *chavo*, the ordinary word for a young Gypsy, to refer either to one of their own children or a gentleman's son from the surrounding mansions; as for *raklo* ['boy'], that was confined to the offspring of the working or middle-class Welsh families around them. But the disdain felt by the Woods for any

1 Genealogical relationships among the Wood clan, and individual dates of birth and death, are all taken from Jarman and Jarman 1991, chapters 5 ("The Family of Abram Wood") and 6 ("The Roberts Family").

human being who was not a Gypsy, and any Gypsy who was not a Wood, was softened in the case of Sampson, who had the natural unobtrusiveness of the good fieldworker. *Jūnel o raia akai o Wālsenenge Kāle, lengo ōzi*, people said: “that gentleman knows the Welsh Gypsies, in his heart” (Sampson 1926: s.v. ‘Kālo’).²

As for John Sampson, he was, to borrow a word from his own collections, *kushke-kandengere* [‘well-eared’] in picking up languages. His great work, *The Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales*, was based on transcription from the spoken language (Sampson 1926). Because of this, it contained a great deal of folklore, even when this was not foregrounded as such, but simply swept up in his project of comprehensively recording the spoken environment of an extended family. Previous explorers of Gypsy linguistics had similar experiences while transcribing the later diminished forms of the language. When Charles Leland sat down with Matty Cooper to record samples of the Anglo-Romani spoken in south-east England, he was treated to a string of proverbs and told who the Seven Whistlers are, why the flounder has his mouth askew, and how old Henry Cooper heard the little people in the woods laughing and talking to each other in good Romani (Leland 1873: 100–108, 218, 227–228, 243). When Wester Boswell worked with Bath Smart and Henry Crofton on their dictionary, he gave them a number of fables, a dialogue on a haunted stopping-place, and the tale of the miller of Warwick in fairyland (Smart and Crofton 1875: 196–197, 217–218, 223–225).

Sampson, like his precursors, had to engage with the challenge of setting down and analysing the oral. Dictionaries, ever since Johnson, had been based on a corpus of texts, but where in the ebb and flow of spoken language were these texts to be found? About half of the citations in *The Dialect* are taken from ordinary conversation, indirectly providing evidence that the Woods had long ceased to pay any attention to Sampson and his notebook; scurrilous, quarrelsome and obscene talk went on all around him, and although a gentlemanly evasiveness sometimes shows in the translations, he faithfully transcribes the Romani. But the dictionary also draws on conscious linguistic performances. Sometimes Sampson took down “queer little ‘sense riddles’, which will be a pretty novelty in a grammar” (Sampson 1997: 57). Sometimes, with his pen racing to keep up, he would listen to the vast repertoire of wonder tales which had been

2 *Wālseno* [‘Welsh’] is one of several English loanwords in the Romani of the Woods, evidently acquired before they left England. These include *mūra* [‘hill, mountain’] from *moor*, a sense found in the south and west (such as Exmoor) but not in the West Midlands.

retained by Matthew Wood (1845–1929), the son of Edward's cousin Saiforella:

A romantic figure with mystical deep-set eyes, aquiline nose, sensitive mouth, and long black curls reaching to his shoulders [he] was a prince of story-tellers. In moments of emotion the Romani tale would come tumbling from his lips at a terrific speed almost too fast to be recorded and Matthew, carried away by the drama he was relating, would often identify himself with the hero.

(Yates 1948: 3)

Through this transcription³ of folkloric genres, *The Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales*, like other dictionaries of oral languages, draws on much longer unforced samples of natural speech than could be transcribed from daily conversation. And so the Romani thought-world, as presented in the dictionary entries, is disconcertingly magical: within a single entry, fiddlers and fishermen suddenly jostle with dragons, giants and hell-hounds. That was what came from using folktales as a source of vocabulary: but they were more than that, since among his community Matthew's *paramishi* had acquired a value not unlike that of a written canon. They were at some remove from Lauri Honko's concept of *primary folklore*, unthinkingly embedded in the fabric of daily life, for the Woods – already trilingual in Welsh, Romani and English, and fiercely conscious of their status as speakers of the pure language – were well aware of the linguistic heritage in their stories, and struggled to hand them down as they had been heard. Sampson published the folktales as a running series in the *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* from 1907 to 1930, from which a selection was published after his death (Sampson 1933); the riddles were published separately (Petsch 1911–1912). As for the superstitions, beliefs and customs which are scattered through *The Dialect*, have been extracted along with idiomatic sayings, weather prognostications and traditional cookery (Jarman and Jarman 1991: 178–190).

3 Sampson recorded Welsh Romani in an alphabet of his own, adapted from that of Miklosich, which was "strictly phonetic, each symbol standing for one simple sound" (1926: 3). Unfortunately this system, so easy to write, is near impossible to type and most writers of contemporary Romani rely on digraphs rather than special characters. In my transcriptions I have used j for Sampson's j̄ [dʒ], x for his χ [x], ch for his č [tʃ], sh for his š [ʃ], zh for his ž [ʒ], ng for his ŋ [ŋ], rr for his r̄ [r], kh for his k' [kʰ], ph for his p' [pʰ], and th for his t' [tʰ]. However, I have retained the letters â [ɔ] and ã [ɔ:], for which there is no practical substitute. Sampson systematically marked the long vowels, but I have only used macrons where there is a possibility that the vowel might be short or long: terminal e, i and o are always long in polysyllabic words. And where he faithfully recorded the clipped vowels of conversational language, I have reinstated the full form of the words, with (e.g.) *adoi* for Sampson's 'doi.

Ethnographers always like to think of themselves as having arrived just in time to catch a dying tradition, but in Sampson's case this can hardly be disputed. He published *The Dialect* in 1926; within thirty years, the language which it recorded was confined to two or three speakers, and today there is no Gypsy in England or Wales who speaks inflected Romani as a family language. So his work is an irreplaceable linguistic record, just as it is a long-term ethnographic study of a Romani-speaking family. By achieving these two aims so well, it enables us to go beyond both and ask to what extent the linguistic frame of Romani was itself influencing the folklore. The Woods were quick and agile translators between their three languages, but were the traditions that they presented in Romani merely renditions from Welsh and English into that tongue? Or did they record an independent tradition, a specifically Gypsy view of the world?

Certainly the stories of Matthew Wood and his peers are not, in the literal sense, Gypsy stories – not situated in the everyday world of the tent and the fire, of horse-dealing, fiddle-playing and fortune-telling. Amongst the other branches of the Roma in Europe, the storyteller will sometimes put forward a Gypsy hero, usually one who gets the better of the Devil or the authorities; but when they tell wonder tales these are set in the conventional world of *Märchen*, with its castles, cottages and merchants' halls, and this is always the case in Welsh Romani. The stories begin with a young man who takes to the road one midsummer morning to seek his fortune, living on his wits and knocking on any door to see what will follow. That might seem a good prescription for a Gypsy life but in fact Welsh *Jak* is cut from much the same cloth as the Balkan *Yankos* and English *Jack*, and his picaresque adventures are those which can be found in peasant storytelling the world over. "His virtues are reverence for his mother, generosity in sharing food with strangers, and helpfulness to men or animals in distress. For the rest he is cunning and fortunate rather than wise and deserving..." (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'Jak').

Of course *Jak* ends up marrying the fine lady, clearly a house-dweller like himself; this is implicit in the Welsh Romani stories but is made clear in an English-language version from John Roberts (1816–1894). John was related to the Woods through his mother Sarah, the cousin of Edward's father Adam; like them he had a full command of the three languages and was also literate, so he was able to set his own English version of "Jack and his Golden Snuffbox" (ATU 560) in a relaxed, chatty style which includes, as a subordinate character, a poor Gypsy woman whose family are invited to camp by Jack's marvellous palace, and to teach Romani to his children

(Groome 1880: 201–214). So if these are Gypsies, then evidently Jack and his lady and her gentleman father and all the other characters are not.

But though the setting of these stories might be at a double remove from ordinary life – not just a fantasy world, but one which is a fantasy of the settled people – that did not diminish their popularity. Black Ellen Wood (c. 1780–1866), Matthew's grandmother through his father Henry, would sit up all night storytelling. *Chīoxa!* she would suddenly call if the children's attention seemed to be flagging, and they would respond *xolova!* – 'shoes!', the traditional demand, and 'stockings!' the answer that showed they were wide awake and wanted more (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'chīox'; s.vv. 'sov-', 'stōrios'). Many years later, her grandson Charlie remembered travelling with his distant cousin John Roberts, and staying up one night until three in the morning, sharing story after story. The next morning the farmer called them up to the kitchen, all together, and the Gypsies went, not without trepidation: but it was to thank them for their prayers. Oh, it was so beautiful, said the farmer, those holy and powerful words that you were praying in your tent last night. John capped it all with a short but fervent Romani grace, thanking God for making a world so fertile in fools, and the family sat down to their complimentary breakfast (Yates 1953: 69–70).

The farmer would not have made his mistake unless Romani storytelling had a rhetorical intensity about it, something different from ordinary conversation. The stories traditionally begin with a short sentence that sets the scene – something like *sas phuri tha trin chave* ['there was an old woman and three sons']. As Sampson notes (1926: 228) this way of opening with the verb *si* ['it is'] differs from the ordinary conversational order, and since the same story opening was used by speakers of Continental Romani, it must be an archaic feature dating back before the Arrival in Britain. The stories then proceed in rapid style, with simple sentences following each other in quick succession. Romani syntax is not much given to subordinate clauses anyway, but this feature is more marked in the folktales.

When these tales have an aristocratic setting, it is more or less contemporary – great halls, butlers, carriages, balls. But lexical clues suggest that the tradition had earlier roots. As noted above, British Romani has an impoverished core vocabulary even for native wild animals, so the storytellers were at a loss when they wanted to talk about the extravagant fauna of fairytale. The lion, for instance, becomes rather lamely a *balano jukel* ['hairy dog'] (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'jukel'). But an exception is found in the wolf, *ruv*. This is an archaic word, found also in the Continental

dialects – but in southern Britain, unlike France and Germany, there were no wolves; even at the time of the Arrival they were extinct. Since *ruv* was a word without a real-life referent, it can only have survived until 1894 by transmission through idiom or narrative. Of the half-dozen examples given by Sampson (1926: s.v. ‘ruv’), all but one are taken from stories and this suggests a longstanding tradition of storytelling in the Romani language.

On the other hand, the most famous wolf of fairytale was known to the Woods through the story of *I Bita Loli Kistimangi Hufa*, a title which is a word-for-word translation of “Little Red Riding Hood” (Sampson 1926: s.v. ‘kistimango’). Perrault’s *Petit Chaperon Rouge* has been known for her riding hood, in preference to any other style of hood or cap, since 1729 when Robert Samber chose this phrase when publishing the tale in English; so the name comes from a written, not an oral tradition (Perrault 1729). Clearly illiteracy had not prevented knowledge of these stories among the Woods, or their relatives. Already in 1751 we find one of the English branch of the family calling his daughter Cinderella, a name which had been invented only twenty-two years earlier to translate the Cendrillon of *Contes des fées* (Edwards 2012–2014: 302).

So while the storytelling tradition in Romani might go back hundreds of years, individual stories were being added to the repertoire through the eighteenth century with sources ranging from the *Arabian Nights* to Marryat’s novel of 1837, *Snarley-yow, or, The Dog-Fiend* (Halliday 1933: 33–36). Some of them contain verbal echoes of their English originals. A version of ATU 480, entitled “The Crop-Tailed Hen”, has the repeated phrase *Azer man, tha khos man, tha bura man, tha chi man tale shukār* (Sampson 1926: s.v. ‘burav-’) which corresponds to the “wash me, comb me, lay me down softly” (Opie and Opie 1974: 208) of “The Three Heads in the Well”, tale IV in the *History of the Four Kings*, which circulated as a chapbook until the 1830s (Opie and Opie 1974: 204).

Clearly some, perhaps all, of the *Märchen* told by the Woods had been acquired from earlier English storytellers, and yet they were now being transmitted in Romani. True, there were those who said the stories were really handed down in English, and only rendered into Romani to please Sampson (Davidson and Chaudhri 2003: 47). This claim was made by Esmeralda Lock, but the evidence from family tradition is against it, and so is the style of the stories, which contain none of the authorial digressions or explanations used by English-language Gypsy tellers such as those recorded by Thomas William Thompson (Thompson 1922; cf. Lapage 1997). The Locks (originally a branch of the Boswells) travelled in the

Welsh borders and knew a great deal of Gypsy lore, but they would have been dismissed as *hãchiwiche* by the Woods, and Esmeralda's family language was not Old Romani, but the later dialect of Anglo-Romani which uses Romani words embedded in English grammar. She was not the best-informed witness on the subject of language.

A plausible explanation for the transfer of stories between languages can be found in the traditional tags used to end a tale. Like their counterparts in many cultures, they treat storytelling as a branch of public entertainment: "I played the fiddle for them and they gave me beer" (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'bãshav-'); "and that was all they gave me for playing at the hedgehog's wedding" (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'romeriben'). Evidently storytelling, like playing the harp or fiddle, was once an art which the Gypsies could practice at gatherings in return for food and drink and hospitality. The corpus was kept in memory by being rehearsed among the family – and therefore in Romani – until a time came when the house-dwellers lost interest in it, after which it survived as a purely Gypsy tradition. Exactly the same thing happened to music in the twentieth century. In earlier times, Gypsy musicians had expected to make money by playing jigs and dance tunes, which they practiced at night round the fire, but after the 1930s this music was no longer in demand and performances were confined to the narrower circle of the community.

Gypsy folktales typically took their plots from the host culture, just as Gypsy song was mostly derived from the common ballad and popular repertoire (Yates 1948: 7; Pettitt 2008: 87–88). The Woods and Robertses played the tunes that their Welsh customers wanted at pub or fair, and when they referred to them in Romani it was by calques of their familiar names: a few bars of *I Chai Ka Mukdom Pãle* and the audience would recognise *The Girl I Left Behind Me* (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'chai'). But the words used for music itself suggest a longer-lived tradition. To play an instrument was *bãshav-*, the causative form of the verb *bãsh-* which originally referred not to music but to the sound made by any creature; live-stock, wild beasts and birds could all *bãsh-* after their kind. To *bãshav-*, then, is to make a living creature speak, and only indirectly 'to play music' (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'bash-'). An instrument was a *bãshimangero*, one of the genitive constructions used for neologisms, in this case from *bãshimos* ['him of the music']. With ideas like this present at the archaic level of the language, it is not surprising that Gypsies had stories of the "Devil's Violin" type, in which the fiddle is made from bones and hair and sinew, and speaks with the voice of the dead (Groome 1899: 131–132).

Songs, like tunes, were more likely to be absorbed from the surrounding culture; this was made easier by the Woods' fluency in languages. On hearing *The Banks of Sweet Primroses*, Edward Wood at once produced a metrical Romani translation of two lines (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'kokoro'). More distinctive material was composed for children, who could be kept in order by the threatened indifference of *Bāre-Chōrreskero* ['him of the long beard'], otherwise known as Father Christmas. There was a rhyme:

*O Bāre-chōrreskero avela
Tāp pesko kāshtenengo grai;
Leske dūda are leski pochi,
Tāp lesko shēro shi les goi*

(Sampson 1926: s.v. 'chōrreskero')

Father Christmas is coming,
On his wooden horse;
His sweets in his pocket
His pudding on his head.

This seems to have been an original composition, but it must have been a recent one. Few British children, Gypsy or otherwise, had heard of the gift-bearing Father Christmas/Santa Claus before the 1870s. The wooden horse, a traditional steed for St. Nicholas or his servants, may have arrived via America, since this was the immediate source of the tradition.

Unlike their parents, Gypsy children did not socialise with their house-dwelling peers so their games were developed within a separate, Romani-speaking world. There was a version of Blind Man's Buff where the children would call out *mas!* ['meat!'] as the *korodo* or blind man got nearer the hedge; it began with a stereotyped exchange "*Jak, ti dai wāntsela tut te xās mūza*". "*Kai si mi roi?*" "*Praste adotār te dikhes roiaki*" ["Jack, your mother wants you to eat porridge" – "Where is my spoon?" – "Run over there and look for a spoon"] (Sampson 1926: s.vv. 'korodo', 'mūza'). But though games might be produced within the community, riddles were not. Conventionally these have been transmitted from adults to children, partly to entertain them and partly to test their wits. There is one riddle, *Hiki Piki adre bārriati; chala tu i Hiki Piki, dandela tut* ['Hiki Piki in the hedge; if you touch Hiki Piki, it will bite you'] with the answer "a nettle" (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'bārri'). This corresponds, down to the nonsense name, with the common English "Hitty Pitty within the wall,/ Hitty Pitty without the wall:/ If you touch Hitty Pitty, Hitty Pitty will bite you" (Halliwell 1842: 149).

Many of them were known in their English form to the Locks (Thompson 1914–1915: 187). Significantly, while the riddles always find their solutions (as they must, to be viable) in everyday objects, these are never things like kettle-irons or tent-rods which would be familiar to the children but unknown to house-dwellers. Only one example struck Sampson as specifically Gypsy. The riddle is *Kon jana i jukelensa apre o mūra, tha chi na mona?* ['Who are they that travel across the mountain with a pack of hounds and get no sport?'], and the answer is *pārne jukela* ['white dogs'], idiomatic for 'clouds' (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'jukel'). But even this betrays an origin outside Gypsy society, for *pārne jukela* must be a variant on *pāni jukela* ['water dogs'], a term found in several English dialects from Surrey to Worcestershire to identify the stragglings cirrus clouds that foretell more rain (Wright 1898–1905: s.v. 'water-dog'). And just as Romani idiom reflected English in this respect, so it drew on Welsh for the names of insects: the ladybird, *bita loli guruni* from *buwch goch gota* ['little red cow'], and the dragonfly, *sap butiakero* from *gwas y neidr* ['servant of the snake'] (Sampson 1926: s.vv. 'guruni', 'sap').

The Woods had picked up a great deal of local lore in their travels, and evidently enjoyed passing this on to Sampson. Some of it may have been superficial: since it was conventional to coin Romani place-names as calques of the native ones, a formation like *I Bāre-Mūrshesko Tan* for *Bedd y Cawr* proves only a lexical knowledge of the giant's grave in question, a round barrow near Cader Idris. But the wordplay used in other place-names implies more detailed knowledge. Denbigh is *Bāresapesko Gav* ['town of the great snake'], which makes no sense until you remember the story of Sir John Salusbury who killed the resident dragon and then shouted out cheerfully *dim bych!* ['no more dragon!'] to reassure his neighbours that there was no beast to be feared any more (Ashton 1890: 300). Here the Welsh folk-etymology of the place-name has inspired its descriptive form in Romani (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'gav').

The Woods knew local lore from Chirk Castle and Anglesey (Sampson 1926: s.vv. 'kangli', 'keriov-') and were familiar with the legend of Beddgelert (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'rachverdo'). This story, put about by an enterprising hotelier in the 1790s, identified the *bedd* of the place-name as the grave of Gelert, the heroic dog of Llywellyn the Great (Morgan 1983: 87). It attracted tourists, as it was meant to, and would have been a natural money-earner for the family, with their joint command of Welsh and English. But they had other local knowledge which was not derived from outsiders, and which was taken more seriously, such as the healing powers of the well at Llanfihangel-y-Traethau. *Na sas kek i gājengi xeni; ame Kāle*

junasas so sas anre [‘the spring is nothing to the settled folk; but we Gypsies know what is in it’] (Sampson 1926: s.vv. ‘jun-’, ‘xeni’).

The Woods were in touch with the lore of the world around them, but while some traditions were picked up and developed in their Romani idiom, others failed to strike a responsive chord. The fairies, for instance, aroused less interest than you might have expected from a family who spent their lives in wild places. In the folktales they are *i biti fōki* [‘the little people’] (Sampson 1926: s.v. ‘bita’), which is an English rather than a Welsh idiom, and therefore probably established before the Woods crossed over into Wales. As in England, the little clay pipes used and discarded in Elizabethan times were known as fairy pipes, *bitifōkenengi swedli*; one of these would bring good luck if carried in the pocket, and so would a fairy ring, whatever that was (Sampson 1926: s.vv. ‘swedla’, ‘nashav-’). But that was about the sum of fairy lore, and the Gypsies had no interest in the rich Welsh traditions about solitary fairies of various kinds. There was a rich toponymic vocabulary to distinguish different kinds of spirit or goblin haunting spring, lanes or fields – the *bwbach*, *bwgan*, *coblyn*, *pwca* and others (Richards 1969). But these shades of meaning are flattened out in Romani. The *bwgan*, when he appears in place-names, is cursorily translated as a *beng* [‘devil’]; the *bwbach* as a *mulo* [‘ghost’] (Sampson 1926: s.vv. ‘skamin’, ‘mulesko’).

Ghosts were imagined much more vividly than fairies, although “ghost” is a weak translation of the polysemic Romani *mulo*. Sometimes this means ‘corpse’, and sometimes ‘the dead’. It is the word used to describe relatives who have passed away, whose property must be destroyed and whose names, to avoid causing pain to their former owners, should no longer be spoken by the living (Sampson 1926: s.vv. ‘konyo’, ‘mulo’, ‘mulengo’, ‘nav’, ‘riger’). But it can also be used for revenants, grim things like the *mulo tha balano vast*, the bogle with the hairy hand (Sampson 1926: s.vv. ‘balano’, ‘mulo’); and it is sometimes used in the more incorporeal sense of ‘ghost, spirit’. On All Souls’ Eve, when Welsh children went round chanting *Bwyd cenad y meirw!* [‘Give food for the souls’], the Romani translation was *Den xāben i mulengi!* (Sampson 1926: s.v. ‘mulo’).

Nonetheless Gypsy tradition never quite lost its sense of the physical *mulo*, a horribly substantial body come back from the grave. This had been the early medieval view of the walking dead, one which long survived in the Balkans, although much more comparative material would be needed to link this with the thought-world of Welsh Gypsies at the end of the nineteenth century. However, the late coinage of a word *bavalyakero*

['him of the breath, spirit'], suggests that people felt the need for an alternative term which unlike *mulo* did not imply a physical presence (s.v. 'bavalyakero').

There were other words for apparitions. *Te jesa tale o drom, dikhes o gulo*, says a mother to restrain a venturesome child: "if you go down the lane, you'll see a ghost" (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'akatar', 'odotar'). Evidently a *gulo* was frightening, but the etymology of the word is unexpected; it is simply a substantive use of the adjective *gulo*, originally 'sweet' and then 'dear, well-loved' (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'gulo'). The word *meriklo*, also used for ghosts, has a similar history. *Men* is 'neck'; *menri*, 'necklace'; and *meriklo* (originally *menriklo*), 'bead, ornament, jewel'. In its secondary sense, *meriklo* was 'precious, loved one', and finally it is used as another term for 'ghost' (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'meriklo'). *Gulo* and *meriklo* had evidently followed the same semantic development. At first, they were affectionate terms for relatives who had died; then the words were extended, in a conciliatory way, beyond the circle of the loved but still unchancy family dead; until finally they might be used for every terror that walked in field or lane. A long tradition of ghost-lore had been passed down to the Woods, who were aware that this too was part of their Gypsy inheritance. "You're a house-dweller", said one of the family to a visitor. "Things like that won't appear to you, because you've got no faith in them" (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'siker-').

They believed in witches as well, but this was hardly surprising. In Wales, as in England, the village witch remained a focus for communal fears and suspicions until late into the nineteenth century. The malice of the witch (who was stereotypically female, although there were exceptions) could be countered by the skills of the cunning man (stereotypically male, although again not always in real life). These magical practitioners were much in demand, sometimes for telling the future or discovering thefts, but most often for identifying witches and overturning their harmful influence (Suggett 2008).

In Romani these people were *gozhvale*, which translates both English *cunning man* and the Welsh *dyn hysbys*; the adjective *gozhvalo* retained some of its original sense of 'artful, intelligent' but was now largely confined to occult learning (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'gozhvalo'). An older word for a wizard, *herimentos*, survives only in the stories – another testimony to their conservative diction, since it derives from early Modern English

heremite [‘hermit’], with the *-os* termination used for loanwords.⁴ Hermits, like wolves, had not been seen on English ground for many years and the word must have entered Romani early in the sixteenth century, a testimony to the occult interests of the minor clergy.

The Woods shared the belief of their Welsh neighbours in the powers of these people. When Sylvaina Wood ran away with a cousin, her husband went to see a *dyn hysbys*. “*Gyas mo phuro dad kho gozhvalo gājo, wāntselas peski romni pāle*” [“My grandfather went to the cunning man, he wanted his wife back”], said Matthew (Sampson 1926: *s.v.* ‘gozhvalo’). The Gypsies believed too in the stories about witchcraft, like that of the witch who transforms herself into a hare and can only be caught, or at least injured, by the most skilful hunter (Sampson 1926: *s.v.* ‘kanengero’). Matthew’s mother Saiforella (1809–1905) knew a charm to protect herself against witchcraft: she would soak a handkerchief in the water of the well at Glan-y-mor, mould it into the shape of a heart, and press it against her own heart (Sampson 1926: *s.vv.* ‘kindo’, ‘xeni’).

Chovexerdi shom, said Saiforella, ‘I am bewitched’. She was using the adjectival form of *chovexer-*, a verb derived from the noun *chovexano* or *chovexani*. The two forms indicate the genders and refer to a magician, male and female. When describing the stock-in-trade of sorcery in English folktales, we make a lexical distinction between the wizard’s wand and the witch’s cauldron, but in Romani it is all the same – *choveximaski ran*, *choveximaski pīri*. These examples come from the folktales but the same rule applied in real life. A grandfather kept the little ones from fiddling with his fishing-rod by saying *Mā chalaven la, chavālin, mīri basavi ran si* [‘don’t touch that, children, that’s my witch-wand’] (Sampson 1926: *s.v.* ‘ran’).

So, where English makes an implicit verbal distinction between the bad witch and the good wizard, wise man or cunning man – and Welsh, or at least nineteenth-century Welsh, discriminated similarly between the *gwrach* and the *dyn hysbys* – Romani was more open-ended. There was a distinction of the sexes, and another between Gypsy and non-Gypsy; for a family of ancient lineage like the Woods, that ranked almost as high as gender amongst the basic divisions of humanity. To them, the cunning man would always be a *gozhvalo gājo*, a wise man from the householders. But the possession of magic was itself morally neutral. There

4 The word could formally be a borrowing from Old French *hermite* before the loss of initial *h-* in the sixteenth century, but the absence of a cognate in Sinti-Manouche Romani argues against this.

were no words, and apparently no stories, to portray that dreaded figure of village life, the witch who does harm because she is evil and hates the world.

In fact when it came to malefice, Saiforella could give as good as she got. *Sar trashasas late, bāri mārriengeri sas* ['we were all frightened of her, she was a great summoner of curses'] (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'mārriengero'). So was her mother Sylvaina (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'mārri'), and so was her mother-in-law Ellen, who wasn't called Black Ellen just for her complexion (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'chovexer-'). In fact, women found a reputation as a *chovexani* well worth cultivating. Within the community, it meant that they weren't to be messed with – the female equivalent of a man being known as a fighter. And when dealing with the outside world, it was a good way to maintain influence over the credulous.

How much the Gypsies themselves believed is hard to say. Betsy Wood, Saiforella's daughter-in-law, was taken as a girl to help the older woman conduct an exorcism. "The dear Lord gives us *Kāle* the gift of seeing all things", she said when Betsy was rash enough to be sceptical about ghosts (cf. Sampson 1926: s.v. 'da-'). Outside the haunted lodge, she met with the *dyn hysbys*, surrounded by an awe-struck crowd. At a gesture the people fell back, leaving the wise man and the Gypsy to conduct their rite. By the end, Betsy was shivering with excitement, but her mother-in-law said curtly of her colleague: "In some ways he is wise but in others very credulous as are all *gāje*, and it is well to humour them; my pocket is heavy from this night's work" (Lyster 1926: 70–73).

Such scepticism is understandable, for Gypsy women had a supernatural performance of their own in fortune-telling, and yet this was something in which they did not believe at all. They were happy to take the stranger's hand, talk a lot of high-flown nonsense about the mysterious powers of the Romany, and prophesy a glowing future; Gypsies had been doing this long before the Arrival, and the verb for it, *druker-*, is found in all the Continental dialects. But it was all a show, a financial performance. In the dispute between the families of Thomas and Ellen Wood and that of their elder sister Alabaina, one of the accusations was that Alabaina's children had let this be known. *Phukavenas i gājengi te xoxiben sas o drukeriben* ['they told the house-dwellers that fortune-telling was a lie'], and so put their cousins out of the way of making money (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'drukeriben').

Nevertheless, the Woods and their relatives were superstitious in their own way. Old women in search of luck would carry the *sapeski mortsi* ['the sloughed snakeskin']. "When we see a snake in the road, we kill it, cut it in

half, and pass between the pieces three times” (Sampson 1926: s.v. ‘sap’). If Saiforella saw a kite, she would strip off her petticoat, turn it inside out and put it on again, repeating three times *Trin melane avena man palal i kaita* [‘Three yellow ‘uns come to me following the kite’] (Sampson 1926: s.v. ‘melano’), and would go on to expect the arrival of three gold sovereigns. The family held the belief, found also amongst their English kinsfolk, that to see a wagtail is a sign that you will meet with some other Gypsies (Ingram 2014: 223). So they called it the *Romano cheriklo*; and it was also the *lovesko cheriklo* or money bird, apparently because like the kite it foretold the arrival of money (Sampson 1926: s.v. ‘cheriklo’).

All these beliefs, and there were many others like them, have a common feature – that of happenstance. The Gypsies are passing down the road, they encounter something, and at once the wisest of the family divine what it means for good or bad. This seemed very credible even to a people for whom the idea of conscious, purposeful divination of the future was a joke, to be exploited for gain in *drukeriben*. Faith in adventitious omens made sense for anyone who followed a travelling life – for just as quick-witted Gypsies would spot a source of food or fuel by the road, or promptly size up some new-met opportunity for making money, so they expected to grasp the natural omens which told if things would go well or ill that day.

Any chance encounter might reveal the presence of *baxt* [‘luck, fortune, success’] or its opposite. Birds, as we have seen, were particularly significant. *Te avelas yekh kālo cheriklo alan tuti are asarrla, nai-lo baxtalo kek: dikhesa dūi, baxtale shi-le* [‘If you come across a single crow in front of you in the morning, it’s unlucky; it’s lucky if you see two’] (Sampson 1926: s.v. ‘baxtalo’). These ornithomancies must have been very old, for they explain the survival in British Romani of two words from the archaic vocabulary. Almost all bird-names are loanwords or descriptive compounds, *cheriklo* playing the same generic role that *rukħ* does in names for trees: but *kakarachka* [‘magpie’] and *korako* [‘crow’] are old words, and they are associated in both cases with superstitions (Sampson 1926: s.vv. ‘kakarachka’, ‘korako’). Since the two corvids were no good for anything but omens, it must have been in association with these that their names were handed down in the language.

And yet the vocabulary of Romani superstition, like that of the riddles and stories, was permeated by borrowings from the host culture. *Shunde sār tume adīa phuri huleta? Adoi si yekh amende te mērela* [‘Did you hear that old owl? One of us is going to die’] (Sampson 1926: s.v. ‘huleta’). But *huleta* [‘owl’] is simply English dialect *howlet*. When Ellen Wood was old and blind, her children would say *Ake grifti akai* [‘look here is

some frogspawn'], and she would ask to be led to it, and would throw a handful over her shoulder, saying *Baxt avela man* ['luck will come to me'] (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'grifti'). But *grifti* is just the Welsh *grifft*, for which there was already a Romani expression, *jambenge yakha* ['frogs' eyes'] (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'jambengo'). And strangest of all, the mundane English *broad* was taken into Romani as *brādo* to describe "the broad flat fasciated growth of a bough" (of thorn, ash or holly), which, like other strange natural things, was propitious to discover (Sampson 1926: s.v. 'brādo').

This lucky find appears in a characteristic reminiscence of John Roberts. Here, he is not the dignified *Telynor Cymru* of later life, "the Harpist of Wales" who played for dukes and earls, and wrote as an advocate of Romany culture – but young John, a half-starved Gypsy boy trudging along the road with no horse or donkey to carry his load. Still, he had his wits about him: and when he saw a *brādo* on a holly bush, he cut it and took it to his mother. She broke it in three, looked skywards and said some words that little John did not understand. And then luck was with them, for the next big house that they called at, she was asked to *druker* the ladies and gentlemen, and sweet money came thick and fast. They ate and drank for a week, bought a horse and cart, and continued on their way (Groome 1880: 373–374, cited s.v. 'brādo').

That is a typical Gypsy story, with its casual alternation of wealth and destitution, its reverence for the secret workings of luck that slips into the level-headed business of fortune-telling, and at the centre of it, a Romany tradition wrapped around an English word. John Roberts' story reveals something of the history behind Sampson's citations of folklore in *The Dialect*. Though the *teulu Abram Wd* kept themselves to themselves in the uplands of Wales, for many years before 1926 they had been heard of as a family who were Romani of the Romani, the keepers of a distinct and archaic tradition. They were lucky to find their amanuensis in a scholar already familiar with the language and competent with Gypsy culture in general, so that his introduction into fellowship with the Woods was much smoother than the journeys of discovery undertaken by scholars of a previous generation. He was also fortunate to engage with people who had grown up well aware of their status as outsiders to two other cultures, Welsh and English, and who therefore understood what it meant to be a tradition-bearer, more consciously than their English relatives had done when contributing to previous lexicographical ventures.

But *The Dialect* was still a work of rescue linguistics and ethnography, a collaboration between a scholar and a family who both wanted things to be set down before they vanished forever. In a few generations the stories

would be forgotten and the unique survival of a language that had been dead elsewhere in Britain for more than a century would be lost. Sampson did not have the time to make a separate study of the traditions that he was recording: he did publish the folktales separately as they were being recorded, and brought in the expertise of William Halliday when he realised that the complexity of their historical transmission lay outside his own sphere. As for the children's games, superstitions, local lore, calendar customs and supernatural beliefs that he heard, Sampson transcribed these pell-mell into his notebooks and let them find their own place in what is primarily a linguistic study, from which later generations could extract them as needed. The study of Gypsy lore was a collaborative approach in which a limited number of researchers were in touch with interlocking circles of informants and it was understood that they would draw on what Thomas William Thompson, that other great collector of Gypsy folktales, called "the most fascinating part of Dr. Sampson's great work... the quotations with which his vocabulary is enlivened and humanized" (Thompson 1926: 96).

The Dialect should be read, not as a dictionary including a study of folklore, but as a cultural record which was expected by its creator to be of use to folklorists amongst others, provided they had some acquaintance with the background tapestry of Gypsy life. Ultimately the language was the medium rather than the precondition of this lore. Examining the world of British Gypsies through the medium of Romani does not reveal some timeless Indic heritage hidden from the host cultures by a secret language. Instead, the Romani recorded by Sampson and his contemporaries turns out to be permeated by loans, translations and appropriations – and there was nothing new about that; it had been under way since Proto-Romani first drew on the resources of Armenian, Persian and Greek. But the linguistic fluency that marked the long road from Anatolia to Snowdon was itself witness to the enduring mutabilities that have made up Gypsy life.

References

- Acton, Thomas and Gary Mundy. 1997. *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Ashton, John. 1890. *Curious Creatures in Zoology*. London: John Nimmo.
- Cressy, David. 2018. *Gypsies: An English History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crofton, Henry Thomas. 1907–1908. Borde's Egipt Speche. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 2nd series, 1: 157–168.

- Crofton, Henry Thomas. 1928. Thomas Daniell and Romani. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 3rd series, 7: 48.
- Edwards, Richard. 2012–1914. The Life of Shadrach Boswell: II. *Romany Routes* 11: 299–302.
- Fraser, Angus. 1992. *The Gypsies*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Groome, Francis Hinde. 1880. In *Gipsy Tents*. Edinburgh: William P. Nimmo.
- Groome, Francis Hinde. 1899. *Gypsy Folk Tales*. London: Hurst and Blackett.
- Halliday, William Reginald. 1933. *Indo-European Folk-Tales and Greek Legend*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliwell, James Orchard. 1842. *The Nursery Rhymes of England*. London: Percy Society.
- Hancock, Ian. 1984. *Romani and Angloromani*. In Trudgill 1984: 366–383.
- Hancock, Ian. 2010. *Danger! Educated Gypsy: Selected Essays*. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Hobsbawm, Eric and Terence Ragner. 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ingram, Peter. 2014. *Wagtail Tale: Gypsy Life of Bygone Days*. Selborne: Limes End Yard.
- Jarman, Eldra, and A. O. H. Jarman. 1991. *The Welsh Gypsies: Children of Abram Wood*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Jenkins, Gereint. 1969. *Studies in Folk Life: Essays in Honour of Iorwerth C. Peate*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Lapage, Ginny. 1997. The English Folktale Corpus and Gypsy Oral Tradition. In Acton and Mundy 1997: 16–28.
- Leland, Charles. 1873. *The English Gypsies and Their Language*. London: Trübner.
- Lyster, M. Eileen. 1926. *The Gypsy Life of Betsy Wood*. London: Dent.
- Matras, Yaron. 2004a. *Romani: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Yaron. 2004b. *The Role of Language in Mystifying and Demystifying Gypsy Identity*. In Saul and Tebbutt 2004: 53–78.
- Morgan, Prys. 1983. *The Hunt for the Welsh Past in the Romantic Period*. In Hobsbawm and Ragner 1983: 43–100.
- Okely, Judith. 1983. *The Traveller-Gypsies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Opie, Iona, and Peter Opie. 1974. *The Classic Fairy Tales*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Perrault, Charles. 1729. *Histories, or Tales of Past Times*. Trans. Robert Samber. London: J. Pote and R. Montagu.
- Petsch, Robert. 1911–1912. Fifty Welsh-Gypsy Folk-Riddles. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 2nd series, 5: 241–255.
- Pettitt, Tom. 2008. From Journalism to Gypsy Folk Song: The Road to Orality of an English Ballad. *Oral Tradition* 23: 87–117

- Richards, Melville. 1969. The Supernatural in Welsh Place-Names. In Jenkins 1969: 303–313.
- Sampson, Anthony. 1997. *The Scholar Gypsy: The Quest for a Family Secret*. London: John Murray.
- Sampson, John. 1926. *The Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales: Being the Older Form of British Romani Preserved in the Speech of the Clan of Abram Wood*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Sampson, John. 1933. *XXI Welsh Gypsy Folk-Tales*. Ed. Dora Yates. Newtown: Gregynog.
- Saul, Nicholas and Susan Tebbutt, eds. 2004. *The Role of the Romanies: Images and Counter-Images of "Gypsies"/ Romanies in European Cultures*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Smart, Bath C., and Henry Thomas Crofton. 1875. *The Dialect of the English Gypsies*. London: Asher.
- Suggett, Richard. 2008. *A History of Magic and Witchcraft in Wales*. Stroud: History Press.
- Thompson, Thomas William. 1914–1915. English Gypsy Folk-Tales, and Other Traditional Stories. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* series, 8: 163–232.
- Thompson, Thomas William. 1922. The Gypsy Grays as Tale-Tellers. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 3rd series, 1: 118–137.
- Thompson, Thomas William. 1926. Review of *The Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales*. *Folk-Lore* 37: 93–98.
- Trudgill 1984. *Language in the British Isles*, edited by Peter Trudgill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Winstedt, Eric Otto. 1913–1914. Early British Gypsies. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* series, 7: 5–37.
- Wright, Joseph. 1898–1905. *The English Dialect Dictionary*. London: Henry Frowde.
- Yates, Dora. 1948. *Gypsy Folk Tales*. London: Phoenix.
- Yates, Dora. 1953. *My Gypsy Days: Recollections of a Romany Rawnie*. London: Phoenix.

Case Studies of Dictionaries

Karadžić's "Srpski rječnik" (*The Serbian Dictionary*) and Serbian Culture

Zoja Karanović and Jasmina Dražić

Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1784–1864) was the author of the first Serbian dictionary which is the focus of this chapter. As he was also the key figure in Serbian culture in the first half of the nineteenth century, thanks to his work as philologist, folklorist, historian, language reformer and translator, before we turn to the dictionary, we might discuss his importance within Serbian culture, and the place of his lexicographical work within his wider oeuvre. Early in his life, Karadžić worked as a scribe within the First Serbian Uprising against the Ottoman Empire (1804–1813). After the failure of that uprising, he, together with the other rebels, left Serbia and settled in Vienna where he married, and lived until the end of his life. However, whenever there was a chance, Vuk used to return for research purposes to the south Slavic territories – to Srem, Slavonia, Croatia, Dalmatia, Dubrovnik, Boka Kotorska, and Montenegro. Russia was also one of his important cultural destinations. While many co-nationals were important in helping Vuk with his work, his acquaintance with Jernej Kopitar, an Austrian censor of Slavic books, whom he met in Vienna shortly after his arrival there, was of decisive importance for his work. It was Kopitar, who having read an article by Karadžić on the failure of uprising who talked him into collecting folk songs, stories, proverbs, customs, beliefs.

Shortly afterward, Vuk published his first collection of folk songs entitled *Mala prostonarodna slaveno-serbska pjesnarica* ['Little Slavoserbian Songbook of the Common People'] (1814). The following year he published his second collection of songs entitled *Narodna srbska pjesnarica* ['Songbook of the Serbian People']. In both collections of songs, the influence of Herder's romantic ideas about folk poetry can be found. And it was shortly after this that he published the first edition of his dictionary, with both German and Latin as metalanguage for definitions. His linguistic work also involved a spelling reform, the authoring of

a *Grammar*, and attempts at bringing more popular speech into Serbian literature.

In the meantime, mostly thanks to Jernej Kopitar, Vuk made the acquaintance of European intellectuals of that period. The German historian, Leopold von Ranke, was one such, and it was mostly based on Vuk's reports that he wrote the history of Serbs: *Die Serbische Revolution* (1804–1813 and 1815). Kopitar also connected Karadžić with Jakob Grimm with whom he shared analogous interests. Karadžić was advised by Grimm on how he should collect folk literature; like Vuk, Grimm was occupied in the compiling a dictionary (the *Deutsches Wörterbuch*). And just as the Brothers Grimm had written a grammar of their language, Vuk had of his. In fact, this synchronization of their interest and undertaking was the foundation of their contact. Much more information can be found on Vuk and his activities in the biographical study by Wilson (1970).

The Serbian Dictionary

The Serbian Dictionary explained with German and Latin words (1818, 1852) by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić is an important source for researching of both Serbian and Slavic culture. Its full original title was *Srpski rječnik: istolkovan njemačkim i latinskim riječma*, but it will henceforth be referred to as *Rječnik*. It contains linguistic, ethnographic and folklore material which makes it possible to reconstruct the language of its informants and the Serbian folk culture as a semiotic system (cf. Plotnikova 2015: 87). A lexeme in the *Rječnik* is often an entry point to worldview, beliefs, and customs, which are sometimes described in verses, phrases and stories. These descriptions are often “complete miniature studies in history, sociology, folklore, etc.”¹ (Vukomanović 1976: 714). Its special character is reflected by the fact that it provides a plethora of information on Serbian material and nonmaterial culture, and can thus be read as an ethnological testimony of a time, given in the form of a semasiologically (alphabetically) organized dictionary. In other words, the dictionary's headwords and definitions provide pictures of traditional life expressed in language as “a most distinctive mark and expression of ethnos” (Tolstoj 1995: 9). As Karadžić's explanations of the meanings of Serbian words are also the first descriptions of Serbian beliefs, prose, poetry and examples of rituals, customs and magical practice, he can be considered as one of the founders of

1 All citations have been translated from Serbian by the translator of this paper.

Serbian ethnography, sociology and folklore studies (Lukić 1966: 163–177; Lutovac 1966: 189–203; Filipović 1972: 514). For this reason, Karadžić's *Rječnik* is a source of inspiration, and a book that is "forever open" (cf. Konstantinović 1964: 7), as is also evident in the contemporary literary works and anthologies of texts based on *Rječnik*.

The two editions of Karadžić's dictionary (1818, 1852) contain not only semantic data, but also a wealth of cultural data. Our intention in this chapter is to analyze Karadžić's dictionary (1818, 1852) not so much as a work of lexicography, but as a source which makes it possible to reconstruct a world of the tradition bearers who lived in Karadžić's times, reflecting earlier centuries of material and non-material Serbian culture too. The meanings of the headwords are contextualized by customs, beliefs, oral folk poetry, etc. (e.g. the lexeme *kolač* ['bread']: "When one visits a bride's or a groom's family (or next of kin), he should bring bread in addition to a drink and other things; even dark bread is better than an empty bag"). Since the second edition of *Rječnik* contains around forty-seven thousand headwords and an abundance of descriptions of customary activities as well as oral folk poetry and prose, it is impossible to provide a separate description for each of the segments. An overview of the most representative examples of the lexemes pertaining to material and nonmaterial culture will provide a mosaic image of the folk spirit recorded in this revolutionary work of Serbian culture.

The first (1818) edition of this dictionary² is mostly based on the words which have been said to constitute "the core of the lexicographical treasure of the contemporary Serbian language" (Ivić 1966: 79). Karadžić's first goal was to collect and lexicographically present the vocabulary of his birth region, the area around Tršić.³ However, he also marked a milestone in the process of establishing the Serbian literary language, since already in 1818 he had enacted an orthographic reform, introducing a phonological spelling system, and gave grammatical information and presented the basic lexical fond of the newly created literary language⁴ (cf. Kašić 1987: 160). Karadžić also provided a rich description of how rural Serbs lived

2 The value of the first edition of the dictionary is therefore not lessened by the smaller number of words described in it (26,270 in total) in relation to the second edition (47,427 words).

3 Tršić is a village in Eastern Serbia, not far from Loznica, in the District of Mačva. Karadžić's family originally moved to Tršić from Drobniak in Montenegro.

4 The main characteristics of Karadžić's dictionary are the language of the people devoid of Church Slavonic elements, the ljekavian dialect and phonemic orthography (Ivić 1966: 46).

in his time, and in the Foreword to the dictionary (1818: viii) he stated the following: “Everything the folk knows and says about a particular word should be given in the dictionary and described as well as possible”. So already in the first edition of the dictionary, Karadžić surpassed the fragmentary attempts of his predecessors,⁵ and was the first to show the richness of Serbian rural culture.

The first edition of the dictionary (much like the second edition) presented the way of life of a person in a rural area. It included the terminology of farming and agriculture, clothing, crafts and trades, army and weaponry, food and drink, social relationships and circumstances of social life just as much as of spiritual culture. The second edition differs from it in that it included a larger number of words and sometimes contained revised definitions for previously-included words. The second edition (1852) contained a greater inventory of headwords and was richer with social and cultural information (folklore, ethnology, oral literature) that illustrated their meaning. It was the fruit of Karadžić’s longstanding research into folk life and beliefs,⁶ which he conducted in a much larger territory than Serbia covered at the time. Karadžić says the following about it in the Foreword:

I kept the words printed earlier in my head, and I wrote them down as I remembered them; the new ones added here I collected in various regions where our people lives, and in order to do this I travelled [...] to Croatia, Dalmatia, Dubrovnik, Boka Kotorska and Montenegro.

(Karadžić 1852: v)

In addition to the new local words, the lexical fond was enlarged with regional⁷ and dialectal variants of the same denotata⁸ as well as with

5 A number of authors touched upon the life of the Serbs before Karadžić. These were Jerotej Račanin (the beginning of the eighteenth century), Djordje Branković (1645–1711), Vasilije Brkić (around 1719–1791), Petar Ranjanin (1775–1836), Stevan Stratimirović (1757–1839), Sava Tekelija (1761–1842), Matija Reljković (1732–1798) and Dositej Obradović (1742–1811). Foreigners also wrote about the life of the Serbs: Francesco Grisellini, Friedrich Wilhelm von Taube, Balthasar Hacquet, Alberto Fortis (cf. Filipović 1972: 529).

6 Karadžić had associates who informed him about some meanings of words, their interpretation, customs, beliefs and folklore forms, and these were: Vuk Popović (from Risan), Vuk Vrčević (from Boka Kotorska), Djordje Nikolajević (from Dalmatia), Jovan Gavrilović (from Srem), Milica Stojadinović Srpkinja (from Srem).

7 Karadžić uses *vide* [‘see’] to refer to entries denoting regional and dialectal variants with the same meaning. The dialectal variants are contained in both editions, and this lexical diversity helped create a literary language which would “open its doors for the vernacular words, phraseology and folklore stylistics” (Tolstoj 1984: 181).

8 E.g. *breg* [‘hill’, ekavian dialect], *brijeg* [‘hill’, ijekavian dialect]; *bob*, *pasulj*, *grah*, *gra* (synonyms for beans).

foreign words, which were mostly Germanisms, Romanianisms, Hungarisms⁹ and words from the urban milieu.¹⁰ This served to show that the literary language should include both rural and urban vocabulary (Kašić 1987: 67).

The second (1852) edition was larger not only because of new lexemes or their dialectal pairs, but also because explanations and examples that accompanied the lexemes were updated with new information. The headwords now included new information and regionalisms as separate entries. For example, in the first edition, the entry for the lexeme *kolač* ['bread'] contained the expressions *Zao kolač!* ['Evil bread!'] and *krsni kolač* ['baptismal bread'], whereas in the second edition, the lexeme was also supplied with social and cultural background about and discussion of the symbolic value of bread. The inclusion of new information shows that the author approached folk life dynamically, so cultural, social and historical background and events in which these words existed can also be seen in the dictionary. The example is the lexeme *dodola*, which may refer to the rain-invoking ritual, the female participant in this ritual and the song she performs: the headword is more informative in the second edition, where it is also stated that the ritual was becoming extinct. At the same time, the lexemes in both editions of the dictionary testify to the life in all its forms and are static in character in the sense that they comprise an inventory of the material and non-material culture of the Serbs in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; they show what people ate and drank, what they wore, how they earned their living and understood the world. For this reason, even the lexemes that are not explained or have a short definition¹¹ in both editions are an important confirmation that what they denoted existed, was used and had some purpose at the time.

It should be mentioned that obscene words, phrases, descriptions and folklore forms are absent in the second edition (or hidden in phrases such as tongue-twisters), because of strong criticism from the contemporary

9 E.g. *amrel* ['umbrella'], *morel* ['painter'], *bermet* (a type of red wine), *cigla* ['brick'], *paprikaš* ['paprika stew].

10 According to Kašić (1987: 73), the category of urban lexemes includes some lexemes denoting time and weather, building materials and parts of buildings, body parts, games, food, money, diseases, clothes, weapons, household items, agriculture, traffic, kinship terms, toponyms, fauna and flora.

11 These were usually some words from the common lexical pool, e.g. kinship terms: *otac* ['father'], *stric* ['paternal uncle'], *ded* ['grandfather'], *baba* ['grandmother']; tools: *ralo* ['plow'], *međaš* ['border stone']; food and drinks: *kaša* ['gruel'], *pogača* ['flat bread']; some plant and animal species: *duvan* ['tobacco'], *pavit* ['clematis'], *srna* ['deer'], *medved* ['bear']; personal names and toponyms: *Miroslava*, *Miroč*; abstract concepts: *strah* ['fear'], *ljepota* ['beauty'].

authorities. Despite the criticisms of some Serbian readers directed at the presence of such “lewd”, “improper”, “foul” words in the first edition of the dictionary, Karadžić was right in having recorded them, because he was convinced that “such words and sayings ... show the ‘character’ and the ‘ways’ of the people, its ‘spirit’ and its ‘life’” (Pantić 1965: 605).

Traditional Way of Life in the Dictionary

The *Rječnik* reflects the way traditional people explained the world, space, time and the realia they were surrounded by. The explanations show that a great number of geographical concepts and localities are historically relevant and have beliefs and narratives attached to them. Legends about the origin of some places and locations are particularly notable: *Vučitrn*, *Golubac*, *Koznik*, *Senj*, *Zvornik*, *Kotor* and *Carigrad* [Constantinople] for example. They are sometimes just a reason to illustrate by a belief or a legend about supernatural forces, as is the case with *Kotor* and *Constantinople*. Elements of travel writings about the places Karadžić visited are also present in the dictionary, such as *Gamzigrad*, *Koviljača*, *Petrovac* and *Perušić*. This is obvious in the description of *Koviljača*, which is described with a lot of details: “Na dnu toga sela, pod samijem brdom, ima jedan okrugao brijeg, obrastao grabićima” [‘At the bottom of the village, right under the hill, there is a round hillock, overgrown with small hornbeams’] (Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 181).¹² This entry includes an etymological legend¹³ about the name of the two villages: “Srbi onuda pripovijedaju da su onuda bile dvije sestre Vida i Koviljka: pa Vida gradila Vidojevicu, a Koviljka taj Koviljaču” [‘The Serbs there talk about two sisters, Vida and Koviljka: Vida built Vidojević, and Koviljka built the city Koviljača’] (Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 181). In doing this, Karadžić not only set the framework of cultural geography (Lutovac 1966: 193), but also recorded these legends for the first time. Karadžić also gives the information about the lexeme *selo* [‘village’] which is important because it indicates what a typical Serbian village looked like on the plain and in the mountainous regions of his time: “Po brdovitijem mjestima tako su kuće razdaleko [...] a po ravni dosta su česte, ali nijesu u redu, kao npr. po Srijemu i ovuda po Njemačkoj, nego rasturene po polju” [‘In the hilly areas, houses are far

12 Some lexemes appear in only one edition of the dictionary.

13 Folk etymology in general, as illustrated by the examples from Karadžić’s dictionary, is almost always the main stimulus for the generation of more complex units – plays, rituals and plots (cf. Tolstoj 1995: 72).

from one another [...] and in the plains they are rather close, but they are not ordered in rows as they are in Srem or everywhere here in Germany, but are more scattered around'] (Karadžić 1966 [1818]: 756; Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 676).

The image of the traditional man of Karadžić's time and his activities is a more rounded one due to the documentation of words referring to house-building and sections of a house,¹⁴ tools and artifacts, as well as the terminology for farming, agriculture¹⁵ and crafts. To illustrate just the last two semantic fields, the dictionary contains over sixty words that refer to the plough and ploughing and around hundred and fifty for crafts, a large number of which are about potters and pottery. Also, the lexemes in the dictionary make it possible to reconstruct what kind of clothes and shoes people wore, such as *dolama* ['dolman'], *kalpak* ['calpack'], *kožuh* ['jerkin'] or *kićenka* ['ornamentation']. As many as five hundred words from this thematic group testify to the importance of the materials used for making clothes, shoes and jewellery.

Rural life was centred on the cultivation of plants, which is evident from the rich inventory of lexemes reflecting the way of life of the Serbs in those times. There is a developed derivational nest from the noun *kukuruz* ['maize']¹⁶ as opposed to *pšenica* ['wheat', Lat. *Triticum*],¹⁷ for example, which confirms that maize was dominant in the rural diet. However, according to the dictionary, wheat also had sacral value. This is evident from the entry for the adjective form, *žitni*, which contains the verses "Na ti snaho žita da si žitna, / Na ti snavo meda da si medna" ['Have some wheat my daughter-in-law to be like wheat, Have some honey daughter-in-law to be like honey']. These verses express the symbolic value of wheat in endowing strength, and see a young woman as the "mixture of vegetative strength, fertility, origin of life, immortality, eternal regeneration, health; [...] the multitude" (Mečanin, Radenković & Loma 2001: 180). Wheat is also a ritual food, placed at the centre of the table on holy days

14 Such words are, for example, *kučara*, *klijet*, *stasina*. *Kučara* is explained as "a partition in a building, a housing cooperative, where married men live with their wives" (Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 318)

15 Examples of tools: *ašov* ['shovel'], *crtalo* ['ruler'], *šestar* ['pair of compasses']; artifacts: *razboj* ['loom'], *košnica* ['hive']; farming: *ozimče* ['a pig fattened to be slaughtered for Christmas']; agriculture: *valov* ['trough'].

16 For example, *kukuruzan* (adj), *kukuruzina* (augmentative), *kukuruzište* ['field'], *kukuruznica* ['bread'], *kukuruzovina* ['waste'], *kukuruščić* ['small maize'].

17 Synonym: *všenica*; hyperonym: *žito* ['grain'].

(such as Christmas).¹⁸ The belief in the extraordinary power of this plant is also evident from a meal called *varica*, which is wheat cooked on *Varin dan* [‘St Barbara’s Day’].¹⁹ The dictionary says the following about *varica*: “s koje je strane navrela, te na onoj strani siju žita ove godine: jer kažu da će onamo najbolje roditi” [‘people will sow wheat on the same side of the land that *varica* froths in a pot, because, they say, that is where it will grow best’] (Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 54).

The *Rječnik* also contains the names of real and imaginary herbs and plants which were believed to have opiate and magical powers: *bendeluk* [‘henbane’], *vratić* [‘tansy’], *vratolom* [literally ‘neck-breaking plant’; this is a fictional plant], *zdravac* [‘geranium’], *kopitnjak* [‘hazelwort’], *kos-tolom* [literally ‘bone-breaking plant’; this is a fictional plant] and *rasko-wnik* (it is possible that this too is a fictional herb). Additionally, it includes the names of the plants used in rituals – and these names are related to their desired effect or their temporal or spatial aspect (Karanović & Dražić 2016a: 11). The power of the plants is described in the dictionary entries for holidays: *Djurdjev dan* [‘St George’s Day’], *Ivanjdan* [‘St John’s Day’], and their symbolic value is coded in many phrases in *Rječnik*. *Kupus* [‘cabbage’], for example, was one of the most important foods among the Serbs and was mentioned in many phrases and proverbs. The phrase *sve kupus i dijete* [‘All cabbages and a child’] contains a parallelism between the number of family members and the fertility of the cabbage, i.e. the ability to plant, grow and successfully harvest cabbage (many heads) every year, just as children could be born every year.

The patriarchal organization of families is visible in the data Karadžić provides as parts of the definitions of lexemes *zadruga* (denoting large families which included parents, sons with their wives and children and unmarried daughters), *starešina* [‘the head of the family’, who organizes the way of life for every person in the family], or *čeljad* [‘members of a large household’]. The dictionary also shows that the community had lexicalized independent way of living through the lexeme *jednoglavac* [literally ‘one-head-man’]. Gender markedness in the community was also evident in a number of tasks that were clearly gender related. One such task was slaughtering of the livestock, which, according to the dictionary description of the lexeme *klati* [‘to slaughter’] was an exclusively male

18 “one svijeće usadi u žito [...] ono žito daju žene posle kokošima da nose jaja” [‘candles are placed in wheat [...] and later women give this wheat to chickens to lay eggs’] (Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 34–35)

19 St Barbara’s Day is a Christian holiday is celebrated on December 17th in the Gregorian calendar.

work. For women it constituted a taboo, a forbidden task, permitted only under certain conditions: "žena muškobana uzme soni tučak te metne sebi među noge, pa onako s tučkom kolje" ['a masculine woman would take a pestle for salt, put it between her legs and then slaughter animals'] (Karadžić 1966 [1818]: 308; Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 272). The dictionary also describes mutual aid in the community, one form of this being *moba*, i.e. a custom of participating in a collective unpaid work for someone, such as a widow, in a form of mutual aid during the summer or other holiday, in exchange for just food and drink (Karadžić 1966 [1818]: 408, Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 365). Already in the 1818 edition, Karadžić described this custom in great detail and included three songs that used to be sung on these occasions.

Many lexemes in the dictionary show the rules of behaviour, customary law, obligations toward the members of the community and the Turks. Thus, *kotarnina* was the money given to the *spahi*,²⁰ as a tithe of the harvested seeds, whereas *krvnina* was a monetary fine for a murder or any accident resulting in death. Karadžić stated that Turkish blood was worth one thousand *groš* (in the currency used at the time) whereas Serbian blood was one hundred *groš* (Karadžić 1966 [1818]: 338; Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 300). There are also over fifty terms related to other legal customs. Some of them are paired with explanations, as is the case with the word *napolica* ['a half'], that describes a sharecropping practice: "kad se kome da nešto da radi na pola, n.p. kaku zemlju ili kaku stoku (da glavno ostaje onome čije je, a dobitak na polak)" ['when somebody is given half a job to do, for example, to work half of the land, take care of a half of the herd (so the land and the animals still belong to the person that owns them, but the profit is split in half)'] (Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 401).

Folklore in the Dictionary

Far more information about the life of ordinary folk, their material and spiritual world and the way they thought about themselves and their surroundings, can be found under the lexemes whose meanings are illustrated with the descriptions of the customs and beliefs, stories, legends, songs and fragments of songs, incantations, curses, riddles, proverbs and tongue-twisters. These were often interwoven within a single entry, as "various forms of expression one after another, as links in a chain,

20 A *spahi* was an owner of a big estate, a Turkish landlord.

[...] all fluid and emerging in a vivacious texture of the oral and the literary” (Popović 1983: 163). This kind of syncretism can be seen in the entry for the headword *kolač*: the translation (*panis genus*) is followed by a description of the norms which are operative during the special social and ritual occasions. The explanation includes a coded and symbolic value of the *kolač* [‘bread’], as the most sacral aspect of the essence of food, a symbol of abundance and well-being (cf. Mečanin, Radenković & Loma 2001: 562; Gheerbrant & Chevalier 2013: 274): “Kad se ide u prijatelje (svoji u goste) svagda u torbi osim čuture i još čega valja ponijeti i kolač (t.j. šenični hljeb)” [‘When one visits a bride’s or a groom’s family (or next of kin), he should bring bread in addition to a drink and other things’] (Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 284). The entry also includes proverbs, such as “Bolji je i crn kolač nego prazna torba” [‘A dark²¹ loaf is better than an empty bag’] (Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 284), phrases with this headword used metaphorically: “Nijesam se nadao tome kolaču” [‘I hadn’t expected that kind of bread, meaning I didn’t hope that such thing will happen’], syntagmatic combinations, and names of ritual breads: *krsni kolač* [‘baptismal bread’]. One of the characteristics of this dictionary is that information about one entity can be found under several entries, each adding a piece to the mosaic of the concept. An example for this is the lexeme *hleb* [‘bread’], which can be found under the entries *krsni* [‘baptismal’], *slava* [‘slava’], *Božić* [‘Christmas’], or the entry *Mačva* (a toponym), which states that nowhere in Serbia do people eat wheat bread on its own, as they do in Mačva.

The same methodology Karadžić uses when describing one entity within the floral semantic group. Some words belonging to the floral lexical and semantic group are accompanied with descriptions of a magical act when one is willing to create good and bad, such as casting of spells, fortune telling and incantations which serve to invoke something good or evil. According to the examples given under the entries for *mađije* [‘incantations’] and *čini* [‘spells’], these are either “cast” or “stepped upon”, which implies a need to do somebody harm. One such example is the lexeme *zatraviti*, the verb from the noun *trava* [‘grass’], which means to charm somebody by giving someone some herb to drink. On the other hand, magic can also be used to cure people. One example is the lexeme *zapis* [‘writing’], which is a testimony about the magical practice of treating sicknesses and “other evils” with some writing on a different kind of material.

21 “Dark” here refers to the colour of bread which is made of whole grain as opposed to white, finer bread made of white flour.

Such a writing can then be used as an amulet or even be eaten. The entry for *zapis* contains the following description: "od bijesna pseteta zapiše se zapis na gornjoj kori od kupovnog hleba (somuna) pa se ova kora osiječe i da bolesniku te jede, a hljeb ostane onome ko je zapisivao" ['to help cure somebody – from a mad dog, one needs to buy some bread and carve a zapis (writing) on its upper crust; then he should cut the writing out and give it to the sick person to eat, keeping the rest of the bread for himself'] (Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 188). Karadžić noted these explanations in the second edition, whereas the first only contained the meaning of the word *amajlija* ['amulet'] (Karadžić 1966 [1818]: 208). The dictionary also gives magical procedures for achieving happiness in love – *ujenčanje* ['wedding'], *navala* ['herbs' or 'spells'], fertility and good weather and harvest – *dodola*.²² There are also other descriptions of beliefs and incantations about the weather, like *zlogodnica* ['jackdaw'], a bird whose presence signifies bad weather in the year, activities to drive away vermin like the *lasa* ['weasel'], many related to wealth like *zdravljak* (a word which is connected with notion 'health'; it is used in the phrase: *zdrav zdravljače, nov novljače!* which is associated with phenomenon of the appearance of the 'new moon' when someone wishes wealth to somebody), and good health like *vilino sito* ['silver thistle'; literally, 'vila's sieve'] or *zavarčiti* ['to cast a spell'].

The dictionary also describes how people protected themselves against *urok* ['evil eye'], a look or an act which can bring misfortune on someone. One such explanation is given under the entry *gasiti ugljevlje* ['to extinguish coals'], where it is explained how water and coals can help discover who it was that cast *urok* on the sick person and how one can be cured from it:

kad se za koga misli da je urečen, onda mu bajalica gasi ugljevlje, t.j. živo ugljevlje baca u nenačetu vodu namjenjujući na one za koje se misli da su ga urekli, pa kod čijega imena ugljen potone, za onoga se misli da ga je urekao; po tom bolesnik od one vode u tripud srkne i umije se njome

(Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 83)

when a chanting woman throws coals into water thinking of a suspect person, the coals will sink or float. If they sink, it means that she had

22 The entry for the word *dodola* contains the following information: "nekoliko djevojaka kad je suša idu po selu [...] te pjevaju i slute da udari kiša" ['in times of drought, several girls go around the village and sing, calling upon rain to fall'] (Karadžić 1966 [1818]: 135–136; Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 128).

guessed right, and if they float, she has to keep on guessing. When she has guessed right, the sick person takes the water in which the coals sank, washes his face with it and drinks it

This can be understood as meaning that such water is thought to have a lustrative character.

Judging from the length of the dictionary entries and the wealth of information presented, Karadžić was most interested in folk customs and beliefs. This is evident from the descriptions of winter, spring and summer holidays – *Varin dan* ['St Barbara's Day'], *Materice* ['St Theophania the Empress' Day', or, 'Mothers' Day'], *Oci* ['Fathers Day'], *Božić* ['Christmas'], *Bogojavljenje* ['Epiphany'], *Vaskresenje* ['Easter'], *Đurđev dan* ['St George's Day'], *Spasov dan* ['Ascension Day'], *Trojice* ['Pentecost'], *Ivanjdan* ['St John's Day'], which are mostly associated with fertility. The information about the way these holidays were celebrated and the related ritual and customs was almost completely transferred from the first edition of the dictionary to the second. The entry for Christmas, for example, was enlarged with information about this custom in various regions, such as Bačka, Grblje and Boka Kotorska (Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 35). The fact that he had described the holidays as early as 1818, makes him one of the pioneers of Serbian ethnography. The dictionary is also a rich source of descriptions of rituals and customs as well as of the procedures and verbalizations that were part of them – beliefs, verses, stories. These descriptions are given with the words: *maškare* ['masquerade'], *bukara* ['bonfire'], *družičalo* ['gatherings'], *dodole*, *koleda*,²³ *krsno ime* ['the family day'], *lazarice*,²⁴ *kraljice*.²⁵ The wealth of information and lexical symbolism in verse forms can also be found in the descriptions of rites of passage related to birth: *babine* ['the postpartum period'], *jednomesečici* ['children born on the same month']; marriage: *dobjeglica* ['a girl who moves in with a boy in order to marry him against her parents wishes'], *dobra molitva* ['good prayer'], *ženidba* ['nuptials']; and death: *zadušnice* ['All Souls' Day'], *daća* ['wake'], *narikača* ['mourner']. Some expressions are difficult to understand out of context, without knowing the ritual practice. Such is the case, for example, with the description: "Nije sedmu noć dočuvan – imaju običaj reći onome ko je malo suludast" ['They lost him on

23 *Koledo* is a word of unknown origin. *Koledovanje* is a ritual procession consisting mainly of younger men who went around village on Christmas Eve.

24 *Lazarice* is a ritual procession of girls, related to fertility and initiation that went around villages on Lazarus Saturday.

25 *Kraljice* is a ritual procession associated with fertility and initiation of girls, which went around village on the Pentecost.

the seventh night – a phrase people tend to say about someone who is a bit crazy’] (Karadžić 1966 [1818]: 15; Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 10); this relates to the first seven days of the postpartum period, when the newly born babies and their mothers are guarded by women who eat and drink and sing during the whole night by their side to protect them from evil spirits.

Mythical Origins

Some explanations present the beliefs about the origin of celestial bodies, real places, otherworldly phenomena and creatures and plants and animals. Karadžić termed these beliefs “Serbian mythology”. The explanations of the origin of the cosmos and natural realia are also legends, which accordingly start with the usual “people say”, “some say”, and are followed with a short story. Such is the ætiological legend about the origin of the spots on the Moon, given under the entry *Kain i Avelj* [‘Cain and Abel’], where Karadžić notes that what can be seen on the Moon is in fact a shadow of the two brothers, left as a warning to the world about a great sin (Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 259). Another example is the story about the origin of the celestial phenomenon *kumovska slama* [‘the Milky Way’; literally ‘Godfather’s straw’] (Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 314). According to the legend, it is straw that a man (i.e. a ‘godfather’) lost while he was running away from the thief he had christened because he had stolen his straw (Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 314).

The origin of plants and animals and their characteristics can also be found under the entries of the words denoting them: “stidak ima bijel cvijet u srijedi malo crven; Srblji pripovjedaju da je ovo crveno od prije veće bilo, pa sad svaki dan biva manje: jer već nestaje stida među ljudima” [‘the white laceflower (*Orlaya grandiflora*, literally ‘shame’) has a white flower with a little bit of red in the middle; Serbs say that the red used to be bigger, but is shrinking each day: this is because shame is already disappearing in people’]. *Kornjača* [‘turtle’] originated from a story of chicken and bread not being offered to a godfather. This legend, which Karadžić had undoubtedly heard from ordinary people, was recorded for the first time in the sixteenth century and then later on several occasions, mostly in religious literature (Pantić 1988: 393–394). The *kukavica* [‘cuckoo’] derived from a woman who wailed for so long over her deceased brother that God grew tired of her and turned her into a cuckoo (Karadžić 1966 [1818]: 350, Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 312).

In the 1852 edition, the explanation included the following belief about this bird:

ko prvi put čuje kukavicu da kuka, ako je prije sunca, valja tri puta da reče: za mojim zlotvorom! U nas se misli da je kukavicu grjehota ubiti, ali ih u Dubrovniku biju i jedu i kažu da su vrlo dobre za jelo

(Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 312)

the person who hears a cuckoo for the first time before the sunrise, should say three times: cuckoo after my enemy! We believe that it is a sin to kill a cuckoo, but people in Dubrovnik kill them and eat them and say that they are very tasty

There are also stories about the origin of the parts of the human body, as is the one about the Adam's apple in men. According to the legend, it originated from an apple given to Adam by Eve, but it got stuck in his throat and he could not swallow it.

Some entries contain descriptions of great buildings, undertakings which are attributed to a man or a higher force – *Korona*, *Kraljičina vrata* ['the Queen's door'], *Carigrad* ['Constantinople']. According to the legend, the name of the toponym *Korona* was generated after the noun of similar sound, *kruna* ['crown']. As Karadžić notes, people say that the location of Sretenje monastery on the mountain Ovčar is related to the international motif of throwing a coin or crown into the air: the place where it fell determined the location of the monastery (Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 292). Under the entry for Constantinople in the 1818 edition of the dictionary, Karadžić wrote a story about a self-constructing city, which refers to an international motif about the miraculous birth of Emperor Constantine (Pantić 1988: 392), combined with the motif of the rich man and his fatal brother and son-in-law.

Demonological legends in the dictionary testify to the richness of beliefs in various supernatural creatures, encounters with them and how people saw them and fought against them, mostly unsuccessfully. For example, under the entries *veštica* ['witch'], *vila* ['fairy'], *vukodlak* ['werewolf'], *mora* ['mare'], *kuga* ['plague'] and *Trojan* ['Trojan'], Karadžić describes the beliefs about these creatures and the legends related to them. These legends are differentiated by the scope of the phenomena they describe or explain. Thus, in the 1818 edition of the dictionary, the entry *mora* ['(night) mare'] is only described as "a ghost that leans on people in their sleep" (Karadžić 1966 [1818]: 411). In the 1852 edition, the entry is enlarged with a syncretic description of the belief in this supernatural being, information about it from various regions, a legend about a man who ran away from

the (night)mare which turned out to be his horse (mare), a prayer which is read to drive it away and a piece of an advice about how to prevent this evil apparition from appearing: "Koga pritiskuje mora, treba da stavi za vrata od one sobe gdje će spavati metlu naopako kad pođe spavati" ['The person tortured by a mare should put a broom behind the door of the room in which he sleeps and position it upside down'] (Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 368).

Cultural and historic legends are presented in the entries devoted to national heroes and events from their lives: Prince Lazar, *s.v.* 'bupilo' [literally 'falling down']; Miloš Obilić, *s.vv.* 'dvorište' ['yard'], 'Mačva', 'Miloševo Skakalište', 'Obil', 'Skakalište' ['jumping place']; Stefan the Tall, *s.vv.* 'Manasija' (a monastery near Despotovac), 'Sibinjanin Janko' (a hero); Prince Marko, *s.vv.* 'Krajina', 'Kraljevića Skakala', 'Marko Kraljević', 'Mrnjavčeva Gradina'. These legends are given as parts of descriptions and explanations of various lexemes and are often internationally known. Karadžić sometimes gives several of them one after another. Thus, under the entries for *Krajina* (Karadžić 1966 [1818]: 244) and *Marko Kraljević* (Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 346) there are legends about how King Marko got his horse Šarac and several variants about Marko's death:

jedni vele da ga je negdje u selu Rovinama ubio nekakav karavlaški vojvoda Mirčeta zlatnom strijelom u usta [...], drugi vele da mu se u takovome boju zaglavio Šarac [...], treći kažu da je u takome boju toliko ljudi poginulo [...], a Bog se smilovao i nekakvijem čudnim načinom prenio i njega i Šarca u pećinu, u kojoj i sada obojica žive

(Karadžić 1977 [1852]: 346)

some people say that he was killed with a golden arrow shot into his mouth by Mirčeta, a Karavlach duke, in the village of Rovine; others say that his horse Šarac got stuck in such a battle [...], some say that many people died in this battle [...], and God felt mercy for him and Šarac and brought them both into a cave where they live to this day

Being a good narrator, Karadžić often uses funny stories to explain words: *Bogojavljenje* ['Epiphany'], *dembel* ['lazybag'], *đavolak* ['devil'], *jesenas* ['this autumn'], *pop* ['priest'] (cf. Pantić 1988: 385–386). These stories may be autochthonous or have prototypes in other cultures (cf. Pantić 1988: 382–395). There are also short funny stories based on a question and a witty answer: *svitati* ['to dawn'] and short stories to illustrate proverbs or explain their origin. The *Rječnik* of 1818 already contained more than sixty stories and at least as many excerpts from stories. Almost all of them were then published for the first time (Pantić 1988: 385–396) as the dictionary preceded the first, much smaller collection of stories by

Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1821). This is why this edition of the dictionary is considered to be the first anthology of folk stories in the Serbian area. It was followed by two collections of stories (1821, 1853) and the second enlarged edition of *Rječnik* (1852), which also contained new stories and legends.

The first edition is also rich with songs and, especially, excerpts of songs. They testify to the richness of Serbian folk poetry, which was later in the focus of Karadžić's attention. Some of the verses were taken from Karadžić's anthologies (1814, 1815), while others anticipated collections of songs that would be published later, but were already in Karadžić's possession at the time. For reasons of space, only two examples are given here – those cited under the entries for *dodola* and *zastava* ['place under the feasting table']. The first word, *dodola*, is exemplified by the verses:

*Naša doda Boga moli,
Oj dodo, oj dodole
Da udari rosna kiša
Oj dodo, oj dodoledodola*

(Karadžić 1977 [1852]: s.v. 'dodola')

[Our doda prays to God,
Oi dodo, oi dodole
For dewy rain to fall
oi dodo, oi dodole]

The complete version of this song and other *dodola*-songs were published later (Karadžić 1824: 185). The explanation for the word *zastava* includes the following: "mjesto na dnu stola, prema gonjem čelu" ['the place at the foot of the table, opposite the head'] and the verse: "U zastavu vojvodu Miloša" ['At the foot of the table, he put duke Miloš'], which is a verse from a famous Kosovo song "The Prince's Dinner" (Karadžić 1823: no. 20) stating where prince Lazar placed the hero Miloš Obilić at the table. There is also: "Kod Srba je po Ercegovini i sad običaj da u zastavu (kad je kakva čast) posade ravnoga onome koji sjedi u gornjem čelu" ['It is still a custom among the Serbs in Herzegovina to show respect to somebody on a festive occasion by placing him at the foot of the table, thus expressing that he is equal to the person sitting at the head of the table'] (Karadžić 1966 [1818]: 215). In the first edition of the dictionary, Karadžić also included humorous erotic songs and phrases which were directly or indirectly obscene, which were given as explanations of words such as *vrći se* ['take after somebody'], *zijeve* ['yawn'], *pic*, *picin* (vulgar term for the female sexual organ), *strina* ['uncle's wife']. Also, the songs and phrases in

which these occur were mostly remnants of pagan ritual celebrations (cf. Karanović 2015: 431–446).

On the basis of this segmentary overview of the way Serbian language was presented in the *Rječnik*, it can be concluded that what Karadžić accomplished was a voluminous and complex task in the field of national culture, extremely important for at least two reasons. Firstly, *Rječnik* testifies about Serbian material and non-material culture of Karadžić's time, which is based on tradition several centuries long, and is therefore more than an inventory of collected lexemes referring to existing referents. It surpasses the scope of a dictionary as it is understood in classical lexicology. In this dictionary, an entry is a motif of the social and cultural context, described by verses, proverbs, beliefs, customs, riddles, funny stories and legends; by different folklore genres which are often syncretized in a single form, where the semantics of a lexeme is implicitly incorporated in a wide network of ethnological, sociological cultural and historical data. On the other hand, information about a single phenomenon are read into other semantic contents so that fragmentary data found under one entry are combined together into a mosaic picture of the traditional man who Karadžić wanted to present as completely as possible. In the South Slavic region, *Rječnik* was the first to present, in a systematic and organized manner, a material, real and predominantly rural environment, as well as what was known, believed, habitual and ritual in the society at the time. This is almost a whole cosmogony of a people, which can serve as a basis for contemporary research of Serbian and pan-Slavic traditional view of the world. Secondly, the *Rječnik* confirms the scope of realia, their practical use, of human activities that were realized in isolation or in interaction with others, it is an inventory and a description of the historical given and of the social structure. As such, it constitutes a pioneering foundation of more modern areas of study such as ethnology, sociology and folklore, but is also an inspiration for literary and artistic achievements in theoretical sense as well as in terms of content and poetics.

The *Serbian Dictionary* remains important for contemporary research whether at an inter-Slavic level or beyond, something which lies behind the statement of Radomir Konstantinović that it is "the only book of the nineteenth century that is truly open and relevant for all eras" (1964: 7). Reconstructing the elements of material evidence and spiritual culture of Serbs described within it leads us to a picture of pre-modern man, his traditions, beliefs, and his anthropocentric understanding of the phenomena with which he is surrounded. The wealth of information given in the descriptions, with their translation into German and Latin, and the

short examples in various narrative, epic, lyrical and other forms, provides rich material for ethnologists and linguo-culturologists, whether their study have a purely local focus or a wider comparative (or contrastive) one. Regarding this, Milenko Filipović has remarked: “in 1818 Vuk still describes customs only out of lexicographic needs. But there are so many of these descriptions, and they are of such quality, that they far exceed the significance he attached to them at the time: with this Vuk has laid the foundations of Serbian ethnology” (1972: 523). This is confirmed by the words of Anna Plotnikova (2015: 87): “Vuk’s work, more specifically his *Dictionary* from 1818 serves as a direct source for the dictionary *Slavjanske Drevnosti* [edited by N. Tolstoj (1995–2012)]”. Apart from the fields of ethnology, dialectology, literature, lexicology and lexicography, the *Dictionary* is important for translators needing cultural-specific concepts, because languages do not compartmentalise non-linguistic reality in the same way (cf. Prčić 2008: 138). This is especially important when it comes to non-translation vocabulary, as a reflection of the folk cultural heritage, which Karadžić contextualised with descriptions from folk life, beliefs, and traditions. In this sense, the connotative component of lexical meaning is important in interlingual relations, which is the sum of beliefs, attitudes, opinions, feelings and associations of one ethnic group according to certain non-linguistic phenomena, and therefore the *Dictionary* can be used as source for identifying the (pragmatic) positive, negative, or neutral attitude of Serbian speakers towards a certain lexicalised phenomenon. Finally, as a synthesis of all that has been said, it can be stated that the vocabulary in the *Dictionary*, in light of modern cognitive semantics, is an example of a modern view of lexical meaning. On the correlation between cognition and vocabulary that marks a certain language in relation to others, Anna Wierzbicka (1996: 5) states that it is precisely the culturally specific meanings of lexemes that reflect and transmit, not only the characteristics of the way of life of a given social community, but also models of thought. Thus, the categories of experience of the speech representatives of a community are the background of the meaning of the word, which is known in Fillmore’s terminology as a “semantic framework” (Fillmore 1994: 28). In this light, the lexical inventory of any synchronic cross-section is the best representative of a given culture at a given time because it is “the most distinctive feature and indicator of ethnos” (Tolstoj 1995: 9), and the directions of semantic development reflect human cognitive abilities and their development (Grković-Major 2008: 52).

References

- Dragičević, Rajna. 2008. O jednoj metodi za ispitivanje uticaja kulturnih i društvenih promena na značenje reči. In Radovanović and Piper 2008: 81–95.
- Đorđević-Belić, Smiljana and Danka Lajić-Mihajlović, eds. 2015. *Savremena srpska folkloristika II*. Beograd: Institut za književnost i umetnost, Udruženje folklorista Srbije, Univerzitetska biblioteka "Svetožar Marković".
- Filipović, Milenko, ed. 1972. *Etnografski spisi, br. 17: Sabrana dela Vuka Karadžića*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Fillmore, Charles. 1982. Frame semantics. In Linguistics Society of Korea 1982: 111–137.
- Gheerbrant, Alain, and Jean Chevalier. 2004. *Rečnik simbola*. Novi Sad: Stilos.
- Grković-Major, Jasmina. 2008. O kognitivnim osnovama semantičke promene. In Radovanović and Piper 2008: 49–65.
- Ivić, Pavle. 1968. *O Vukovom Rječniku iz 1818. godine*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Kamčevski, Danko. 2012. O dalekosežnim implikacijama filologije Vuka Stefanovića Karadžića i braće Grim. *Nasleđe* 23: 103–117.
- Karanović, Zoja. 2015. Smehovno i erotsko u delu Vuka Stefanovića Karadžića u kontekstu premodernog osećanja sveta (na primeru Rječnika 1818). In Milošević Đorđević: 431–446.
- Karanović, Zoja, and Jasmina Dražić. 2016a. In the Beginning was the Word (Nomination of Plants in Karadžić's Rječnik 1852). In Karanović and Dražić 2016b: 7–21.
- Karanović, Zoja, and Jasmina Dražić. 2016b. *Plants and Herbs in Traditional Serbian Culture*. Belgrade: Folklorist Association and University Library "Svetožar Marković".
- Karadžić Vuk Stefanović. 1823. *Narodne srpske pjesme, knjiga druga u kojoj su pjesme junačke najstarije*. Lipisca: Štamparija Brejtkopfa i Eršla.
- Karadžić, Vuk Stefanović. 1824. *Narodne srpske pjesme, knjiga prva u kojoj su pjesme junačke najstarije*. Lipisca: Štamparija Brejtkopfa i Eršla.
- Karadžić, Vuk Stefanović. 1966 [1818]. *Srpski rječnik istumačen njemačkim i latinskijem riječima, tom 2: Sabrana dela Vuka Karadžića*. Beograd: Prosveta 1966.
- Karadžić, Vuk Stefanović. 1977 [1852]. *Srpski rječnik istumačen njemačkim i latinskijem riječima*. Beograd: Nolit.
- Kašić, Jovan. 1987. *Tragom Vukove reči*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Konstantinović, Radomir, ed. 1964. *Raskovnik: Proza iz Rječnika*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Linguistics Society of Korea, ed. 1982. *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. Seoul: Hanshin.
- Lukić, Radomir. 1966. Vuk i naša sociologija. In Novak 1966: 163–177.

- Lutovac, Milisav. 1966. Značaj rada Vuka Karadžića za našu geografiju. In Novak 1966: 193–203.
- Mečanin, Radmila, Ljubinko Radenković, Aleksandar Loma, eds. 2001. *Slovenska mitologija, enciklopedijski rečnik*. Beograd: Zepter book world.
- Pantić, Miroslav, ed. 1988. Vuk Stefanović Karadžić. Srpske narodne pripovetke: Sabrana dela Vuka Karadžića. 3 volumes. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Plotnikova, Anna. 2015. Srpska građa u moskovskom rečniku Slovenske starine. In Đorđević-Belić and Mihajlović 2015: 85–97.
- Popović, Miodrag. 1983. *Pamtivek. Srpski rječnik Vuka St. Karadžića*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i naučna sredstva.
- Prčić, Tvrtko. 2008. *Semantika i pragmatika reči*. Novi Sad: Zmaj.
- Radovanović, Milorad and Predrag Piper, eds. 2008. *Semantička proučavanja srpskog jezika*. Beograd: SANU.
- Tolstoj, Nikita. 1984. Srpskohrvatska dijalekatska leksikografija u lingvo-geografskoj perspektivi. In Jerković 1984: 181–190.
- Tolstoj, Nikita. 1995. *Jezik slovenske kulture*. Niš: Biblioteka slovenski svet.
- Vukomanović, Slavko. 1976. Tumačenje reči u Vukovom Srpskom rječniku iz 1852. *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane* 5: 705–716.
- Wierzbicka Anna. 1996. *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words. English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, Duncan. 1970. *The Life and Times of Vuk Stefanovic Karadzic, 1787-1864: Literacy, Literature, and National Independence in Serbia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Superstition is Deeply Imprinted in the Human Heart

Halbertsma's *Lexicon Frisicum*

Anne Dykstra

In this chapter I will deal with folklore in the Frisian-Latin *Lexicon Frisicum* (1872), compiled by Joost Hiddes Halbertsma (1789–1869). First, I will give a brief outline of the Frisian language. Then I will introduce Halbertsma and his dictionary. In the next section I will discuss folklore in a broader nineteenth-century context and explain how Halbertsma fits in. In the main part of the article I will deal with Halbertsma's ideas about folklore, or mythology, as he would call it, and illustrate by means of a few dictionary articles how these are expressed in the *Lexicon Frisicum*.

Frisian

Frisian, the language spoken in the Dutch Province of Friesland, is of West Germanic origin. Its earliest stage, Old Frisian, belongs with Old English and Old Saxon, to the North Sea Germanic group. Traditionally, three stages are recognized – Old, Middle and Modern Frisian. These three stages do not coincide, however, with the periodization of the other West Germanic dialects. Old Frisian is the language found in a number of manuscripts and charters from the eleventh to the sixteenth centuries, originating from an area ranging from the German river Weser in the East to the IJsselmeer in the West. Though the oldest manuscripts are relatively late, they often contain texts that are much older. Linguistically, these early texts reflect features that justify calling this stage Old Frisian. Middle Frisian is the term used for the language of the renaissance poet Gysbert Japicx (1603–1666), and that of the literature of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries. Frisian is the second official language in

the Netherlands. It is considered the closest living language to English. Modern Frisian is the language as it has been written and spoken since 1800.

Frisian is chiefly a spoken language. It was only in the nineteenth century that the production of written Frisian would increase significantly (Duijff 2010: 1472). Duijff rightly connects the rise of written Frisian to the influence of the Romantic Movement. Joost Hiddes Halbertsma (1789–1869), Mennonite minister, language lover, author of the *Lexicon Frisicum* and a true Romantic himself, was one of the people who strove to further (written) Frisian (Breuker 2017b).

Halbertsma and the *Lexicon Frisicum*¹

Halbertsma was involved in a large variety of fields in his long life. He was a Mennonite minister by occupation, but his interests went far beyond theology. In many of his works, language and culture are central issues. He was especially interested in Frisian in all its historical and geographical aspects and in older Dutch, and spent much of his working life on the *Lexicon Frisicum*. He chose to use Latin as the dictionary's metalanguage (Dykstra 2010 and Dykstra 2011: 89ff). Halbertsma felt that the language scholars of his time had made inadequate use of the Frisian language in comparative linguistics, and with the *Lexicon Frisicum*, he wanted to demonstrate that Frisian was indispensable for the study the Germanic languages. Therefore he regularly placed the Frisian language in a broader Germanic context in his dictionary. When Halbertsma passed away in 1869, the *Lexicon Frisicum* was not ready. In 1872, his son Tjalling published the material his father had finished in manuscript, the part *A* to *Feer*.

Halbertsma wanted his dictionary to contain all of the present and past varieties of Frisian. For Old and Middle Frisian and also for Frisian varieties spoken in Germany, he had to rely on lexicographic descriptions and text editions. Since there were no Modern Frisian dictionaries or wordlists and hardly any written contemporary sources, he had to collect nineteenth-century Frisian language and cultural material by himself. He took his fieldwork quite seriously and he carefully selected his informants. He was the first to make extensive collections of (Modern) Frisian language

1 This section is based on Dykstra (2011).

material and also the first to describe such material in a dictionary format, which makes him the founding father of modern Frisian lexicography.

Folklore in a Nineteenth-Century Context

At the start of Halbertsma's linguistic career – his first publication is from 1822 – Romanticism in Europe was already quite an influential social and political movement. Romanticism came with a great historical interest. Historical consciousness was characteristic of linguistics and other areas of the humanities. The past was an instrument for assessing and explaining the present. Throughout Europe, many scholars pursued the remnants of the idealized Middle Ages that might be found among the rural population. The scholars gathered folk tales, folk songs and fairy tales. In Germany in Halbertsma's time, Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm worked at the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* and in the Netherlands from 1864 onward the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* by Matthias de Vries was published in instalments.

There was much interest in Romantic linguistics for etymological and historical comparative research, and linguists were drawn to folklore and dialects. A people and its language were considered one and national character and national culture were no longer seen separately from one other. Romanticism was more and more influenced by nationalist ideas. One's own language, one's own history and one's own culture became highly praised. Due to the strong nationalist tendencies of Romanticism, scholars were increasingly focused on the language, history and the folklore of their own country. Halbertsma may be considered a real romanticist. He idealized the freedom-loving Frisians and their old, valuable language and culture, not to mention their superior character.

This was the time the Indo-European paradigm came into vogue. Due to this paradigm, “the vernaculars of Europe became the backbone of an ethnographic division of Europe of differently-thinking, differently-feeling nations each with their separate, specific and ethnically inherited character” (Leerssen 2017b: 60). And this is why, Leerssen suggests, “the study of language shows considerable overlap with the developing study of folklore and oral culture, the writing of national literary histories, and the investigation and edition of written sources in the nation's vernacular” (Leerssen 2017b: 60, see also: Netzer 2017, Shippey 2005a: 1, and Van der Sijs 2017). Mohnike (2017: 145) observes that the Indo-European paradigm was “closely linked to the restructuring of European societies into

civic nation-states in search of a new form of social cohesion based on language and myths". It was in this intellectual climate that Jacob Grimm published his influential *Deutsche Mythologie* (1835, 3rd. edn. 1854).

Leerssen (1999: 81) considers the activities of the brothers Grimm as trend-setting for everything in romantic Europe that was concerned with the national past. In fact, he claims that there is almost no European cultural nationalism that did not begin with folkloristic fieldwork and publications of folk songs, ballads or fairy tales and narratives. Such inventories had their origins in the new cultural sciences, and they exercised great influence on the emerging national awareness of the country in question, and they inspired poets and activists. It was very important that the collected material originated from the people itself. It was all about national traditions and traditions forming a link between past and present: continuity over time was the most important pillar in the concept of "National identity" (Leerssen 1999: 81). Old ballads, oral literature, traditional festivals and customs, fairy tales and narratives, Leerssen (1999: 80–81) explains, were important sources in which the true spirit of a people could be rediscovered, untouched by alienating cosmopolitan levelling of the "high" culture. Just as historians fall back on ethnic, ethnographic and folkloristic indications for the ancient folk culture of bygone years, Leerssen argues, folklore becomes the demotic antiquarian studies of romanticism par excellence.²

Halbertsma (1843 and later) showed himself to be an exponent of romantic general scholarship in his application of both mythology and linguistics in the solution of scholarly problems. He considered it the task of the mythologist *and* the linguist (the text has *taalbeoefenaar* ['a man of language, a language practitioner']) to uncover the religious concepts that underlie popular ideas and beliefs about North and South. He apparently saw himself as both a mythologist and a linguist, as for him mythology and linguistics were disciplines that could, or should, be practiced in combination.

Halbertsma, the *Lexicon Frisicum* and Folklore

Halbertsma had actually "been encouraged by Grimm to write about Frisian manners, customs and folktales" (Breuker 2017c). Jacob Grimm himself

2 Leerssen explicitly refers to Herder as the origin of this scholarly stance.

sent him a copy of his *Deutsche Mythologie* in the second edition of 1844³ (Van der Molen 1969: 257). The ten references to the *Deutsche Mythologie* in the dictionary show that Halbertsma used it when compiling the *Lexicon Frisicum*. Yet, the enumeration of Halbertsma's publications and manuscripts in Jongsma (1933) makes clear that his interest was mainly in linguistics (lexicography, etymology, comparative linguistics, dialectology, onomastics) and to a lesser extent in (Frisian) history and literature and folklore. Folklore certainly held his interest, though this does not show in official publications on the subject. The myths and legends that he discovered during his fieldwork have largely been incorporated into his literary work, but we also find folklore material in the *Lexicon Frisicum*. Van der Molen (1969: 260) reminds us that Halbertsma in his manuscripts never used the words *volkskunde* or *folklore*, simply because they only came into existence during his lifetime. He mostly used, as did his contemporaries, the word *mythology*, as in the title of his manuscript hs. 5464: *Aanteekeningen over Bijgeloof, tot de kennis der oude Mythologie, bij het volk zelf opgezameld* ['Notes about Superstition, to the knowledge of ancient Mythology, collected from the people itself']. Van der Molen (1969: 263) thinks that Halbertsma knew what he was talking about when it comes to folklore. He was active in many fields, from farmers' houses to folk tales, from superstition to traditional costume, from children's games to ice skating, from the national hymn to the head brooch,⁵ from the Southwest

-
- 3 Halbertsma and Grimm corresponded. In a letter from 11 June 1836 he wrote to Grimm about his observation that everywhere where farmers in the Dutch Province of Overijssel believe in *wite wiven* (spirits of wise, or witty women, AD), old Germanic sepulchral mounds were found (Van der Molen 1969: 261). Halbertsma wrote Grimm in a letter from 26 July 1855 about *bijgelovigheden* ['superstitions']. Grimm in the second edition of the *Deutsche Mythologie* (1844: 620) referred to Halbertsma's book on Buddhism (Halbertsma 1843, a facsimile of which was published in Ter Haar, Halbertsma and de Jong (2019)).
- 4 Hs. stands for *handschrift* ['manuscript']. Most of Halbertsma's library, his correspondence and his manuscripts are kept in Tresoar, the Frisian scholarly library in Leeuwarden.
- 5 In the *Lexicon Frisicum*: "eâr-izer, n. diadema fæminarum Frisïæ olim ex ferro, unde (izer ferrum) nomen trahit; deinde ex argento, nunc ex auro fabrefactum. [...] - Figure, cornua vaccæ, quod diadema muliebre antiquitus juxta utramque aurem exiebat in caput vaccæ cornubus instructum, quod amuleti vices præstabat. *Hie di kou sawol ien gouden as ien sulweren eârizer wier hja méar wurdich*, vacca plus valeret si concinnis cornubus erat instructa" (Halbertsma 1872: 114, s.v. 'eâr-izer').
 ['eâr-izer' [literally: ear iron], neuter noun, a head ornament for Frisian women, which used to be made of iron, from which (*izer*, iron) its name derives; then [made] of silver, now [made] of gold. [...] - Figuratively: the horns of a cow, because the ear iron used to stick out on both sides besides the ears like the horns on the head of a cow; this was the highest valued ornament. "If the cow had both a gold and a silver ear iron, it would be worth more", the cow would be worth more if she had nice horns.]

region of Friesland to the northern island of Terschelling, from the northern church door⁶ to country fairs.

Since Halbertsma had such a broad view of contemporary and former society, and because he put language at the centre of everything, it seems only natural that he also conveyed his interests in his dictionary. And that is what he did prodigiously. *S.v.* ‘berthe-leppel’ [‘birth spoon’],⁷ for example, he dwells on the customs and traditions around birth and *s.v.* ‘bigraffenis’ [‘funeral’] he spends more than two columns to inform the reader about a variety of subjects that are related to burial in Friesland. We find information about exorcism *s.v.* ‘düewel-banner’ [‘exorcist’]. *S.v.* ‘brilloft’ [‘wedding’] and ‘breid’ [‘bride’] we find ample details concerning marriage customs.

In many places, the *Lexicon Frisicum* has an almost encyclopedic character, partly caused by Halbertsma’s typical associative way of working.⁸ The short article *boale-moánne* [‘bread month’] may serve as an example:

boale-moánne, cg. prima mensis matrimonii, Ang. honey-moon. Lit it pear hwat máljeije, it is noch yn ‘e boale-moánne, Gal. Laissez le couple folatrer; il se trouve encore dans la lune de miel. Panis triticeus erat olim ditiorum, Hol. v. herenbrood; siligineus contra populi in

6 In the *Lexicon Frisicum*: “noarder-doárke, n. janua parva in pariete templi boreali, per quam medio ævo liti et abjectæ sortis homines intrabant templum; per portam australem, quæ et multo major et architectonicem ornatio est, intrabant libri et honestiore loco nati. In foribus, qui hanc portam claudunt, sæpe minor est janua, per quam hodie cujuscumque ordinis homines intrant: integri fores tunc tandem aperiantur, cum funus viri nobilis, ex stirpe antiqua Frisiorum, in antrum sepulchrale familiæ deducitur. [...]” (Halbertsma 1872:686, *s.v.* ‘noarder-doárke’).

[‘noarder-doárke, neuter (noun), a small door in the northern wall of the church, through which in the Middle Ages unfree people and people of low birth entered the church; through the southern gate, which is both much larger and architecturally speaking more beautiful, came free people and people of high births. The doors, which close this gate, often contain a smaller door through which today people of all ranks and positions enter: finally, the whole (large) doors are only opened when the body of a distinguished man of Frisian lineage is brought to the family vault.]

7 The *Lexicon Frisicum* makes a distinction between lemmata in capital letters and lemmata in lower case letters. The lemmata in upper case letters are ordered alphabetically. The lemmata in small letters following a lemma in upper case, have a morpho-semantic or etymological relationship with the preceding upper case lemma. They are often not in the place we would expect to find them in alphabetically. A substantial part of the *Lexicon Frisicum* is now available online at <<http://lexiconfrisicum.ivdnt.org>>, which of course makes the search considerably easier. All available articles are provided with translations in Frisian. Quite a few of them have also been translated into Dutch. Most of the articles referred to in this chapter are available online. It is the intention that eventually the entire *Lexicon Frisicum*, with translations, will be published online.

8 See for Halbertsma’s associative way of working in the *Lexicon Frisicum* also: Dykstra (2011: 81).

genere; inde Frisii distinguunt inter brea, panis siligineus, et boale, triticeus; ideo et Hol. primum tempus matrimonii vocant de wittebroodsweken, F. wigge-moânne, idem. Wiggen sunt panes ex farre triticeo puriore, forma digitorum agglutinatorum; inde Burman. 66, 'T is iette yne wigmoane. Hos panes, qui cunas referunt, Frisii comedunt in festo nati Christi. Ang. v. Christmas-batch.

(Halbertsma 1872: 442, s.v. 'boale-moânne')

boale-moânne, common gender, the first month of marriage, English *honey-moon*. *Lit it pear hwat mâljeije, it is noch yn 'e boale-moânne* [*Let the couple frolic, they are still in their honeymoon*'], French *Laissez le couple folatrer; il se trouve encore dans la lune de miel* [*Let the couple frolic, they are still in their honeymoon*']. Real wheat bread used to be something for the wealthy, Old Dutch *herenbrood* [*gentlemen's bread*]. White wheat bread was generally something for the people. Frisians make a distinction between *brea*, bread made of white wheat, and *boale*, bread made of real wheat; that is why the Dutch call the first period of the marriage the *wittebroodsweken* [*'honeymoon'*, literally: 'white bread weeks'], Frisian *wigge-moânne*, idem. *Wiggen* are loaves of somewhat cleaner wheat cereal in the form of fingers sticking together; hence Burmania 66: *'T is iette yne wigmoane* [*'It is still in the honeymoon*']. These loaves, which are reminiscent of cots, are eaten by the Frisians at Christmas. Older English *Christmas-batch*.

After giving a lexicographical definition, "first month of a marriage", Halbertsma mentions the semantically related concept of English *honeymoon*. He then proceeds with a Frisian illustrative sentence, without giving a source, followed by a French translation, also without a source.⁹ Then he adds a folkloric, rather than a lexicographical, explanation; "Wheat bread used to be for the upper class", which apparently reminds him of Dutch *herenbrood* [*'gentlemen's bread'*], white bread made from the purest and finest wheat flour. Here the article takes an encyclopedic twist. The following distinction between *brea* and *boale* might be regarded as lexicographical again. All this prompted him to explain the origin of the Dutch term *wittebroodsweken* [*'honeymoon'*]. After that he provides *wigge-moânne* as the Frisian equivalent of Dutch *wittebroodsweken*. Before he gives an example with *wigge-moânne*, in a different spelling, he apparently feels the need to explain what *wiggen* are. Finally, there follows a folkloric addition about the Frisian custom of eating these loaves to

9 It may very well be the other way around. Halbertsma often translated sentences from other sources in his dictionary, while he put the translation first.

celebrate the birth of Christ, which again inspired him to refer to Middle English *Christmas-batch*.

The entry for *boale-moànnne* is typical of how Halbertsma worked. It is not just typical of his dictionary, but also of his other works. An article on a trip to Rome may contain many pages with etymological digressions, and his short story the *Hexershól* [‘Witches cave’] (1854), is a good example of literary work in which he included a number of superstitions. He collected them in the part of Friesland that he thinks remained the most “national”, i.e. the South-West region. Halbertsma thinks that this region stands out as nowhere else can so much of the old Frisian language and of the noble Frisian character be found, and thus also Frisian national feeling (the manuscript has *nationaliteit* [‘nationality’]) and most of the old national superstitions have been preserved.¹⁰ Van der Molen tentatively argues that to Halbertsma examples of superstition are proof of the Frisianness of a region. He relates the high level of superstitionness in this region to the seafaring people, who kept many superstitions that the people who inhabited the land were no longer aware of (Van der Molen 1969: 258).

There may be no official publications by Halbertsma on mythology, we do have two manuscripts in which he deals with what we will call folklore. In Hs. 547, *De wouden* [‘The Woods’], Halbertsma maintains that the Frisians of all Germanic peoples are the only ones who, as long as history speaks, did not only preserve their name but also their ancient residences. Hence, he claims, in the countryside, where the language and habits of other peoples did not repress all originality,¹¹ the language still has expressions dating back to fifteen centuries and longer ago. Note that Halbertsma puts language and habits on a par with each other.

The main topic of manuscript Hs. 547 is pregnancy and child birth. Halbertsma claims that the Frisians always called everything by its name, the only exception being things that might offend a chaste audience. He believes that the Frisian language bears the unmistakable traces of an ancestral chastity and restraint in all matters concerning human reproduction. As an example of this he mentions the expression *hja mat nei de wâlden*,¹² literally: ‘she must go to the woods’, meaning: ‘the woman is pregnant’.

10 That is reminiscent of Grimm’s conviction that ‘to every nation a belief in gods was as necessary as language’ (Shippey 2005a: 16).

11 Cf. Leerssen (1999: 80–81) cited above.

12 Halbertsma’s spelling is pretty loose. I cite his Frisian as I found it.

We should be aware, Halbertsma says, that the forests were the first temples of the Germanic people. He thinks that the majestic and solemn Gothic churches are nothing more than a grotesque development of the idea of an ancient and arch-like oak forest. Not only did everything that was holy and mysterious attach itself to the idea of forest, but also the creative power of deity that provided for mankind at birth. If we now consider the deep secrecy with which the Frisians and the English¹³ treated all matters concerning love and wedding promises, but especially pregnancy and childbirth, it will not surprise us that they pictured childbirth as a journey to the forests (Halbertsma ca. 1853: 133). Thus, the Frisian children believe that mother is going to the woods, and that she, while heaps of children shouted at her from the branches of trees: “Take me first, take me first”, finally chose the little sister or brother, and came home with her or him. When mother needs to lie down after returning from the journey, that is because she, while grabbing the child, had stepped into a nail. Halbertsma thinks that this and other children’s tales cannot be anything else than old and original, simply because we see the ideas that come forward in them evidenced in the language. And language, other than history, always tells the truth (Halbertsma ca. 1853: 134–135).

Halbertsma must have liked the story about the forests. He refers to it in a literary publication,¹⁴ at least five times in the two manuscripts with material that he collected and later used to compile the *Lexicon Frisicum*, and in the *Lexicon Frisicum* itself, for instance *s.vv.* ‘béam’ [‘tree’] and ‘bûmi’ [North Frisian: ‘to plant trees’], where he also quotes related examples from the Dutch Provinces of Gelderland and Holland:

BÉAM [...] Bern ut ‘e héage béam helje, *liberos arcessere ex alta arbore, liberos parere. Animadvertite inter Frisios late sparsam esse fabellam infantes provenire ex arbore concava (di holle béam) summæ antiquitatis et magnitudinis, quæ latebat in immensa sylva.* [...].

(Halbertsma 1872: *s.v.* ‘béam’)

BÉAM, [...] Bern ut ‘e héage béam hellje, invite children from the high tree, have children. Bear in mind that there has been a widespread fable among the Frisians that children come from a hollow tree (*di*

13 Why the English suddenly appear here is discussed below.

14 “Reinsk ... het ien fiere reis nei de wâlden dien om ien poppe to heljen. Dær sieten honderten fen poppen yn ‘e bjemmen” [‘Reinsk.... has made a long journey to the woods to get a baby. There were hundreds of babies in the trees’] (Halbertsma 1854: 387).

holle béam [‘the hollow tree’]) that is very old and large, and that stood in a huge forest.

bûmi, *vb.a. F.b. pingere quid arbusculis. [...] Confer béam (p. 204) et adde eis, quæ monui de superstitione infantili homines nasci ex arbore concava, inde pendere phrasin, It wiif mat nei di wâlden (mulieri eundum est in sylvas) mulier est gravida, parturit. Ipsa mater enim creditur cum obstetrice et nutrice in cymba per lacus navigare in sylvam, ubi infantes aviculorum instar assultim ludunt in ramis arboris antiquæ, omnes precibus certatim petentes a matre, ut eo amplectatur. Vide plura in voce wâlden. Gelri arborem hominum genitricem appellant kinderboom, holle boom, Hol. holle boom. Vide Langedijk, IV. 367.*

(Halbertsma 1872: s.v. ‘bûmi’)

bûmi, transitive verb, (North Frisian), to decorate something with small trees. [...] Compare: *béam* [‘tree’] (p. 204) and add to that my comment that according to a childhood belief the children come from a hollow tree, hence the saying, *It wiif mat nei di wâlden* (‘The woman must go to the woods’), i.e. the woman is pregnant, is about to give birth. It was believed that the mother and the midwife and the nurse would sail in a boat over the lake to the forest, where unborn children play like flocks of birds in the branches of an old tree, and all beg loudly to be taken by the mother in her arms. Note the plural of the word *wâlden*. In Gelderland they call the tree from which the children come *kinderboom* [‘children tree’], *holle boom* [‘hollow tree’], Dutch *holle boom* [‘hollow tree’]. See Langedijk, IV 367.

Because children are being fetched from the woods, in pure Frisian one does not speak of *bern krye* [‘to get’, i.e. ‘receive children’], formed after Dutch *kinderen krijgen*, but rather of *bern helje* [‘to fetch children’]. We find the same explanation in the *Lexicon Frisicum*:

bern-helje, parere liberos; proprie petere, apportare liberos, scilicet e sylva, cujus arbores fabula infantilis perhibet in ramis ferre infantes quasi tot mala. [...].

(Halbertsma 1872: 183, s.v. ‘bern-helje’)

bern-helje, give birth to children; actually, fetch children, and take them away from a forest where, according to a children’s story, the trees carry babies on their branches as if they were apples. [...].

In Hs. 543, *De zuidzijde van het kerkhof* [‘The South Side of the Graveyard’], Halbertsma dwells on the notion of superstition. He starts off by saying that superstition is deeply imprinted in the human heart. To him, superstition is related to the longing of the heart for higher aid and the inclination of the human mind to the mysterious. Therefore it is almost inseparable from religious feeling, which is a distinguishing feature of humanity. That is why he agrees wholeheartedly with Goethe, whom he claims to have said that superstition is typical of a human being. You cannot expel it completely, because it will hide in every nook and cranny to come forward as soon as you are gone. He compares superstition to a herb, rather than to a weed. He carries this simile further by comparing the sanctified concepts of religion to good wheat. We will never be able to root out this kind of weed,¹⁵ he says, without eradicating the faith of miracles and revelation. Philosophy and education managed to eradicate all superstition in thousands of people, but their faith in the revelations of God is so weakened, that we seem to have the choice to tolerate either religion with a mixture of superstition, or to eradicate all superstition with damage to the root of religion itself.

As Halbertsma considered superstition to be an essential part of religious faith, or maybe even of life itself, it will come as no surprise that in his dictionary we find many references of it. One example is *s.v.* ‘St. Anna, Anne’:

ST. ANNA, anne, una ex Sanctis mulieribus, quas colit Ecclesia Romano-Catholica. Phrasis, Dær rint fen Sint Anna under, Hol. Daar loopt van Sint Anne onder, præstigia mixta sunt seriis. Hæc phrasis ortum debet imagini lignæ Sta Annæ, cujus ramenta vendebat piscator; hic metuens ne citius consumeretur ejus loco pergebat vendere superstitiosis ramenta e conto ligneo unci, quo imaginem e fundo aquæ tulerat. Sed longa est fabula, quam retulit Abr. Magyrus, Almanachs Heylingen. 1680. p. 189.

(Halbertsma 1872: *s.v.* ‘St. Anna, Anne’)

ST. ANNA, anne, one of the female saints venerated by the Roman Catholic Church. Expression, *Dær rint fen Sint Anna under* [‘That runs from under St. Ann’], Dutch: *Daar loopt van Sint Anne onder* [‘That runs from under St. Ann’], delusions are combined with truths. This expression must have originated from a wooden statuette of Saint Anne, scrapings of which were sold by a fisherman; but he was afraid that, in doing so, this statuette would soon be finished, so, instead, he

15 The text has *onkruid*, which in English is ‘weed’, rather than ‘herb’.

went on selling to the superstitious people scrapings from the wooden beam of the hook that he had lifted the statuette from the bottom of the water with. But this is a long story, told by Abr. Magyrus, *Almanachs Heylingen*. 1680. p. 189.

St. Anne is one of the female saints venerated by the Roman Catholic Church. Halbertsma explains that the expression *Dær rint fen Sint Anna under* [literally ‘there is something of St. Anne underneath’] refers to delusions that are combined with truths. The expression must have originated from a wooden statuette of Saint Anne, he says, scrapings of which were sold by a fisherman. Since the fisherman was afraid that, when he kept doing so, there would very soon be nothing left of the statuette. So, what he did instead, was selling the superstitious people scrapings from the wooden beam of the hook with which he had lifted the statuette from the bottom of the water. For the complete story, he refers to an external source.

The superstitious belief that *thiansters* (also, *thsjoensters*) [‘witches’] make chickens lay eggs without shells because they need eggshells to sail on lakes and seas in is discussed s.v. ‘wyn’-aei’ [‘wind egg’]:

wyn’-aei, idem quod Ang. windegg, an egg which has a soft skin instead of a shell. Halliwel. Ovum urinum, zephyricum. Male Johnsonus, “an egg not impregnated; an egg that does not contain the principles of life”. – Moike leit him nin wyn-aeyen, avuncula larga suis donis eum ponit in re lauta. – Di thiansters (thsjoensters) meitse dat di hinnen wyn-aeyen lidze, sagæ amant vehi putaminibus ovorum loco cymbæ per lacus et maria, adeoque privant ova putaminibus, cum jam in gallinis formata, at nondum posita sunt. Superstitio quoque est sagas in ovorum putaminibus vehi super aquas; inde post prandium finitum pater familias ancillam jubebat, Di aeyen goed toknetterje, heár! intende ut rite perfringas ovorum putamina! Beit-skemol foer yn ien aisdop oer ‘e Wezer, vetula Beitska in ovi putamine navigabat super Wesaram. Eadem plane superstitio regnabat inter Anglos, quibus solennis erat formula, to break the eggshell after the meat is out. Longe autem extra Germaniæ fines sparsa erat superstitio; Plinius enim, “Huc pertinet”, inquit, “ovorum, ut exsorbuerit quisque, calices cochlearumque protinus frangi aut eadem cochlearibus perforari”. Cum his conspirant quæ habet Delrio (Disquisit. Magicæ Lib. VI. c. 2. Sect. 1, quæst. 1) “Et is ova comederint eorum testas, non nisi ter cultro perfossas, in catinum projiciunt; timentes neglectum veneficiis nocendi occasionem præbere”. Confer Brand, popular antiquities, ed. H. Ellis. 1849. III, 19. (col. 71).

(Halbertsma 1872: s.v. ‘wyn’-aei’)

wyn'-aei, this is the same as English *windegg*, “an egg which has a soft skin instead of a shell”. Halliwell[1]. Water egg, wind egg. Johnson says, wrongly: “an egg not impregnated; an egg that does not contain the principles of life”. – *Moike leit him nin wyn-aejen* [literally: ‘his aunt does not lay him windeggs’], thanks to the gifts of his generous aunt, he lives a luxury life. – *Di thiansters (thsjoensters) meitse dat di hinnen wyn-aejen lidze* [‘the witches make the chickens lay windeggs’], witches like to sail lakes and seas with eggshells as boats, and therefore they steal the shells of eggs that are already formed in the chickens, but not yet laid. A superstition is also that witches in eggshells sail over the water; that’s why the father of the family admonished the girl after the meal: *Di aejen goed toknetterje, heár!* make sure you properly squeeze the eggshells! *Beitskemoi foer yn ien aisdop oer’e Weser*, old Beitske sailed in an eggshell across the Weser. This superstition was widespread among the English, among whom to break the eggshell after the meat is out was a saying. The superstition, however, also occurred far beyond the borders of Germania, as Pliny says: “As to eggshells, if you have slurped them empty, and as to snail shells, you should break them immediately or pierce them with the spoons”. This corresponds to what Delrio writes (*Disquisitiones Magicae*, book VI, chapter 2, section 1, question 1): “And when they have eaten the eggs, they throw the eggshells into the dish, never without having stabbed them three times with a knife; for they fear that the omission of this ritual act brings misfortune”. Compare Brand, *Popular Antiquities*, adapted by H. Ellis, 1849, part III, 19.

Halbertsma remarks that the superstition about eggshells is to be found among the English, too. But not only there, we find it all over the Germanic area. It is typical of Halbertsma to be aware of (inter)national folkloric connections (Van der Molen 1969: 262). Yet in his publications and in his manuscripts, he mainly focused on the special relationship between England and Friesland and between English and Frisian. In his dictionary, he actually wanted to prove that Frisian was the origin of English. It is therefore certainly no coincidence that he refers to Brand-Ellis at the end of the article,¹⁶ since he also sees similarities in manners and customs between

16 This is one of 32 references to Brand-Ellis in the *Lexicon Frisicum*. Breuker (2017a) points out other interesting non-linguistic sources in which Halbertsma found evidence for his proposition that Frisian was the origin of English, namely J. Strutt’s *Sports and pastimes of the people of England* (1801) and Cruikshank’s *Comic Almanack* for 1837, “which listed popular pastimes that had, as Halbertsma noted, Frisian analogues. [...] Friesland and England had the most witches (*tjoensters*) and shared a number of cultural traditions and popular customs [...]”. The *Lexicon Frisicum* has four references to Strutt, and only one to Cruikshank, none of them very relevant to the relationship between England and Friesland.

Friesland and England. He acknowledges that there was no communication between the Frisian country people and those of England during the last fourteen centuries. Yet, when we find both the same language and the same customs, excluding those derived from Rome's missionaries, Halbertsma thinks that we can be sure they date back to the times that the English and Coastal Saxons, as he calls them, together with Frisian colonists,¹⁷ conquered Britain (Halbertsma c. 1853: 134).

As far as maternity celebrations are concerned, Halbertsma discovered much more similarity between those of the Frisians and the English than he thought one could reasonably expect of two kindred peoples having been separated for more than fourteen centuries. He noticed, for instance, that in Friesland the women who come to visit the new mother, bring her spice loaf, rusks, candy, tea, coffee, fine cake, etc., while in England visitors brought lots of rusks, waffles, crispbread (spice loaf) and large cakes to the new mother (Halbertsma c. 1853: 142). I have found no mention of this in the *Lexicon Frisicum*.

It is still customary among the Frisians that the person after whom the newborn child is named gives the child a birth spoon. In England, Halbertsma tells us, witnesses of the baptism ceremony used to give spoons of gold-plated silver to the child. They were called Apostle spoons, because the images of the Apostles were engraved or cut at the top of the stems. The rich gave the full dozen, the ordinary citizens gave four spoons and the poorer ones gave only one, the one that worshipped the image of the saint after whom the child was named (Halbertsma ca. 1853: 143). *S.v.* 'berthe-leppel' ['birth spoon'] Halbertsma also refers to the English *Apostle-spoons*, though less extensively than in his manuscript.

berthe-leppel, cg. F.u. geboorte-lepel, cg. cochleare argenteum datum infanti recens nato ab eo, cujus nomen ferebat. Manubrii extremitas erat ornata imagine apostoli vel Sancti, cujus nomen ceperat infans. Inter Anglos, quibus hic mos olim sacer habebatur, tale cochleare adeo apostle-spoon dicebatur. (Popular antiquities, Brand, Ellis. II. 83.) [...].

(Halbertsma 1872: *s.v.* 'berthe-leppel')

berthe-leppel, common gender, Town Frisian *geboorte-lepel*, common gender, a silver spoon given to a newborn child by the person he was named after. The end of the spoon was decorated with an image of

17 Note the term 'colonists', which is supposed to underline where the relationship between England and Friesland, their languages, and their customs takes its origin.

the apostle or saint after whom the child was named. Among the English, for whom this was a sacred custom, such a spoon was called an *apostle-spoon*. (*Observations on Popular Antiquities*, Brand & Ellis, II, 83).

Next to superstition, pregnancy and child birth, the *Lexicon Frisicum* shows that there are many other folkloric topics that Halbertsma apparently is interested in. Among them are marriage, death, and witches.

We find a number of common beliefs about death *s.v.* ‘fai’:

FAI, FAEI, adj. morti proximus specie bonæ valitudinis et salutis. [...] Ex variis ominibus veteres portendebant lethalem exitum vel futuram securitatem hominis. Tutus erat, si adveniebat dum amici de eo confabulabantur; hi eum adhuc salutant verbis Dou bisthe noch net fâi, *lupus in fabula; incolumis es. Surdum inopinata mors non manebat; Dy doaf is is nat fâi. Contra campanæ sonus tristis portendit mortem instantem hominis corpore sano; Di klok liedt fâi. Si canis nocte dieque latrat in vicinia domus ægroti, hic morti propinquus habetur. Superstitio eadem regnat inter Anglos. “If dogs houle in the night neer an house, where somebody is sick, ’t is a signe of death”. Brand, Ellis. III. 185. De Scotorum ominibus mortis futuræ consule Brand, popular antiquities, Ellis, III. 228. Fâi teken, omen lethale. Scoti fye-token, idem. Some observing to an old woman, when in the 99th year of her age, that in the course of nature she could not long survive, “Aye!” Said the good old woman with pointed indignation, “What fye-token do you see about me?” Brand, pop. Ant. Ellis, III. 228. Hy is sa fâi as ’n lûs op ’e kaem, in vitæ periculo versatur ut pediculus in pectine. – Omina sæpe signis contrariis homines decipere amabant. Infantem, qui formâ antecellebat omnes, morti invisum olim credebant vetulæ; ideo nutrices sollicitæ antiquitus faciem venustam conspuebant. – Si quis amicus, cui erat mens sana in corpore sano, amicum ex gravi morbo cubantem visitabat, timebant ne, dum hic reconvalescebat, ille moreretur. Inde proverbium tritum. De siecke leijt op het bêd en de faije giet er om oft stiet er foor, *Burm. 11. De sîke op it bæd ind di fâye er foar, F.o. De kranke ligt to bedde un de fege sit d’r feur, ægrotus cubat in lecto, morti propinquus assidet lecto. Hæc religio alte radices figerat in omnibus Frisiæ cognatis gentibus, præsertim Scandinaviæ, ex. gr. Suethis, Prov. Ofta sitter fege wid them sjukas sæng, sæpe ægrotantis lecto assidet morti proximus, Ihre, feg. I. 459.**

(Halbertsma 1872: *s.v.* ‘fai’)

FAI, FAEI, adjective, near death, while apparently healthy and well. [...] From various omens the Frisians of former times used to predict

whether someone would die or stay alive. Someone was safe if he showed up with friends while they were talking about him; they greet him then with the words *Dou bisthe noch net fâi*, we were just talking about you. You're not in danger yet. A deaf man awaited no unforeseen death: *Dy doaf is is nat fâi* ['who is deaf, is not in danger']. On the other hand, gloomily ringing bells predict the sudden death of a healthy person: *di klok liedt fâi* ['the bell tolls sadly']. When a dog barks around a sick person's house day and night, it is considered an announcement of death. The same superstition reigns among the English. "If dogs houle in the night neer an house, where somebody is sick, 't is a signe of death". Brand & Ellis III 185. About omens of death with the Scots, see Brand *Popular Antiquities*, [ed.] Ellis, III. 228. *Fâi teken*, omen of death. Scots *fye-token*, idem. *Some observing to an old woman, when in the 99 th year of her age, that in the course of nature she could not long survive, "Aye!", said the good old woman with pointed indignation, "What fye-token do you see about me?"*, Brand, *Popular Antiquities*, [ed.] Ellis, III. 228. *Hy is sa fâi as 'n lûs op 'e kaem*, he's in mortal danger like a louse on the comb – people liked to try to neutralize omens with opposite signs. A child that surpassed everyone in beauty was doomed to death, old women used to believe. That's why, in former times, nannies spit upon a pretty face. – When a friend, healthy in mind and body, visited another friend who was lying seriously ill in bed, people feared that while one recovered, the other would die. Hence the common proverb, *de siecke leijt op het bêd en de faije giet er om oft stiet er foar*, Burmania 11. *De sike op it bæd ind di fâye er foar*, East Frisian *De kranke ligt to bedde un de fege sit d'r feur*, the sick man is in bed and the dead man is sitting next to him. This belief was deeply rooted in all peoples related to the Frisians, especially the Scandinavians, for example the Swedes. Proverb: *Ofta sitter fege wid them sjukas sæng*, often the dead person sits at the sick person's bedside, Ihre, lemma feg. volume I. 459.

The adjective *fai* means 'very close to death, while apparently healthy and well'. From different signs, the Frisians of former times predicted that someone would either die or remain unharmed. You were safe when you arrived while others were talking about you. A deaf person awaits no unforeseen death. A sad ringing of a bell predicts the sudden death of a healthy person. When a dog barks at night and during the day in the vicinity of a sick person's house, it is assumed that he is close to death. Halbertsma found the same superstition among the English: "If dogs houle in the night neer an house, where somebody is sick, 't is a signe of death". His source is Brand-Ellis, to whom he also refers for predictions of an approaching death in Scotland. He compares Frisian *fâi teken*

[‘a deadly omen’], with Scottish *fye-token*. People wished to deceive bad omens with opposite signs. Thus, old women believed that a child that was so much more beautiful than all others was hated by death. That’s why the concerned nurses spat on the beautiful face. When a friend, who was sound in mind and body, visited another friend who was seriously ill in bed, people feared that he would die while his ill friend was recovering. Hence, what Halbertsma calls, the worn-out proverb “The ill person is in bed, but the one who is close to death is near the bed”. Halbertsma claims that this belief is deeply rooted in all peoples related to the Frisians, especially in Scandinavia.

S.v. ‘faentsje’ [‘small flag’] Halbertsma throws his nets even further:

faentsje, n. vexillum parvum. [...]. Vexillum Frisiae olim notabant septem foliis nymphæ F. pompe-bledden, quæ repræsentabant septem Zelanden, agros maritimos, in quos Frisiam dispertiebant. Hæc planta quaquaversum in lacubus et aquis pluviatilibus Frisiae nostræ læte floret. Radices agit in fundo, unde scapus ascendit donec se emergens aquæ supernatat ibique lata folia (pompebledden) et flores splendidos, sive albos, sive flavos [...] expandit. Similis huic nymphæ est lotus Ægyptiaca, imago symbolica incubationis et creationis mundi ex aqua. [...].

Ex Aegypto evanuit, crescit vero et luxuriat incomparabili pulchritudine in aquis pluviatilibus Indiæ, ubi Budhisticis est imago symbolica dei intaminati. Aquam habebant symbolum seductionis et feminæ, et ut nymphæa lotus supernatat aquam madore intacta, sic deus se commoveri non sinit illecebris et voluptate. Hinc est quod Budhisticæ repræsentant deum ut adolescentem sedentem in flore et foliis loti natantis. [...]. Dum Germani ex India migrabant in Europam, hanc religionem secum tulisse videntur; certe ejus vestigia restabant apud veteres Frisios, qui hanc plantam verecunde et non sine quodam timore arcano tangebant. Dum nos pueri per hos flores navigabamur, nemo nostrum eos decerpere audebat; communis enim superstitio inter nos ferebat, temerarium, qui hunc florem manu tenens caderet, protinus morbo comitali corripitur vel mori. F. pompebledden, folia nymphææ, proprie folia dejicientia, prosternantia.

(Halbertsma 1872: s.v. ‘faentsje’)

faentsje, neuter (noun), small flag. [...]. The flag of Friesland used to be drawn with seven water lily leaves. Frisian *pompe-bledden*, which represented the Seven Sealands (areas by the sea in which Friesland was divided). This plant grows everywhere in the lakes and rain puddles of our Province of Friesland. It strikes root at the bottom, where the stem grows until, rising up, it floats on top of the water surface,

exhibiting broad leaves (*pompebledden*) and beautiful flowers, either white or blond [...]. Similar to this water lily is the Egyptian lotus, a symbol for the hatching and creation of the world from the water. [...].

It has disappeared in Egypt, but it grows and flourishes with incomparable beauty in the rainy waters of India, where for Buddhists it is a symbol of the immaculate nature of God. They hold the water to be a symbol of temptation and women, and just as the *nymphaea lotus* floats on the water with an untouched humidity, so the god does not allow himself to be touched by temptation and lust. That is why the Buddhists present the god as a young man sitting on the flower and leaf of the floating water lily. Frisian: *It wiif is sa falsk as 't wetter jip is*, that woman is as mean as the depth of the water. While the Germanic people from India moved to Europe, they seem to have brought this faith with them. Traces of this have certainly been preserved by the old Frisians, who touched this plant respectfully and not without a certain sacred awe. While we as boys were playing boat with these flowers, none of us dared to pluck them; a common shared superstition said that the reckless one who would fall when holding this plant with his hand would immediately perish or die from falling sickness. Frisian *pompebledden*, leaves of the water lily, actually falling leaves.

The seven water-lily leaves (Frisian *pompebledden*), in the Frisian flag inspired Halbertsma to write a short treatise about the water lily, which is very common in water-rich Friesland. It has broad leaves (the *pompebledden* themselves) and beautiful flowers, which float on the water surface. He compares the water lily with the Egyptian lotus, a symbol for the creation of the world from the water. It disappeared in Egypt, but it grows and thrives in the rainy waters of India, where for Buddhists it is a symbol of God's immaculateness. They hold the water for a symbol of seduction and woman, and just as the *nymphaea lotus* floats on the water with an undisturbed moistness, so the god does not let himself be moved by seductions and lust. That is why the Buddhists present the god as a young man sitting on the flower and the leaf of the floating water lily. As the Germanic people moved from India to Europe, they seem to have brought this faith with them, says Halbertsma. There have certainly remained traces of this in the ancient Frisians, who respectfully and not without a certain sanctified awe touched this plant. This reminds Halbertsma of the times when as a boy he and his friends were sailing their boats between the water lilies. None of them dared to pick them, because of a common superstition that

said that the reckless one who would fall, while holding a water lily in his hand, would immediately die because of an epileptic fit.¹⁸

Conclusion

Halbertsma's scholarly production does not immediately reveal a great interest in folklore, but his literary work and dictionary most certainly do. His dictionary, due to its encyclopedic character, is an excellent vehicle for giving folklore the attention it deserves according to the nineteenth-century Romantic scholarly paradigm. In the *Lexicon Frisicum*, Halbertsma shows himself to be a worthy member of the nineteenth-century community of general scholars. Not only did he deal with language, he also recorded a wide variety of folklore and historical and other non-linguistic topics. By recording Frisian folk culture and passing it on, the *Lexicon Frisicum* made an important contribution to Frisian cultural nationalism. Breuker (2017c) writes that “[u]ntil his death, Halbertsma remained convinced of the pagan, ancient-Germanic origins of much of what remained in language and popular life of Frisians and Englishmen”. We have seen that the *Lexicon Frisicum* by no means contradicts Breuker's claim. Van der Molen (1969: 257) regards Halbertsma as a folklorist *avant la lettre*. Even though we do not have many complete studies and in spite of the fact that the material is scattered, Van der Molen thinks that we may and should honour Halbertsma as one of the first, if not the first, Frisian folklorist, who moreover has been important for other Dutch regions as a faithful, diligent and accurate fieldworker (Van der Molen 1969: 263).

18 This is also described in a footnote in Halbertsma's book on Buddhism (Halbertsma 1843: 10). Ter Haar (2019: 42) characterizes that publication as “mainly a personal pamphlet in which the writer tries to connect Buddhism (the oriental lotus) with his Mennonite background and Frisian culture (the Frisian waterlily leaf)” [translated from Dutch].

References

- Breuker, Philippus. 2017a. Language interest: Frisian. In Leerssen 2017a II: 946–947. <https://doi.org/10.5117/9789462981188/ngXE1T16jYOT3IkCQX2TjEwh>
- Breuker, Philippus. 2017b. Frisian historical fiction. In Leerssen 2017a II: 950–951. <https://doi.org/10.5117/9789462981188/ngKR2C46wKRG5VxTDMDG8Rju>
- Breuker, Philippus. 2017c. Mythology: Frisian. In Leerssen 2017a II: 947–948. <https://doi.org/10.5117/9789462981188/ngRY3V16dSoN2CeSKRKNbYqb>
- Considine, John, ed. 2010. *Adventuring in Dictionaries: New Studies in the History of Lexicography*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.
- Duijff, Pieter. 2010. The Language Norm in a Century of Frisian Dictionaries. In Dykstra and Schoonheim 2010: 1471–1484. <<https://goo.gl/wBZ5Uz>>.
- Dykstra, Anne. 2010. Joost Halbertsma, Latin and the Lexicon Frisicum. In Considine 2010: 238–255.
- Dykstra, Anne. 2011. *J. H. Halbertsma als lexicograaf: Studies over het Lexicon Frisicum (1872)*. Ljouwert: Afûk. <https://hdl.handle.net/11245/1.345550>
- Dykstra, Anne and Tanneke Schoonheim, eds. 2010. *Proceedings of the 14th EURALEX International Congress*. Ljouwert: Fryske Akademy. <<https://euralex.org/category/publications/euralex-leeuwarden-2010/>>
- Grage, Joachim and Thomas Mohnike, eds. 2017. *Geographies of Knowledge and Imagination in 19th Century Philological Research on Northern Europe*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.
- Grimm, Jacob. 1844. *Deutsche Mythologie*. Second edition. Göttingen: Dieterich.
- Haar, B. J. ter, T. H. F. Halbertsma and A. de Jong. 2019. *De predikant en de Boeddha: Beschouwingen bij de heruitgave van Joost Halbertsma's 'Het budhisme en zijn stichter' uit 1843*. Gorredijk: Noordboek.
- Halbertsma, Eeltsje and Joost Hiddes Halbertsma. 1854. *Leed in wille en De Flotgærzen*. Deventer: De Lange.
- Halbertsma, J. H. c. 1843 and later. *De zuidkant van het kerkhof*. Manuscript Tresoar Hs. 543. In Kalma 1969: 68–92.
- Halbertsma, J. H. c. 1853. *De wouden*. Manuscript Tresoar Hs. 547. In Kalma 1969: 133–148.
- Halbertsma, J. H. 1854. It Hexershool. In Halbertsma and Halbertsma 1854: 324–454.
- Halbertsma, Justus [= Joost Hiddes] 1872. *Lexicon Frisicum: A–Feer: Composuit Justus Halbertsma Hiddonis filius: Post auctoris mortem edidit et indices adiecit Tiallingius Halbertsma Justi filius*. Deventer: De Lange. [in 1874 and 1876 unaltered editions were been published by Martinus Nijhoff in Den Haag].
- Halbertsma, Hylke et al. eds. 1969. *Joost Hiddes Halbertsma 1789–1869: Brekker en bouwer*. Drachten: Laverman.

- Jongsma, P. A. 1933. Dr. J. H. Halbertsma. *Een bijdrage tot de kennis van zijn persoon, zijn denkbeelden en zijn arbeid*. Doctoral dissertation, Universiteit van Amsterdam. Sneek: A. Flach.
- Kalma, J. J. 1969. *Kent Gij Halbertsma van Deventer?* Drachten: Laverman.
- Leerssen, Joep. 1999. *Nationaal denken in Europa: Een cultuurhistorische schets*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Leerssen, Joep. 2017a. *Encyclopedia of Romantic Nationalism in Europe*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. <<https://ernie.uva.nl/viewer>>
- Leerssen, Joep. 2017b. Language Interest: Europe – Introductory Survey Essay. In Leerssen 2017a I: 59–63. <<https://ernie.uva.nl/viewer>>
- Mohnike, Thomas. 2017. Frédéric-Guillaume, or Friedrich Wilhelm, Bergmann and the Birth of Scandinavian Studies in France Out of the Spirit of Comparative Philology. In Grae and Mohnike 2017: 139–158.
- Molen, S. J. van der. 1969. Halbertsma as folkskundige. In Halbertsma, Hylke et al eds. 1969: 257–263.
- Netzer, Katinka. 2017. Language Interest: German. In Leerssen 2017a II: 988–990. <https://doi.org/10.5117/9789462981188/ngYF1U26kZPUijINRARU2Fxi>
- Shippey, Tom. 2005a. A Revolution Reconsidered: Mythography and Mythology in the Nineteenth Century. In Shippey 2005b: 1–28.
- Shippey, Tom. 2005b. *The Shadow-Walkers: Jacob Grimm's Mythology of the Monstrous*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Sijs, Nicoline van der. 2017. Language Interest: Dutch. In Leerssen 2017a II: 801–803. <https://doi.org/10.5117/9789462981188/ngYF1U26kZPUijINRARU2Fxi>

Between and Betwixt the Folklorist and the Lexicographer

The Case of Some Greek Glossary Compilers at the End of the Nineteenth and in the Early Twentieth Century

Haralampos Passalis

θήρμη η, [πυρετός], [...] θεραπεύεται δε δι' επωδών, ως εξής: Ο γητευτής λαμβάνει τρία φύλλα ελαίας. Επί του πρώτου γράφει [...] Επί του δευτέρου: Ιησούς Χριστός και επί του τρίτου [...] Είτα τα τρία αυτά φύλλα θέτει επ' ολίγων ανημμένων ανθράκων εντός καπνιστηρίου [...] τα περιφέρει διά του καπνιστηρίου τρις επί της κεφαλής του πάσχοντος. Μετά ρίπτει την τέφραν των εντός ποτηρίου ύδατος, όπερ ο πάσχων πίνει αμέσως. Τούτων γενομένων η θεραπεία επέρχεται πλήρης. (Καθ' υπαγόρευσιν της θείας μου κ. Κασσιανής Χρ. Γεωργιάδου, ετών 56, γινωσκούσης ταύτην παρά του πατρός της) [...].

(Farmakidis 1983 [1912–1925]: 383)

therme, [fever] [...] cured with incantations as follows: the charmer takes three leaves from an olive tree. On the first one he writes [...] In the second: “Jesus Christ” and in the third one [...] Then he places those leaves onto a few burning charcoals in an incensory [...] [and he] rotates it [the incensory] over the head of the sick person. Afterwards he puts ash into a glass of water, which the sick one instantly drinks. When the procedure is complete the person recovers fully. (Reported by my 56 year-old aunt, Mrs Kassiani Chr. Georgiadou, who found out about this healing process from her father) [...].

ατραγάναις, [...] Την λέξη ταύτην ευρίσκω εν τω ακόλουθω μυρολόγιω γραιάς τινός εν τω βορείω χωρίω των Καρδαμύλων. Η γυνή αύτη απώλεσε τον σύζυγόν της και τρεις υιούς συμπνιγέντας εν τρικυμία, παρά τα παράλια της Μυτιλήνης [...] Ανάθεμα σε, βρε βοριά, ου που πνίγεις καράβια. | Γεμίζ η θάλασσα πανιά, | και άμμος παλληκάρια. |

*Μες τες μεγάλες θάλασσοες| και μες στες ατραγάνες| κοιμάται κύρης
και παιδιά| και μη τους εξυπνάτε.*

(Paspatis 1888: 99)

atraganes, [‘big stones, rocks on a beach’], [...] I encountered this word in the following lament of an old woman from Kardamila, a northern village. That woman lost her husband and her three sons who drowned in a tempest on the coast of the island Mitilini [...] ‘Goddamn, North Wind,| for you sink ships. | The sea is full of floating sails,| and the sand [is full] of young men. | Into the vast seas | and among *atraganes* [‘big rocks’] |there lies husband and children| do not wake them’.

The texts above come from entries in glossaries compiled at the end of the nineteenth century and in the first decades of the twentieth. An ethnographic documentation of a folk therapeutic practice is recorded in the entry for *θέρμη* [‘fever’] in a Glossary (*Γλωσσάριον Ξενοφώντος Π. Φαρμακίδου*) compiled between 1912 and 1926 by a Greek-Cypriot folklorist and lexicographer Xenophon P. Farmakidis (1875–1943). It is worth adding that the second healing ritual, which includes a quite extensive verbal charm, is also cited in the same entry. The second text, namely the entry on *ατραγάναις* [‘big rocks’] from the *Το Χιακόν γλωσσάριον, ήτοι η εν Χίω λαλουμένη γλώσσα μετά τινών επιγραφών αρχαίων τε και νέων και του χάρτου της νήσου* [‘Glossary of the Chian Language: The Spoken Language on the Island of Chios, with Some Ancient and Contemporary Inscriptions along with a Map of the Island’] by A. G. Paspatis (1888) includes a lament, where the word *ατραγάναις* is found, along with information on the origin of this text. From a lexicographic point of view, those two entries do not follow the standard microstructure of a dictionary or a glossary entry.

Studies which include entries with such a structure are titled glossaries, dictionaries, lists or catalogues of words, or just words – the terms are often utilized without semantic differentiation¹ – and appear in the

1 The majority of these studies are titled *Γλωσσάριον* [‘Glossary’] (Defner 1872; Marangos 1874; Tsitselis 1875; Klon 1879; Papazafiroopoulos 1887; Paspatis 1888; Anagnostou 1903; Loukas 1979 [1898–1925]; Psaltis 1905; Aravantinos 1909; Farmakidis 1983 [1912–1925]; Dawkins 1916, Kondylakis 1983 [1870–1919]; Amantos 1925) or *Λεξιλόγιον* [‘Vocabulary’] (Mousaios 1884; Gonios 1891; Manolakis 1891; Papadopoulos G. 1891; Zikidis 1891; Valavanis 1892; Glykas 1896; Zografakis 1896; Kondylakis 1990; Poulakis 1891; Stamatelos 1880; Krinopoulos 1889). On occasion however they are titled *Λεξικόν* [‘Dictionary’] (Poulakis 1896; Zois 1963 [1898–1916]; Defner 1923), *Συλλογές λέξεων* [‘Collections of words’] (Damiralis 1891) or just *Λέξεις* [‘Words’] (Sakellarios 1891: 422–892). However, irrespective of how they are titled,

Greek-speaking area approximately from the second half of the nineteenth until the first decades of the twentieth century.² The compilers collected their data from various regions where the majority of Greek populations were not yet incorporated in the officially recognized Greek territory, or had only recently been incorporated into the newly-established Greek state.³ We shall examine a few of the most representative cases of glossaries of this type attempting to identify the kind of ethnographic data included in the entries. Subsequently, we will try to detect the factors that led to the emergence of those glossaries during the specific period along with the reasons justifying such extensive coexistence of ethnographic and linguistic information.

Representative Cases of Linguistic and Ethnographic Fluidity

One of the first representative cases of this type of glossaries is the *Γλωσσάριον συγκριτικόν ελληνοκαππαδοκικών λέξεων* [‘Comparative Glossary of Cappadocian Greek Words’] compiled by P. K. Karolidis and published in Izmir in 1885. The main objective of Karolidis (1849–1930), teacher and history lecturer in the University of Athens, as he explained in the introduction of the book, was, on the one hand, to document the language spoken in Cappadocia and, on the other, to verify that it is indeed

based on the commonly acceptable distinction, according to which glossaries (< Latin *glossarium*, ancient Greek *γλώσσα* [‘rare idiomatic words’]) list words not belonging to the vocabulary of the standard language, all the above texts can be categorized as glossaries, since they all include dialectal material.

- 2 It has to be noted that in this study we have also included glossaries which were published for whatever reason much later in cases where they were in fact compiled before the first two decades of the twentieth century. The glossaries of Loukas (1979 [1898–1925], Cyprus), Farmakidis (1983 [1912–1925], Cyprus) and Kondylakis (1990 [1870–1919], Crete) belong to this category.
- 3 These studies gather and publish dialectal material from various regions where Greek-speaking populations existed, such as (in alphabetical order): Cappadocia (Karolidis 1884), Cephalonia (Tsitselis 1875), Chios (Paspatis 1888; Vios 1920; Amantos 1925), Crete (Zografakis 1896, Kondylakis 1990 [1870–1919]), Cyprus (Sakelarios 1891: 422–829; Loukas 1979 [1898–1925]; Farmakidis (1983 [1912–1925]), Epirus (Gonios 1891; Zikidis 1891; Aravantinos 1909), Fertakaina (Krinopoulos 1889), Icaria (Poulakis 1891), Imvros (Glykas 1896), Naxos (Damiralis 1891), Karpathus (Manolakis 1891), Karystos (Papahatzis 1915), *Lebissos* (Mousaios 1884), Lesbos (Defner 1872; Anagnostou 1903), Leukada (Marangos 1874), Minor Asia (Dawkins 1916), Nisyros (Papadopoulos G. 1891), Peloponnesus (Papazafiroopoulos 1887), Pontus (Stamatelos 1880; Valavanis 1892), Samos (Zafiriou 1914), Saranta Ekkliisies (Thrace) (Psaltis 1905), Sikinos (Poulakis 1896), Syros (Klon 1879), Tsakony (Defner 1923), Zakyntos (Zois 1963 [1898–1916]).

a Greek dialect (Karolides 1885: 6). For this reason, and through field research, the compiler collected “living monuments” (*τα ζώντα μνημεία*) of this particular Greek dialect, phrases, songs and myths which, according to him, “despite being vulgar and barbaric [*χυδαίων μεν και βαρβάρων*] are rich in literary treasures” (6). The study comprises two main parts. The first part, following a brief introduction (3–7), examines the ancient Cappadocian language (7–24) and then the spoken Greek language of the area (24–108) in terms of its relevance to other languages such as Sanskrit, Latin, Turkish, Persian, Phrygian, etc. In the first chapter the comparison between the Cappadocian and Armenian language is prominent (62–108). Thus it lists alphabetically 99 dialect words, derived from Armenian. The second part of the study comprises a grammar (109–129) and a glossary of the spoken Cappadocian language entitled *Κατάλογος λέξεων αξιοσημειώτων της εν Καππαδοκία λαλουμένης ελληνικής διαλέκτου* [‘Catalogue/List of Remarkable Words in the Spoken Greek Dialect in Cappadocia’] (132–221). This list records 463 words. The microstructure of the entries, both in the part referring to the relation of the dialect with the Armenian language and in the overall word-list at the end of the book, is almost always restricted exclusively to the explanation of word meanings and to providing relevant observations from a comparative point of view.

Although Karolides’ main interests were historical and linguistic, in the word-lists we often encounter interesting ethnographic information. For example, in the entry *Άλης* [‘Alis’, the name of a demonic entity] (137–138), a custom dealing with the problems of a woman who has recently delivered a child is documented. Equally interesting information is recorded in many other entries.⁴ A most interesting four-page entry (71–75) is for the word *Βαρτουβάρια* [‘Vartouvaria’], a ritual feast connected to the ancient Greek celebration of *Ανθεστήρια* [‘Anthestiria’]. In this entry, the researcher provides detailed information and description on the folk rituals of the area during the celebration, comparing them with the corresponding customs of other adjacent regions. Karolides is a characteristic case of an expert researcher who investigates the origin and the relations of the dialect in question based on a historical-comparative

4 The entry *Σιφώτ ή σιφώτης* (a kind of demon related to the Christian celebration of Φώτα [‘Epiphany’]) (Karolides 1885: 212–213) is a characteristic example. Ethnographic information is also documented in the entry *Μαγ’α Μάγασου(ν)* (191–192), a nonsensical phrase used in a children’s game (the first word is a name and the second is related to a verb which means ‘to count’). Karolides explains how the game is played, thus enriching the article with an analytical, detailed, two-page description of it.

method. Nonetheless, sufficient ethnographic data do also emerge in this otherwise strictly linguistic approach.

An indicative case of blurring the line between ethnographic and linguistic information is the glossary included in the study *Περιουναγωγή γλωσσικής ύλης και εθίμων του ελληνικού λαού ιδία δε του της Πελοποννήσου παραβαλλομένων εν πολλοίς προς τα των Αρχαίων Ελλήνων* [‘A Collection of Linguistic Material and Customs of the Greek Nation, to be Found Mainly in the Area of Peloponnesus and Compared to those of the Ancient Greeks’] compiled by P. Papazafiroopoulos (1819–1908), a priest and scholar in Vitina (County of Arcadia, Peloponnesus), and published in Patras in 1887. This study consists of two parts. The first part (27–210) records data on life-cycle customs (marriage, birth, funerals). The second part assembles simple forms of oral literature.⁵ Then follows a glossary of about approximately 1,700 alphabetically listed words (369–526). Each entry includes information on the typology, morphology, and in some cases on the etymology of Greek words originating from Latin, Italian and Turkish. Excerpts from folk songs (and even complete songs), proverbs, nursery songs, blessings and curses, toasts, sayings, and legends are incorporated in several entries. Information concerning various aspects of contemporary Greek traditional life, nursery rhymes, food, tools and utensils, etc. is also frequently encountered. Likewise, there is recurrent information regarding superstitions as well as prejudices and generally practices and beliefs which are incongruent with the official recognized religious system.⁶ It is noteworthy that in the entry *γητεύω* [‘to charm’] the texts of seven verbal charms are quoted.⁷ The recurrent entries of this type of information are justifiable owing to the author’s dual capacity as a scholar and a priest. Due to the author’s sensitivity to issues incongruent with the officially accepted religious system, a range of information about superstitions of the region’s traditional culture is preserved and recorded in the entries. The main purpose of the

5 Such as proverbs (Papazafiroopoulos 1887: 212–315), riddles (316–323), puns (324–331), curses, (332–333) greetings (334–335), superstitions (335–345), weather predictions (345–355), legends (356–362) and riddles (363–368).

6 Aim of the author is also to educate the lower social classes of the Greek population as well as his fellow priests thus contributing to the elimination of prejudices and superstitions related to ignorance; for the function of clerics during this period see also Passalis 2011.

7 One against the pain in the eye (*Επί πάσχοντος τον οφθαλμόν*, p. 409), two for healing wounds (*Επί τραύματος*, p. 409), two charms against tuberculosis (*Επί χοιράδων*, p. 409–410), one for lichen (*Επί λειχήνων*, p. 410) and one against epilepsy (*Επί επιληπτικού παιδίου*, p. 410).

collection and publication of this material is, however, to verify and to prove the relation of the Modern Greek population to the ancient Greeks.⁸

Folklore data is documented to a lesser extent in another glossary edited a year later, *Το Χιακόν γλωσσάριον, ἤτοι η εν Χίω λαλουμένη γλώσσα μετά τινών επιγραφών αρχαίων τε και νέων και του χάρτου της νήσου* [‘The Glossary of the Chian language: The Spoken Language on the Island of Chios, with Some Ancient and Contemporary Inscriptions along with a Map of the Island’] (1888). The author, A. G. Paspatis (1814–1891), a doctor and a scholar with significant research work in the field of Byzantine studies, was one of the founders of the Philological Society of Constantinople and the Society Korais in Athens.

This glossary consists of an extensive introduction (Paspatis 1888: 1–40) which, besides the information on the sources, methodology and objectives, also includes notarial documents of the eighteenth and nineteenth century as well as archival data on the island’s history and topography. Then follows a glossary of about 2,500 words (41–400). Each entry includes grammatical information and a definition. There is frequent discussion of the historic evolution of the specific word as well as references to other researchers who have studied that word, as in the case of Adamantios Korais, one of the most prominent Greek intellectuals of the Modern Greek enlightenment.⁹ Texts from oral literature such as curses, blessings, proverbs and riddles are cited in several entries. Though limited from two, up to a maximum of four, verses, there is also an extensive number of excerpts from folk/demotic songs.¹⁰

-
- 8 His procedure was to draw comparisons between Modern Greek customs and language material and ancient ones derived from excerpts taken from Homer, Aristophanes, Euripides, Sophocles and other writers of the classical antiquity (Papazafiroopoulos 1887: 19–20, 30–31).
- 9 Within the echelons of the Greek intellectuals active during the peak period of the Modern Greek enlightenment (1770–1820), two antithetical trends emerged towards traditional culture: one purely rationalistic, the other leaning towards the tenets of Romanticism. The former, propounded by a circle of scholars surrounding Adamantios Korais (1748–1833) residing at the time in Paris, was based on the premise that the common people constitute the lower level of the culture predominated by ignorance and superstitions. The basic aim of these scholars was to establish a connection between the ancient and Modern Greek culture by educating the masses in an effort to impart to them the achievements of a glorified ancient Greek past.
- 10 Although the compiler generally avoids quoting a wider range of contextual information and extensive texts, he is not reluctant to record longer songs; for example, an eight-verse lament in the entry *ατραγάναις* [‘big stones, rocks at the shore’] (Paspatis 1888: 99) presented above, and a 10-verse folk song in the entry *κοντόγιερμα* [‘evening’] (Paspatis 1888: 193). Detailed information on performative context is also noted in the phrase entry *Άρα ει παρα ει, στου Δημήτρη το μανδρί* (Paspatis 1888: 90). This almost nonsensical utterance is used in children’s games thus the writer makes a thorough reference to the rules of the game to explain its meaning.

The 151-page glossary included in the study *Λεσβιακά, ήτοι συλλογή λαογραφικών περι Λέσβου πραγματειών* [‘On Lesbos: A Collection of Folkloric Treatises on Lesbos’] by Sp. Anagnostou, published in Athens in 1903 is, from many perspectives, of exquisite interest (Anagnostou 1903: 49–160). The whole study consists of three main parts, called *βιβλία* [‘books’]. The first book treats the grammar of the dialect, the second book is a glossary *per se*. The third book (161–254) is a collection of tales, proverbs, and a wide range of folk songs. The writer gathered all the data from farmers and the elderly who live in the northern part of the island (Anagnostou 1903: γ’), while working as a teacher (Anagnostou 1903: β’). The glossary in the second part includes approximately 900 alphabetically-listed entries. Each entry includes information on grammar, a definition and plentiful examples of their use in context. Several entries in this glossary feature texts of oral literature, primarily proverbs (accompanied by meaning and explanation of their usage), but also verse extracts from folk/demotic songs, nursery songs, and to a much lesser extent, blessings, curses, proverbs and puns. Similarly, information about superstitions, therapeutic practices, and a range of customs are listed in many entries; such instances are often justifiable by the need to clarify the entry’s meaning.

From the perspective of ethnographic documentation, the entry *φτάζιμος* (a kind of bread made with various herbs during the first fortnight of August, commonly known as devil’s bread) (Anagnostou 1903: 153–154) is exceptionally interesting. This entry, which takes up almost one page, includes a remarkably meticulous description of rituals and incantations performed during making *φτάζιμος*. Equally remarkable information is cited in the entry *φτύκα*, which is a bundle of wheatgrass with a repelling power against demons (Anagnostou 1903: 154), in the entry *δηκοχτού* (a bird that belongs to the family of pigeons known as colared dove) (Anagnostou 1903: 83–84), where an aetiological tradition explaining the name of the bird is quoted, and in the entry for the adjective *δίτσος* [‘fair’] (85–86) in which a detailed description of a nursery game is recorded. In the entry *δουντόππτα* (a pie made for a child’s teething) (Anagnostou 1903: 86), there is a reference to a folk custom performed when a baby’s first tooth appears to predict the child’s future profession. It is also worth mentioning that the entry *ακάρ’* (the last weaving stick of a loom) quotes oracular customs performed to predict the gender of an unborn baby (Anagnostou 1903: 51).¹¹

11 In many cases the writer seeks for interrelations between the presented folk traditions with those of ancient Greece. The entry *βγάζω* [‘take out’] (Anagnostou 1903: 74) is a characteristic example as it includes information on curses in Ancient Greece.

An equally interesting blurring of boundaries between folkloric and linguistic material is found in Cyprus among a group of glossary compilers who studied the vernacular of the island from the mid-nineteenth century on. The main advocates of this fluidity throughout the period of our concern were, in sequence, A. Sakelarios, G. Loukas and X. P. Farmakidis. All these authors of glossaries kept contact with Greek cultural centres in Athens, as well their contemporary journals and the Philological Societies. They were all teachers, methodically involved in the collection of linguistic and folkloric data.

The first compiler, Athanasios Sakellarios (1826–1901), who is regarded today as the founder of the Cypriot folklore research, published in Athens in 1855 the first volume of his work *Τα Κυπριακά, ήτοι πραγματεία περί γεωγραφίας, αρχαιολογίας, στατιστικής, ιστορίας, μυθολογίας και διαλέκτου της νήσου της Κύπρου* [*Kypriaka: A Treatise on Geography, Archaeology, Statistics, History, Mythology and Dialect of the Island of Cyprus*]. A decade later, in 1866, he published the second volume of his study titled *Η εν Κύπρω Γλώσσα* [*Language in Cyprus*]. Both volumes were reprinted in 1891 under the title *Τα Κυπριακά, ήτοι γεωγραφία, ιστορία και γλώσσα της νήσου Κύπρου από των αρχαιοτάτων χρόνων μέχρι σήμερα* [*Kypriaka: The Geography, History and Language of the Island of Cyprus from Ancient Times until Today*]. The second volume, with the subheading *Η εν Κύπρω γλώσσα* [*Language in Cyprus*] includes an extensive glossary (entitled ‘Words’) of approximately 550 pages containing over 10,000 medieval and modern Cypriot entries (Sakellarios 1891: 422–975). Each entry includes information on grammatical category, morphology and semantics. Couplets, proverbs, riddles and curses along with extracts of folklore songs and tales are frequently, yet in moderation, recorded in the entries, since the writer makes relevant references to other sections of the same work where more explicit information is cited. The aim of this work is to contribute to the study of the Cypriot dialect, especially when the association of the dialect with the ancient Greek is disputable. According to the writer such a relation is evident in the study of vernacular linguistic material since the Greek language is maintained in its purest form in its dialects (Anagnostou 1903: στ’).

G. Loukas (1843–1925) continues A. Sakellarios’ effort. What is noteworthy in the field of linguistics is his work *Λεξιλόγιον περί της λαλουμένης γλώσσης των Κυπρίων* [*Vocabulary of the Cypriot Spoken Language*]. The first four fascicles of his dictionary which included the letter “A”, were published between the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first of the twentieth in Lemesos (A 1898, B’ 1899, Γ’ 1899, Δ’ 1902) and received

awards in linguistic competitions of that period (Loukas 1979 [1898–1925]: 16–17). However, the publication of the work in a single volume of 522 pages, with over 5,000 entries, only happened much later, in 1979, by the Cypriot Scientific Research Centre. The information included in this study, was gathered by the writer himself from various parts of the Cypriot countryside (16). Each entry consists of information on morphology, typology, definition, yet only occasionally successful etymologies, while the main characteristic is the numerous references to ancient Greek texts (Papadopoulos 1979: iv; Cypri 1979: 6). A considerable amount of information occurs in his study, which can be effectively utilized also from an ethnographic perspective. In many entries are registered texts of oral literature, such as couplets, proverbs, riddles, and less frequently curses, tongue-twisters, nursery songs, prayers, excerpts from folk/demotic songs as well as legends and superstitions. However, he scarcely overwhelms the structure of the entry with additional information, since, whenever the entry is connected with folk life and customs, the author makes references to his purely folklore study *Φιλολογικές Επισκέψεις* [‘Philological Reflections’] (Loukas 1874). What is also characteristic of the entries in this Glossary written by Loukas is the quest for the ancient Greek origins of the Cypriot words.

The most representative amalgamation of ethnographic and linguistic material from Cyprus is, however, observed in the case of *Γλωσσάριον Ξενοφώντος Π. Φαρμακίδου* [‘Glossary by Xenophon P. Farmakidis’]. Its compiler, Xenophon P. Farmakidis (1875–1943), documented linguistic and ethnographic data from various regions in Cyprus during his teaching career (or on tours, solely organised for the specific purpose) (Cypri 1983: xii). All his material was published in a series of 10 publications entitled *Συναγωγή Κυπριακών Λέξεων* [‘A Compilation/ Anthology of Cypriot Words’] appearing between 1912 and 1925. Each issue comprises words from Α to Ω from different areas of the island of Cyprus (Cypri 1983: xi) and was submitted autonomously in linguistic competitions held by the Linguistic Society of Athens. All of the sections were published in 1983 in a single compound volume which comprises approximately 5,000 entries. Each entry includes information on definition, morphology, dialect variations, as well as analysis of grammatical and phonetic phenomena connected to the word and often its etymology which emphasizes the ancient Greek origin of the Cypriot dialect (Cypri 1983: xiii). Apart from its purely linguistic value, this glossary is remarkable for the vast amount of ethnographic information to be found in its entries. There are texts of oral literature in a number of this dictionary’s entries, such as folk/demotic

songs, couplets, proverbs, riddles, curses, blessings, work songs and tongue-twisters. Ethnographic information is also easily traced in entries connected to food, magic, healing, folk customs/folk religion, legends, gestures, agricultural tools, jobs, weather predictions. The detailed documentation of children's games is also noticeable to such an extent that the gathering of the relevant entries could stand as an autonomous study.

One of the most distinctive entries, *κλήδονας* (Farmakidis 1983 [1912–1925]: 161–162), covers two pages and outlines a detailed description of divinatory rituals that young girls performed on the 3rd and/or the 5th of May to make a prediction concerning their future husbands. A 21-verse incantation is also listed in the very same entry. The entry *πύρωμα* ['erysipelas'] (275) gives analytical descriptions of treatments for the disease, including texts of three different incantations. One incantation is listed in the entry *σταφυλίτις* ['tonsillitis'] (278) while two therapeutic rituals against fever are reported in the entry *θέρμη* ['fever'] (383).¹² His tendency, also, to document and record the most accurate information is evident in the fact that in the period of our concern this is the only glossary where there are supplementary and explicatory pictures and sketches in the entries.

Folk information is also noticeable in less elaborate glossaries published in editions, mainly journals, of the two main philological societies of that time, *Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* ['The Philological Society of Constantinople'] and *Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Παρνασσός* ['The Parnassus Philological Society']. The first volume of *Modern Greek Analecta* published by the Parnassus in 1872 includes a dictionary of 44 pages classifying words from Lesbos, *Γλωσσάριον Λέσβιον* ['Glossary of Lesbos'] (Defner 1872: 385–429), while a glossary including approximately 3,000 entries from the island of Kefallinia (*Γλωσσάριον Κεφαλληνίας* ['Glossary of Kefallinia']) by Tsitselis (1875: 145–360) is included in the second volume of the same issue. Both glossaries are in accord with the general consensus of that time which aspires to provide proof for the continuity of Greek culture and civilization from the ancient Greece and include folk and linguistic information, albeit to a lesser extent. The glossaries published by the Greek Philological Society of Constantinople are in a similar

12 He does not hesitate to incorporate personal experiences to confirm the definition of the word he examines (v. *καμήλα* ['camel']: Farmakidis 1983 [1912–1925]: 462–463), while elsewhere he gives detailed descriptions of agricultural activities like the planting of cotton (486, s.v. 'πηλιώτικον'). In some cases though, he is inclined to amplification in order to clarify where he encountered the word. For instance, the entry *λόδιον* ['rag'] (476–478), one and a half pages in length, reports a legend where this rare word is found.

spirit. One of their most characteristic publications is the two-volume work *Ζωγράφιος Αγών, ήτοι Μνημεία της Ελληνικής Αρχαιότητος ζώντα εν των ελληνικώ λαώ* [*Zografios Competition: Ancient Greek Monuments Current Alive in Greece*] (Zografios Agon, vol. A' 1891, vol. B' 1896). This work constitutes an anthology of linguistic and folk data, submitted to the Linguistic Society's competitions and comprises brief glossaries which are either published autonomously or incorporated into a broader collection of folkloric data.¹³

Linguistic and Folkloric Data and National Identity Formation

Some first, basic observations stem from the examination of these glossaries. All the compilers include ethnographic data in their entries, to a greater or lesser extent. Almost all of the compilers consider it their national duty to embark upon the collection of folk material and customs, since they are convinced that this material demonstrates the continuity of Greek culture and civilization from antiquity up to their own times. Their published material relates to dialectological areas, that is, where a specific linguistic variety of the Greek language is spoken and which they try to link to the ancient Greek language. This material is often submitted to competitions organized by contemporary philological and linguistic societies. All such glossaries compilers, scholars, priests and mainly teachers had been brought up within a broader climate of linguistic archaism and thus kept their distance from the material they collected.

To understand the phenomenon under examination fully we should look into the conditions that allowed and facilitated the production and the reproduction of this type of text. All these dictionaries and glossaries begin to appear during the second part of the nineteenth century and constitute products of an era, whose main aim was to prove the relation of

13 What is interesting in the first volume of Zografios Agon (1891) is the glossary written by G. Zikidis (1891) which is part of his broader study *Νεοελληνικά Ανάλεκτα της Ηπείρου* [*Various Neo-Hellenic Material of Epirus*]. This 33-page glossary includes extracts from folk songs, proverbs, curses, blessings. Information relevant to simple forms of oral literature is identified, yet to a limited extent, in other glossaries of the same volume. Glossaries are published also in the second volume in 1896, such as *Λεξικόν ιδία της Σικίνου και τινων άλλων τόπων* [*Dictionary from Sikinos and Other Areas*] (Poulakis 1896), *Λεξιλόγιον Ίμβρου* [*Vocabulary of Imvros*] (Glykas 1896) and *Δημοτικά Ανάλεκτα του χωρίου Ρωγδίας της Κρήτης* [*Folk Analecta from the Village Rogdia in Crete*] (Zografakis 1896).

Modern Greek customs and language with those of antiquity.¹⁴ The substantiation of this relation during the first years of the Greek Independence – but also throughout the nineteenth century – was essential for the formation of the Greek national identity, which was vital for the young Greek state (Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1997: 39; Herzfeld 1982: 6–7). The chief aim of many glossaries of the time (Papazafiroopoulos 1887: 19; Mousaios 1884: ιζ; Defner 1872: 4) was to prove this continuity, a continuity which was at the time articulated in ethnic/racial terms and which was subject to challenge by European researchers such as Fallmerayer, who expressed the anti-Hellenic thesis in an historical monograph, *Geschichte der Halbinsel Morea während des Mittelalters* (1830).¹⁵ Many compilers emphasize the need of restoring this connection, which is not directly obvious because of the fact that the Greeks, throughout their long history, came into contact and were influenced by other cultures which had left their traces and partially altered the Greek language and customs (Papazafiroopoulos 1887: 13; Paspatis 1888: 23).

The vernacular material, both linguistic and folkloric, was included at that time in the broader category of the so-called “living monuments of Greek antiquity” (Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1997: 67), a category constructed to serve the ideological, political and historical conditions of this era. The collection and publication of relevant material was encouraged and promoted also by the official Greek state. The Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs through the 2 March 1857 circular (no. 1837), but, also through that of 11th December 1887, urged both civil servants and private workers to collect relevant material and submit it for publication either to the government newspaper or to other journal or privately published editions (Polymerou-Kamilaki 2012a: 1132–1135). The government circular, moreover, that was signed by N. Politis (Polymerou-Kamilaki 2012a: 1138–1140), the founder of folkloric studies in Greece, aimed at reaching mainly the Greek school-teacher community and to encourage them to collect any material connected with folk/demotic Greek that they

14 For a brief outline of the general ideological, political tendencies on which the approach to folklore was based during the nineteenth century in Greece see Passalis 2017; Passalis & Politis 2017.

15 In this work, Fallmerayer expressed that not the slightest drop of undiluted Hellenic blood flows in the veins of the Christian population of present-day Greece. A reaction to those theories which contributed to the immediate proliferation of folkloric studies by affording vernacular culture political importance, thus transcending the limits of the academic field, was induced by scientific, philological, historical, linguistic and folkloric studies carried out by scholars of the time (Loukatos 1978: 58–59; Herzfeld 1982: 75–88).

come upon. Amongst this material are included, according to the circular, folksong, legends, proverbs and riddles, customs and manners, as well as popular beliefs and superstitions (Polymerou-Kamilaki 2012a: 1140).

This tendency was further reinforced by the establishment of various philological societies. In March 1861 the Philological Society of Constantinople was established, while in 1865 the Philological Society of Parnassus appeared in Athens. In 1863 the first issue of the journal of the Philological Society of Constantinople was published. In 1875 the same society also supervised the competition of Zografion (Ζωγράφειος Αγών), which involved the issuing of the awards for ten essays written on the topic of “living monuments”, that is on essays concerned with the presentation of Greek dialects, manners and customs of the Greek people (Loukatos 1978: 63). According to the rules of the competition,

Ὅτι κατ' ἔτος ἀπονεμηθήσονται κατὰ τὴν ἐτησίαν τοῦ Συλλόγου εορτὴν χρηματικαὶ ἀμοιβαὶ δέκα, ὡν ἐκάστη δέκα ὀθωμ. λίραι, εἰς συλλογὰς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀποστελλομένας τῶν ζώντων μνημείων τῶν διατηρουμένων ἐν τῇ γλώσσει τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ λαοῦ, ἤτοι 1) λέξεων καὶ φράσεων· 2) κυρίων ὀνομάτων· 3) δημοτικῶν ἀσμάτων καὶ διστίχων· 4) παροιμιῶν, ἀινιγμάτων καὶ λογοπαιγνίων· 5) παραμυθίων· 6) περιγραφῶν παιδιῶν ἀμφοτέρων τῶν φύλων· 7) εὐχῶν καὶ καταρῶν· 8) ἐπωδῶν, καὶ οἰουδήποτε ἄλλου τοιοῦτου.

(Philological Society of Constantinople 1875 IΘ: 188–189)

There will be awarded every year, on occasion of the Society's annual festival, ten lire to every submitted collection sent to the society on the following topics: 1) words and phrases, 2) proper names/nouns, 3) folksong and couplets, 4) proverbs, riddles and word puns, 5) fairy-tales, 6) descriptions of games played by both sexes, 7) blessings and curses, 8) charms and other relevant material.

In the rules of the competition are included instructions on the way and the method of data selection (Giannakopoulos 1998: 420–421). The approach of and preference for approaching traditional culture in this period of time was mainly of an ethnic and patriotic nature: its aim was to promote, through a parallelism between modern and ancient Greek customs, the unbroken continuity of the Greek ethnic state.

Of course the everyday people during this period of time were far from being viewed as part and parcel of the romantic ideology, but rather as the ignorant mass which were used ideologically as long as their cultural manifestations were able to corroborate the link between ancient and modern Greece. The compilers of glossaries were scholars and academics, who had

been brought up within a broader climate of linguistic archaism and who thus kept their distance from the material they collected and published. It is worth noting that the content of all entries of almost all the above mentioned glossaries are written in a strictly literary language, *καθαρεύουσα* [‘puristic Greek’]. Moreover, some compilers, such as Valavanis (1892) in his glossary titled *Ζώντα μνημεία της ανά τον Πόντον ιδιωτικής* [‘Living Monuments of Pontus Private Life’], feel the need to translate the entries in the scholarly, archaic Greek of the time. Some others, such as Papazafiroopoulos, feel the need to be apologetic for their academic interest in folklore. To support and endorse this choice Papazafiroopoulos refers to the broader climate prevalent in Europe, one that supported and promoted this type of research, and uses the example of the first issue of the French journal *Revue des Traditions Populaires* edited in 1886 in Paris (Papazafiroopoulos 1887: ζ’).

Between Ethnography and Lexicography

The information listed next to the entries of these glossaries is to be located on the borderline between ethnography and lexicography. Many of the above compilers collected their material using the ethnographic method of field research. It is worth noting how some compilers collected their data as discussed in the introduction to their second pamphlet:

Την παρούσαν συναγωγήν συνέγραψα ουχί επί τη βάσει των έργων των προ εμού ερμηνευτών και συλλογέων, αλλά συνέλεξα τας λέξεις εξ αυτού του στόματος του αγροτικού λαού, μεθ’ ου ηρχόμενη εις επικοινωνίαν. Πολλάκις έδιδον αφορμήν εις γέροντας και ωρίμους άνδρας απαιδέντους να μοι διηγώνται διάφορα ανέκδοτα του βίου των ή άλλα ιστορικά, καθ’ α μετά προσοχής ηκροαζόμενη και ελάμβανον σημείωσιν πολλών γνησίων κυπριακών λέξεων ή άλλων μη συνηθιζομένων εις άλλα χωρία της ίδιας επαρχίας ή άλλων επαρχιών. Και δεν ηρκούμην μόνον εις τούτο, αλλά προεκάουν αυτούς να προσφέρωσιν ευκρινέστερον λέξιν τινά και να μοι ερμηνεύσωσιν και να επεξηγήσωσιν αυτήν, υποβοηθών αυτούς διά διαφόρων σχετικών ερωτήσεων.

(Farmakidis 1983 [1912–1925]: 47)

The present anthology is not based on preceding collectors, but I gathered all the words, by word of mouth, from residents in rural areas, with whom I conversed. Quite often I encouraged the elderly and mature uneducated men to narrate facts of their life which I

attentively heard and I noted down genuine Cypriot words, or words uncommon in other villages of the same or of different rural districts. Still, I found that insufficient, so I urged them to clearly articulate the word and give an explanation of it. I also asked them various relevant questions.

Πανταχόθεν συνέλεγον άσματα και παροιμίας. Διήλθον πάμπολλα χωρία, συναναστράφην μετά χωρικών, ήκουσα άσματα αδόμενα, παροιμίας, ανιγήματα, τα πάντα καταγράφων, τα πάντα αδιαλείπτως μελετών και παραβάλλων [...] Περιφερόμενος εν τοις χωρίοις της νήσου και αφόβως εισερχόμενος εν ταις καλύβαις των φιλοξένων χωρικών, εμάνθανον λέξεις, γνωστάς μεν εν τισι χωρίοις, αγνώστους δε εν άλλοις.

(Paspatis 1888: 27)

Far and wide, I collected songs and proverbs. I visited numerous villages, encountered villagers, heard songs, proverbs, riddles and I constantly recorded, studied and compared everything [...] Wandering around the island's villages, I fearlessly entered the cottages of hospitable villagers and acquired words familiar to some, unknown to others.

In some cases they incorporated in their entries information connected with their sources; for instance residence, name and age of the informants. A characteristic example is the entry *ευρετή* ['treasure'] in the glossary of Farmakidis:

[...] Η Επιστήμη Χαραλάμπους, κάτοικος του χωριού Μονής της επαρχίας Λεμεσού, καταγόμενη δε εκ του χωριού Βάσα, παρά το χωριόν Σανίδα της ίδιας επαρχίας, γυνή εξηκοντούτις, μοι διηγήθη ότι ο άγιος του χωριού της ερωμάτισεν στον πατέρα της ότι εις την τοποθεσίαν Κούντουρος υπάρχει ευρετή και να υπάγει προς εύρεσίν της. Ούτος δε, αφού ηγέρθη εκ του ύπνου λίαν πρωί, περιχαρής παρέλαβε την σύζυγόν του και μετ' αυτής μετέβη εις το υποδειχθέν μέρος. Υπήρξε δε μεγάλη η έκπληξις του, όταν εύρε μεν το αγγείον, οίον το περιέγραψεν εις αυτόν ο άγιος αλλά κενόν.

(Farmakidis 1983 [1912–1925]: 63)

[...] Epistimi Charalabous, a sixty-year old woman, resident of the village Moni, in Lemesos, born in the village Vasa, near the village Sanida of the same district, recounted to me that the patron saint of her village, appeared in her father's vision and directed him to Kountouros location to find a treasure (*ευρετή*). Thus, he woke up very early and happily set out with his wife to the place the saint had indicated.

Nonetheless he was astonished to find a vessel, like the one described by the saint, yet empty.

The fact that the academic field of folklore studies was still in the making in combination with the fact that most compilers were neither expert folklorists nor specialized lexicographers, can account for this blurring of boundaries in an era, whose main aim was to prove the relation of Modern Greek customs and folk language with those of antiquity. This archaic-centered approach of folk material that was promoted at the time led to the establishment of Greek Folklore Studies as a separate and autonomous academic field in the first decades of the twentieth century.¹⁶

It is worth mentioning that Nikolaos Politis, the founder of the Greek Folkloric Studies, in 1874, published his work titled *Μελέτη επί του Βίου των Νεοτέρων Ελλήνων: Νεοελληνική Μυθολογία* ['A Study of the Life of Contemporary Greeks: Modern Greek Mythology'] (vol. A' 1871, vol. B' 1874), mainly aiming to showcase those points where Modern Greek culture intersects with the ancient one. The same researcher, who, in his capacity as head of the department of primary and secondary education (1884–1888), was, indeed among the most important pioneers for the collection of linguistic and folkloric material.¹⁷ The Greek Folklore Society (*Ελληνική Λαογραφική Εταιρεία*) was founded in 1909 after his own initiative, and the same year it published the first issue of the first strictly folklore journal titled *Λαογραφία* (Laographia, i.e. folklore). In this very first issue, Politis (1909) provided the definition of folklore as well as a diagram of thematic areas. Indicative of the systematization of folklore studies in the beginning of the twentieth century was the establishment, in 1914, of the National Music Collection (*Εθνική Μουσική Συλλογή*) which aimed at the musical recording of songs, as well as the establishment of the Folklore Archive (*Λαογραφικό Αρχείο*), in 1918, whose mission was to collect, rescue and publish the monuments of the life and the language of the Greek people and their folkloric legacy.

16 A characteristic example of different approach before and after this chronological border is to be traced in the case of a dictionary that was published first in 1898 titled *Φιλολογικόν και Ιστορικόν Ζακύνθου* ['Philological and Historical Dictionary of Zakynthos'] by Leonidas X. Zois (1963 [1898–1916]), a dictionary with an abundance of folkloric material cited in its entries. In the 1963 edition its title was modified and it was titled *Λεξικόν ιστορικών και λαογραφικών Ζακύνθου* ['Historical and Folkloric Dictionary of Zakynthos'] (vol. A': *Ιστορικών – βιογραφικών* ['Historical-Biographical'], vol B': *Λαογραφικών* ['Folkloric']).

17 For Nikolaos Politis and folklore material collectors during this era see Polymerou-Kamilaki (2012b) and Kakamboura (2012).

We cannot, however, attribute the co-existence of folkloric and linguistic information in the entries of all the above mentioned glossaries only to historical, political and academic reasons. All forms of oral literature, such as songs, proverbs, charms, riddles, blessings, greetings, toasts, curses, vows, myths, legends, etc. which are met mainly by such glossary compilers as purely linguistic material, constitute, at the same time, folkloric material. Moreover, the idiomatic, rare, dialectical words demands the full interpretation of their meaning through examples and in some cases extensive explanation, so as for it to be fully intelligible and well as fully documented.¹⁸ This needs to clarify an intelligible and rare word led in some cases to exaggeration. For instance, Farmakidis (1983 [1912–1925]: 476–478) in order to explain the word *λόδιν* ('rag'), reports a legend extending into one and half pages, where this rare word is found.

The boundaries between strictly folkloric and linguistic material are by their very nature difficult to define. The same material can serve as a source of information for various scientific fields. The information embedded in the names of things, places, phenomena, human states, situations etc. are of exceptional interest not only from a linguistic, but, also, from a folkloristic as well as from an anthropological point of view. This kind of embedded information can be found in almost all dictionaries of all languages.

Conclusions

All the compilers of glossaries mentioned in the present study were neither expert folklorists nor specialized lexicographers. They were in essence collectors of cultural, linguistic and folkloric data that belong to the category of living monuments (survivals) of the Greek antiquity. Their basic aim was of an ethnic and patriotic nature. They drafted up their collections and submitted them as eligible for awards to the various competitions of their time, displaying in this way their love for their country, with most of them feeling that they were fulfilling their patriotic duty. Most glossary compilers who collected and published relevant material had moreover, the chance to get in touch with primary sources and material, which they

18 Cf. "Εκ των πολλών και παντός είδους ασμάτων των χωρικών των πλείστων ερωτικών, κατέγραφα εν τω οικείω τόπω τεμάχια τινά, ότε μεν αποσαφηνίζοντα ότε δε επικυρούντα την σημασίαν της μνημονευόμενης λέξεως" ['I recorded here some of the diverse and numerous songs of the villagers, the majority of which were love songs, only when they verified and clarified the meaning of the word'] (Paspatis 1888: 26).

collected with that which today we would refer to as “fieldwork”. Also, most of them have had personal experience of the place whose material they selected and reviewed, since it often came from their own birthplace where they have either spent part of their lifetime or have offered their services as local teachers.

Beyond any methodological inaccuracies that we might charge glossary compilers with, and regardless of their motives, whether ethnic, political or personal, these glossaries constitute the first cases of ethnographic recordings, no matter how amateurish, at a time when folkloric studies had not yet been established as an autonomous academic field in Greece. Through fieldwork, these compilers collected a huge amount of information that they seemed not to be in a position to handle effectively. They often opted for the easy solution of registering extensive information within the entry which links to the information provided. This could be attributed to the fact that the collected material that is the product of fieldwork is not easy either to handle or categorize at an era when neither the methodological principles were established nor were any technological means available to facilitate this process. However, owing to such methodological inaccuracies we have at our disposal a rich body of recorded material that reveals cultural aspects of folk life during a specific era on which there is no adequate information today.¹⁹

19 The problem is in what ways we can trace and use this body of information, since they are not directly detectable and are often lost in between the entries. A prominent Greek Folklorist, D. Loukatos, reviewing Pangalos' dictionary (Περί του γλωσσικού ιδιώματος της Κρήτης [On the Cretan dialect]. Vol. Α'-ΣΤ'. Αθήνα 1955-1975. Vol. Ζ' 1983) - which has not been, however, the object of this paper, since it is beyond the time scope of the era under examination - of west Cretan dialect urged the compiler to draw up an index at the end of the dictionary that covers its valuable and useful ethnographic information (Pangalos 1959: 44). This could be a solution that would concern all glossaries. The creation, also of a database where all these glossaries will be registered will be an ideal solution which could promote and enhance this material to be used by expert researchers.

References

- Amantos 1925 = Άμαντος, Κ. 1925. *Συμβολή εις το χιακόν γλωσσάριον και το χιακόν τοπωνυμικόν* [Contribution to the Glossary and the Toponymy of Chios]. *Χιακά Χρονικά* 6: 1–82.
- Anagnostou 1903 = Αναγνώστου, Σπ. 1903. *Λεσβιακά, ήτοι συλλογή λαογραφικών περι Λέσβου πραγματειών* [On Lesbos: A Collection of Folkloric Treatises on Lesbos]. Εν Αθήναις: Εκ του Τυπογραφείου των καταστημάτων Ανέστη Κωνσταντινίδου.
- Aravaninos 1909 = Αραβαντινός, Π. 1909. *Ηπειρωτικόν γλωσσάριον* [Glossary of Epirus]. Εν Αθήναις: Εκ του Τυπογραφείου Π. Α. Πετράκου.
- Cyprī 1979 = Κύπρη, Θ. 1979. Εισαγωγή [Introduction]. In Loukas 1979 [1898–1925]: 1–6.
- Cyprī 1983 = Κύπρη, Θ. 1983. Εισαγωγή [Introduction]. In Farmakidis 1983 [1912–1925]: vii–xvii.
- Damiralīs 1891 = Δαμιράλης, Κωνστ. Ν. 1891. Συλλογή λέξεων ιδιαιτουσών εν τη Νάξω και άλλαις νήσοις του Αιγαίου πελάγους [A Collection of Peculiar Words of Naxos and Other Islands of Aegean Sea]. In *Zografios Agon A'*: 433–445.
- Dawkins, R. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor: A Study of the Dialect of Silli, Cappadokia and Pharassa with Grammar, Texts, Translations and Glossary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Defner 1872 = Δέφνερ, Μ. 1872. Γλωσσάριον Λέσβιον [Glossary of Lesbos]. *Νεοελληνικά Ανάλεκτα Παρνασσού Α'*: 385–429.
- Defner 1923 = Δέφνερ, Μ. 1923. *Λεξικόν της Τσακωνικής διαλέκτου* [Dictionary of Tsakonian Dialect]. Εν Αθήναις: Τυπογραφείο “Εστία”.
- Farmakidis 1983 [1912–1925] = Φαρμακίδης Π. Ξ. 1983. *Γλωσσάριον Ξενοφώντος Π. Φαρμακίδου: Υλικά διά την σύνταξιν Ιστορικού Λεξικού της Κυπριακής Διαλέκτου: Μέρος Β'* [Glossary of Xenophon P. Farmakides: Materials for the Preparation of a Historical Dictionary of the Cyprus Dialect, Part II]. Δημοσιεύματα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών ΙΧ. (Επιμέλεια) Θεοφανώ Δ. Κυπρή, Λευκωσία: Κέντρο Επιστημονικών Ερευνών Κύπρου.
- Giannakopoulos 1998 = Γιαννακόπουλος, Γ. 1998. *Ο Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (1861–1922): Η ελληνική παιδεία και επιστήμη ως εθνική πολιτική στην οθωμανική αυτοκρατορία* [Philological Society of Constantinople (1861–1922): Greek Education as National Policy in the Ottoman Empire]. Εθνικό και Καποδιστριακό Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών [National and Kapodistrian University of Athens], Doctoral Dissertation (available online available: <<http://thesis.ekt.gr/thesisBookReader/id/11026#page/1/mode/1up>>)
- Glykas 1896 = Γλυκάς, Ν. 1896. *Λεξιλόγιον Ίμβρου* [Vocabulary of Imvros]. In *Zografios Agon B'*: 515–519.

- Gonios 1891 = Γονιός, Α. 1891. Ηπειρωτικών Λεξιλόγιον [Vocabulary of Epirus]. In *Zografios Agon A'*: 175–181.
- Herzfeld, M. 1982. *Ours Once More: Folklore Ideology, and the Making of Modern Greece*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Kakamboura 2012 = Κακάμπουρα, Ρέα 2012. Ο Ν. Πολίτης και οι εκπαιδευτικοί ως συλλογείς λαογραφικού υλικού [N. Politis and School Teachers as Collectors of Folklore Material]. In Polymerou-Kamilaki 2012a: 327–341.
- Karolides 1885 = Καρολίδης, Π. Κ. 1885. *Γλωσσάριον συγκριτικόν ελληνοκαππαδοκικών λέξεων ήτοι η εν Καππαδοκία λαλουμένη ελληνική διάλεκτος και τα εν αυτή σωζώμενα ίχνη της αρχαίας καππαδοκικής γλώσσης* [Comparative Glossary of Cappadocian Greek Words: The Spoken Greek Dialect of Cappadocia and the Surviving Traces from Ancient Cappadocian Language]. Μουσείον και βιβλιοθήκη της Ευαγγελικής Σχολής 4. Εν Σμύρνη: Εκ του τυπογραφείου “Ο Τύπος”.
- Klon 1879 = Κλων, Στ. 1879. Γλωσσάριον Σύρου [Glossary of Syros]. *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 3: 20–29.
- Kondylakis 1990 [1870–1919] = Κονδυλάκης Ι.Δ. 1990. *Κρητικόν λεξιλόγιον* [Cretan Vocabulary]. (Επιμέλεια) Θ.Ε. Δετοράκης. Ηράκλειο: Βικελαία Βιβλιοθήκη.
- Krinopoulos 1889 = Κρινόπουλος, Σ. 1889. *Τα Φερτάκαινα υπό εθνολογικήν και φιλολογικήν έποψιν εξεταζόμενα* [Fertakaina Examined from an Ethnological and Philological Point of View]. Αθήνα: Εκ του Τυπογραφείου Δημ. Φέξη. [The vocabulary is found on pp. 41–69].
- Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1993 = Κυριακίδου-Νέστορος, Άλκη. 1993. *Λαογραφικά Μελετήματα II* [Studies on Folklore II]. Αθήνα: Πορεία.
- Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1997 = Κυριακίδου-Νέστορος, Άλκη. 1997. *Η θεωρία της ελληνικής λαογραφίας* [A Theory of Greek Folklore]. Αθήνα: Εταιρεία Σπουδών Νεοελληνικού Πολιτισμού και Γενικής Παιδείας 1997.
- Leerssen, Joep, ed. 2017. *Encyclopedia of Romantic Nationalism in Europe*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- Loukas 1874 = Λουκάς, Γ. 1874. *Φιλολογικά επισκέψεις των εν τω βίω των νεώτερων κυπρίων μνημείων των αρχαίων* [Philological Reflections on Surviving Elements of Ancient Greece in the Life of Modern Cypriots]. Εν Αθήναις: Εκ του Τυπογραφείου Νικολάου Ρουσοπούλου.
- Loukas 1979 [1898–1925] = Λουκάς, Γ. 1979. *Γλωσσάριον Γεωργίου Λουκά* [Glossary of G. Loukas]. *Υλικά διά την σύνταξιν Ιστορικού Λεξικού της Κυπριακής Διαλέκτου, Μέρος Α'* [Materials for the Preparation of a Historical Dictionary of the Cyprus Dialect, Part I]. (Επιμέλεια) Θεοφανώ Δ. Κυπρή. Δημοσιεύματα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών VII. Λευκωσία: Κέντρο Επιστημονικών Ερευνών.
- Loukatos 1978 = Λουκάτος, Δ. 1978. *Εισαγωγή στην ελληνική λαογραφία* [Introduction to Greek Folklore]. Αθήνα: Μορφωτικό Ίδρυμα Εθνικής Τραπέζης.

- Manolakis 1891 = Μανωλάκης, Εμ. 1891. Γλωσσική ύλη της νήσου Καρπάθου [Linguistic Material of the Island of Karpathos]. *Zografios Agon A'*: 318–342.
- Marangos 1874 = Μαραγγός, Γ. 1874. Γλωσσάριο Λευκαδίας διαλέκτου [Glossary of the Dialect of Lefkada]. *Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* 8: 455–464.
- Mousaios 1884 = Μουσαίος, Μ. Ι. 1884. *Βατταρισμοί, ήτοι λεξιλόγιον της Λειβησιανής διαλέκτου* [Stammering/Stuttering: Vocabulary of Lebissois dialect]. Αθήνα: Εκ του Τυπογραφείου Παρνασσού.
- Pangalos 1959 = Πάγκαλος Γ.Ε. 1959. *Περί του γλωσσικού ιδιώματος της Κρήτης* [On the Cretan Dialect]. Vol. Β'. Εν Αθήναις: Εκ του τυπογραφείου Μ. & Κ. Τσεβδού.
- Paradopoulos 1891 = Παπαδόπουλος, Γ. 1891. Γλωσσική ύλη της νήσου Νισύρου [Linguistic Material of the Island of Nisyros]. *Zografios Agon A'*: 381–427. [The vocabulary is to be found 381–388].
- Paradopoulos 1979 = Παπαδόπουλλος, Θ. 1979. Προλεγόμενα επί της συντάξεως του Ιστορικού λεξικού της κυπριακής διαλέκτου [Foreword on the Compilation of a Historical Dictionary of the Cypriot Dialect]. In Loukas 1979 [1898–1925]: i–vii.
- Parahatzis 1915 = Παπαχατζής, Ευάγγελος 1915. *Δοκίμιον του γλωσσικού ιδιώματος Καρύστου και των πέριξ* [Essay on the Dialect of Karystos and the Surrounding Area]. Αθήνα: Ερμής.
- Parazafirooulos 1887 = Παπαζαφειρόπουλου, Π. 1887. *Περисυναγωγή γλωσσικής ύλης και εθίμων του ελληνικού λαού ιδία δε του της Πελοποννήσου παραβαλλομένων εν πολλοίς προς τα των αρχαίων Ελλήνων* [A Collection of Linguistic Material and Customs of the Greek Nation, to be Found Mainly in the Area of Peloponnesus and Compared to those of the Ancient Greeks]. Εν Πάτραις: Τυπογραφείον και Βιβλιοπωλείον “Ο Κάδμος”.
- Paspatis 1888 = Πασπάτης, Α. Γ. 1888. *Το χιακόν γλωσσάριον, ήτοι η εν Χίω λαλουμένη γλώσσα μετά τινων επιγραφών αρχαίων τε και νέων και του χάρτου της νήσου* [Glossary of the Chian Language: The Spoken Language on the Island of Chios, with Some Ancient and Contemporary Inscriptions along with a Map of the Island]. Εν Αθήναις: Εκ του τυπογραφείου των αδελφών Περρή.
- Passalis, H. 2010. Clerics and Ambiguity: Social Control and Religious Identity Formation in Greek Traditional Culture. Available online at: <https://spinnet.humanities.uva.nl/images/2010-11/passalis_clerics_and_ambiguity.pdf>.
- Passalis, H. 2017. Manners and Customs: Greek. In Leerssen 2017: 1029–1030.
- Passalis, H. & Politis, A. 2017. Oral Literature: Greek. In Leerssen 2017: 1026–1028.

- Philological Society of Constantinople = Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. 1875.
- Politis 1909 = Πολίτης, Ν. 1909. Λαογραφία [Folklore]. *Λαογραφία Α'*: 3–18.
- Polymerou-Kamilaki 2012a = Πολύμερου-Καμηλάκη, Αικ. (επιμ.) 2012. *Ο Νικόλαος Γ. Πολίτης και το Κέντρον Ερεύνης της Ελληνικής Λαογραφίας: Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Επιστημονικού Συνεδίου* [Nikolaos G. Politis and the Hellenic Folklore Research Center: Proceedings of International Congreess]. 2 volumes. Δημοσιεύματα του Κέντρου Ερεύνης της Ελληνικής Λαογραφίας 23. Αθήνα: Ακαδημία Αθηνών.
- Polymerou-Kamilaki 2012b = Πολυμέρου-Καμηλάκη Αικ. 2012. Αναδιψώντας την “Υλη Πολίτου”. Ο Νικόλαος Πολίτης και οι συλλογείς λαογραφικού Υλικού [Delving into “Politis Material”. Nikolaos Politis and folklore material collectors]. In Polymerou-Kamilaki 2012a: 767–825.
- Poulakis 1891 = Πουλάκης, Δ. 1891, Λεξιλόγιον Ικαρίας, Κρήνης κλπ. [Vocabulary of Icaria, Krini etc.]. *Zografios Agon Α'*: 428–433.
- Poulakis 1896 = Πουλάκης, Δ. 1896, Λεξικόν ἰδία της Σικίνου καί τινων άλλων τόπων [Dictionary from Sikinos and Other Areas]. *Zografios Agon Β'*: 5–15.
- Psaltis 1905 = Ψάλτης, Στ. Β. 1905. *Θρακικά ή μελέτη περί του γλωσσικού ιδιώματος της πόλεως [των] Σαράντα Εκκλησιών* [About Thrace, or a Study of the Dialect of the City of Saranta EkkhliSSION]. Εν Αθήναις: Τύποις Π.Δ. Σακελλαρίου. [The vocabulary is found on pp. 169–212.]
- Sakellarios 1891 = Σακελλάριος, Α. Α. 1891. *Τα κυπριακά, ήτοι γεωγραφία, ιστορία και γλώσσα της νήσου Κύπρου από των αρχαιότατων χρόνων μέχρι σήμερα* [Kyprika: Geography, History and Language of the island of Cyprus from Ancient Times until Today]: Vol. Β'. Εν Αθήναις: Τύποις Π. Δ. Σακελλαρίου.
- Stamatelos 1880 = Σταματέλος, Ι. 1880. Λεξιλόγιον της Τραπεζουντίας Διαλέκτου [Vocabulary of the Trapezountian Dialect]. *Παρνασσός 4*: 309–317.
- Tsitselis 1875= Τσιτσέλης, Ηλ. 1875. Γλωσσική ύλη: Γλωσσάριον Κεφαλληνίας [Linguistic Material: Glossary of Cephalonia]. *Νεοελληνικά Ανάλεκτα Παρνασσού Β'*: 145–368.
- Valavanis 1892 = Βαλαβάνης, Ι. Γ. 1892. Ζώντα μνημεία της ανά τον Πόντον ιδιωτικής Α': Λεξιλόγιον [Living Monuments of Pontus Private life Α': Vocabulary]. Αθήνησιν: Εκ του Τυπογραφείου των Αδελφών Περρή.
- Vios 1920 = Βίος, Σ. Γ. 1920. *Χιακά γλωσσικά* [Linguistic Material of Chios]. Εν Χίω: Τύποις Παγχιακής.
- Zafiriou 1914 = Ζαφειρίου, Ν. 1914. *Περί της συγχρόνου Σαμίας διαλέκτου* [On the Modern Dialect of Samos]. Πραγματεία βραβευθείσα εν τω διαγωνισμώ του 1912 της εν Αθήναις Γλωσσικής Εταιρείας. Εν Αθήναις: Τύποις Π.Δ. Σακελλαρίου.
- Zikidis 1891 = Ζηκίδης, Γ. 1891. Νεοελληνικά Ανάλεκτα της Ηπείρου [Various Neo-Hellenic material of Epirus]. In *Zografios Agon Α'*: 25–58.

- Zografakis 1896 = Ζωγραφάκης, Ι. 1896. Δημοτικά Ανάλεκτα του χωρίου Ρωγδίας της Κρήτης [Folk Analecta from the village Rogdia in Grete]. *Zografios Agon B'*: 53–85. [The vocabulary is found on pp. 79–85.]
- Zografios Agon* 1891 = Ζωγράφειος Αγών, ήτοι Μνημεία της Ελλ. Αρχαιότητος ζώντα εν τω νυν ελληνικώ λαώ [Zografios Agon, or Monuments of Antiquity Still Extant among the Greek Population]: Vol. A (1891), B (1896). Εν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Τύποις Ι. Παλλαμάρη.
- Zois 1963 [1898–1916] = Ζώης, Λ. 1963 [1898–1916]. Λεξικόν ιστορικών και λαογραφικών Ζακύνθου *A'*: Ιστορικών – βιογραφικών; *B'*: Λαογραφικών [Historical and Folkloric Dictionary of Zakynthos *A'*: Historical-Biographical; *B'*: Folkloric]. Αθήνα: Εκ του Εθνικού τυπογραφείου. [1st ed. 1898: Φιλολογικόν και Ιστορικόν Ζακύνθου [Philological and Historical Dictionary of Zakynthos]. Εν Ζακύνθω: Τυπογραφείον “Ο Φώσκολος”.]

Folklore in Dictionaries: Methodological Considerations

Folklore in a Caribbean English/Creole Dictionary

Inclusion, Definition and Retrieval

Lise Winer

The *Dictionary of the English/Creole of Trinidad and Tobago* (henceforth, *DECTT*) (Winer 2009) is the first historical scholarly dictionary of the vernacular English Creole and local Standard English of this twin-island Caribbean nation. It contains over 12,000 entries, including 2,500 for flora and 2,200 for fauna. Until fairly recently, prevailing views – both internal and external – of the local vernaculars were that they were debased or corrupted versions of “proper English” and should generally be eradicated, except perhaps for some small number of “colourful expressions”. Fortunately, this attitude is waning as a result of long-term work by linguists, educators, writers and others who recognize that these are legitimate language varieties worthy of use and study, and that their lexical content is not simply “folkloric”, when that term is used in a belittling sense.

Nonetheless, it is impossible to ignore the de facto “folkloric characterization” of any non-standard lexicon. As Simpson and Roud note in *A Dictionary of English Folklore*:

“Folklore” is notoriously difficult to define with rigour, and the term now covers a broader field than it did when invented in 1846, linking many aspects of cultural traditions past and present. It includes whatever is voluntarily and informally communicated, created or done jointly by members of a group (of any size, age, or social and educational level); it can circulate through any media (oral, written, or visual); it generally has roots in the past, but is not necessarily very ancient, it has present relevance; it usually recurs in many places, in similar but not identical forms; it has both stable and variable features, and evolves through dynamic adaptation to new circumstances. The essential criterion is the presence of a group whose joint sense

of what is right and appropriate shapes the story, performance, or custom – not the rules and teachings of any official body (State or civic authority, Church, school, scientific or scholarly orthodoxy). It must be stressed that in most other respects this group is likely to share in mainstream culture and to be diverse in socio-economic status, interests, etc.; the notion that folklore is found only or chiefly where an uneducated, homogeneous peasantry preserve ancient ways has no relevance to England today, and probably never had.

(Simpson and Roud 2000: i)

In considering the role of folklore in the *DECTT*, three related areas are examined here: *inclusion*, by principles; *definition*, by descriptors; and *retrieval*, by strategies. Although considerable thought was given to handling of folklore in the dictionary's initial preparation, a closer look at these areas reveals principles and strategies used in the dictionary – intentionally or not – which may help to inform the work of other lexicographers in similar language situations. Suggestions are given for improvement of definitions in the future and retrieval of current items.

Inclusion: Principles and Examples

As the *DECTT* fundamentally comprises lexicon that is not standard International English, a high percentage of entries address folklore and cultural vocabulary in the widest sense (Brunvand 1968). Even in works dedicated solely to content clearly considered folklore, selectivity is always a reality:

We have included a broad range of oral genres, performance genres, calendar customs, life-cycle customs, supernatural, and “superstitious” beliefs. Lack of space forced us regretfully to omit entries on traditional foods, sports, games, fairs, and most obsolete customs; we have also been selective in children’s lore, fairies, plants, and superstitions, since excellent books on these topics are available already.

(Simpson and Roud 2000: ii)

However, because of the still problematic scarcity and inaccessibility of much cultural and linguistic information on Trinidad & Tobago (T&T), a choice was made to include information that is perhaps more encyclopedia level than glossary. Indeed, special attention was paid to including “traditional foods, sports, games, fairs, and most obsolete customs... children’s lore, fairies [i.e. supernatural beings], plants, and superstitions”, as these are areas which evoke considerable interest locally. A decision was

also made to include as much “cultural content” as possible, particularly for areas not limited to single lexical items, e.g. *Carnival*.

The *DECTT* includes folk culture in both lemmatization (given headword status) and citation. Lemmatization includes headwords, phrases, proverbs, and cultural complexes (such as *Carnival*) with cross-references. Citation of individual words or phrases can occur in more than one headword. As an example can be taken the proverb “Crab no walk, crab no fat, crab walk too much he come a pot” [‘A crab that does not walk will not get fat, a crab that walks too much will be caught and put into the pot’ – i.e. a lazy person amounts to nothing; but if a person is too busy or wanders too much, he will be brought to grief]. This particular proverb is cited under both *no* (negator) and *a* (directional preposition), but not under *crab*, as it does not refer to any specific kind of crab (several others of which are lemmatized). Thus the proverb is included, though admittedly not easily retrievable (see further discussion below).

Local supernatural folklore characters were consistently lemmatized. An iconic work depicting a gamut of these figures can be seen in Trinidadian artist Alfred Codallo’s 1958 painting “Trinidad Folklore” (University of Florida Digital Collections 2020) including: *douen*, *jumbie*, *La Diabliesse*, *Mama Glo*, *Papa Bois*, *Phantom*, and *soucouyant*. The *Mama Glo*, for example, is defined in the *DECTT* as:

Mama Glo (Mama Dlo, Mama De L’eau) *n* A folklore character in the form of a beautiful woman, sometimes snake-like, with long hair and a fish-like tail, who lives in rivers.

Citations for this entry include one from a list (Thomas 1869: 18) and another more substantive, from a book on local dance:

Then there were...*mama d’leau* – mother of the waters who is the great snake character of the rivers.

(Ahye 1983: 45)

Local, non-supernatural – though extraordinary – characters are also included, if the name of the character has become generic. For example, the word *badjohn*, which has become a generic word describing a ruffian, is found fairly commonly in reference to criminal activity:

Almost every steelband had its fair share of badjohns, ignorant men who loved to fight or those who just never back down

(*Trinidad Express Supplement* Jan. 17, 1993: 2)

In this case, it was discovered that the expression was based on one particular person whose name became generalized as a common noun and used for any person or people of the particular type. This information led to the inclusion of relevant citations, in the etymology and early meaning:

“Bad John” once more. – Sergeant Johnston charged Picton Childs with assaulting and beating John Archer at St. Vincent Wharf on November 25th. Archer alias Bad John was charged by Johnston with being armed with a weapon at the same time and place as the foregoing, for the purpose of committing a felony... [Archer’s] record is so well known that it was not asked for.

(*Port-of-Spain Gazette* Nov. 26, 1907: 5–6)

In several areas of research for the *DECTT*, intensive ethnographic investigation was carried out for individual domains, including health, body and medicine (Winer 1992). This yielded rich information on belief systems based on interwoven strands of several cultural traditions (Jha 1973, Wong 1967), e.g.

bushet, booshet *n* The cartilaginous end of the sternum or breastbone. In folk medicine, it is believed that when this falls, it causes illness characterized by severe continuous vomiting. It is usually treated by rubbing with SOFT CANDLE, and with vacuum glasses.

atkapaari *n* Migraine; any headache experienced in half the head; believed to be caused by sleeping late so that the sun rises above your head, or by sleeping when the sun is going down.

In citations, references to the cultural significance of a word may be overt or covert. In the case of the *cascadoo* or *cascadura* fish, the well-known folk beliefs connected with it are included in the definition as well as in the citations:

cascadoo, cascade, cascadura *n* *Hoplosternum littorale*, an important food fish, to 23 cm long. Sides of body are covered by two rows of bony plates; snout and tail taper, belly flat. Mouth small, on underside of head and surrounded by two pairs of long fleshy whiskers on the upper jaw. Body colour light to dark grey, sometimes with dark spots. Lives in muddy free-flowing streams, canals, drainage ditches and swamps. According to legend, those who eat the cascadura are bound either to return to or die in Trinidad.

This belief is overtly attested to and explained in fairly early citations, as in this citation found from 1838:

The *Casca Dura*, or Mailed Fish ... inhabits shallow and muddy waters. It is about seven or eight inches long, and clad from head to

tail in a more complete and beautiful suit of scale-armour than human art could make. Its flesh is firm, rich, and so delicious, that there is a proverb or superstition here, which says, that he who eats of the Casca Dura, will either never leave the island, or if he should, will return to die in it.

(Joseph 1838: 70)

However, reference to this belief is more commonly made covertly, without explanation, as in the following citation from a newspaper article:

It was the second time in seven years they were meeting here, Commonwealth Secretary General Chief Emeka Anyaoku said, and no wonder, since he admitted that he had eaten the Cascadura on his last visit.

(*Trinidad Guardian* Sept. 23, 1990: 15)

Proverbial expressions are a mainstay of folklore, but were not easy to handle in the context of a dictionary. It may be that proverbs should indeed be included under key content words, although that is really the province of a dictionary of proverbs (e.g. Allsopp 2004). A general compromise, which might be revised in future, was made to include as many proverbs as possible in citations, but not to lemmatize every proverb per se. In addition to questions of lemmatization discussed above in the example for *crab no walk*, some proverbs reflect a greater or lesser transparency of meaning or significance, particularly to those not familiar with the cultural underpinning of the proverb itself. An example of a fairly transparent proverb is found in the entry for *better belly bust*, which is, like many proverbs, most commonly used in a shortened form:

better belly bust *phr* Said to encourage someone to eat more, or to explain why you are eating more, esp. when there is only a little bit left. (fr full proverb, *better belly burst than good food waste*)

Less transparent proverbs – especially when shortened – are common , e.g.

Many high government officials with cocoa in the sun are happy [his] lips are sealed forever.

(*Bomb* Nov. 7, 1986: 1)

These must be explained with reference to the complete proverb, *s.v.* ‘have cocoa in the sun’:

have cocoa in the sun *phr* A warning that something is vulnerable, and needs to be protected; esp. when people have something to hide. From

proverb “Who have cocoa in the sun must look for rain”. (from rain spoiling drying cocoa beans)

In this case, as pictures were not included in the *DECTT*, the reader is cross-referenced to the entry for *cocoa house*, which spells out the vulnerability of drying cocoa to rain.

Definitions: Descriptors

As Pickett (2007) has discussed, lexicographers – and definers in many disciplines, especially in the social sciences – are often faced with a dilemma of definition in terms of placing themselves in an emic or etic position vis-à-vis the underlying beliefs contributing to the definition. This occurs whether or not the lexicographer is an insider or outsider to the speech community. Consider a historian defining ideologies now generally held to be negative and despicable: Nazism, eugenics, slavery, derogatory names for members of religious or ethnic groups. Inevitably lexicographers find things to be defined with which they do not agree. Generally, this has been dealt with by lexicographic hedging; Pickett notes a number of “indicators of belief and doubt”, such as *thought to be*, *considered*, *purportedly* and *regarded*.

Such indicators cover a wide range of distancing, from the extremes of terms common in older works such as *primitive superstition* and *wicked belief* through more neutral examples such as *belief that*, *belief in*, *believed to be*, *said to*, *notion*, *idea*. A cursory examination of a work such as *A Dictionary of English Folklore* (Simpson and Roud 2000) yields additional descriptors such as *ethnomedical belief* and *folk belief* as well as more neutral terms such as *custom*, *calendar custom*, *festival* and *feast*.

Sometimes a non-standard term such as *obeah* is glossed in publications using Standard English terms such as *witchcraft*, when indeed the use of that term in English is highly contentious but often unexamined.

... the practice of malignant magic... designed and supposedly achieved or “worked” upon or in behalf of someone

(Cassidy and Le Page 1967: 326–327)

... set or system of secret beliefs in the use of supernatural forces to attain or defend against evil ends

(Allsopp 1996: 412)

... witchcraft... not a religion like voodoo in Haiti, but both involved a belief in magic that a practitioner can use to help his clients or harm their enemies

(Holm and Shilling 1982: 145)

In the domain of religion, a distinction between *religion* and *sect* or *cult* (or *witchcraft*) is basic, and fraught with emotional and political judgement. Describing something as *miraculous* or as *believed to have miraculous powers* is an example of a choice the lexicographer may have to make between clear alliances with the belief or some level of disavowal. In the following three examples, indicators move from more neutral – “used in ceremonies”, to less neutral – “ritual of divination” to downright contradictory – “generally believed... but usu[ally]”. Note also the use of “scare quotes” in the third definition’s reference to “suction”, implying that this is not factually true.

adado *n* A white cloth used in ORISHA ceremonies.

Bible and key *n* A ritual of divination by means of a key (E *cleidomancy*, *clidomancy*). It uses a Bible and a key to find out who is a thief, for example by the key moving when a particular person’s name is called.

Belgian blackstone *n arc* A dark slate-like object, generally believed to be stone, but usu. made of burned or calcified cow bone. It is believed to be an antidote when applied to bites of venomous snakes or scorpions; it is also credited with healing, by “suction”, ailments arising from septic conditions of the blood, particularly snake and scorpion bites.

In most cases, validating or not validating a practice is hardly crucial:

bebeiz *n* A sweet beverage made of rum and spices, often given to women after childbirth. The mother drank “bebeiz” because it was said to be strengthening and helpful in producing a speedy recovery. The father on the other hand, made the drink in order to celebrate the birth of his offspring with his friends.

(Thompson 1983: 11)

One might ask what difference it makes to distance oneself from such entries. While no amount of respectful and neutral maneuvering can disguise the distancing implied by *believed*, the lexicographer has a responsibility to represent an emic view as much as possible, keeping in mind that the speech community is by no means monolithic, and considerable opposition to these entries and definitions can be found within it. On the

other hand, this delicate balancing act should be abandoned when a neutral definition of a toxic (or useless) treatment, for example, might indicate endorsement. Hence the warning in the definition (and in this case even more in the choice of citations) for *old maid*, an herb commonly used medicinally:

old maid *n* *Catharanthus roseus*, a cultivated erect or bushy straggling plant... Used medicinally, but can be toxic, and can mask the presence of sugar in the urine... Old Maid, Periwinkle... The tea made from this herb is very popular for both diabetes and blood pressure. There is a grave risk here, because the tea is known to reduce sugar levels in the urine without affecting the blood-sugar level.

(Seaforth, Adams & Sylvester 1983: 46)

This can counter another citation, for example, from a popular amateur book on herbal medicine, that recommends use of this plant without caution. Beliefs that are errors of fact, or fallacies, no matter how popular, should be explicitly countered, for example, that all local snakes are venomous.

Retrieval: Strategies

In its current formats, the *DECTT* is available in hard copy or as a searchable pdf file. These allow for only rather crude and unsatisfactory retrieval strategies, and a proposed online version is described below. The following strategies apply to already published work, especially works only available for search in pdf format, but they can also be helpful in devising definitions and tagging categories for future editions. Specifically in regard to the location of folkloric entries in the *DECTT*, the most useful strategies for retrieval are the use of meta-category, cultural domain, and usage keywords; and belief descriptors, as discussed above. These are easy enough to add to definitions, and some considerations can be given to best terms and consistent usages.

Meta-category keywords are relatively easy to include in definitions, but are not exact within categories. For example, *folk* as a keyword search will find a number of relevant items, e.g. anything described as being part of a *folk value system*, *folk belief*, *folk tradition*, *folk lore*, *folklore*, *folk medicine*, *folk dance*, or *folk drama*; however, it also retrieves *peasant folk*, and *nice folks*, so although it may be a useful keyword, each hit must be checked individually. Cultural domain words such as *traditional*, and

definitions including domain-specific words such as *ritual*, *ceremony*, *children's game*, etc. are also useful. Usage keywords include words such as *child* or *taunt*. Some are obvious, but it can be tedious and non-comprehensive to try to search for all such terms.

In regard to belief indicators, described above, if no signal indicators are present, the entry is difficult to retrieve as folklore, as with, e.g.

bad eye *n* A capacity to cause harm to others by looking at them with jealousy, envy, or ill-will, whether conscious or not.

This could be revised to:

bad eye *n* A belief that someone can cause harm to others...

bad eye *n* In folklore, the capacity to cause harm to others...

However, today such strategies pale by comparison to what is available online with much better databases. A current project, based at the University of the West Indies, Trinidad and Tobago, is aimed at producing a “digital graph” or “ontological database” which will allow deep querying, flexible updates, and conversion to different data formats. This will be connected to a website that offers various services and apps. A good example of this type of format is the online *Oxford English Dictionary*, which permits Boolean-type searches. In the case of the *DECTT*, such searches could address requests such as: provide all agricultural terms that come from Spanish; or provide all Carnival terms derived from French Creole with citations before 1900. This is not possible without considerable preparation, however. All entries will have to be “tagged” with one or more domain markers (e.g. *agriculture*, *Carnival*, *health*, *folklore*) in order for searches to be able to find these categories. As it will doubtless be impossible to foresee all possible types of search, the existing strategies described here both serve for the present and inform the future.

Recommendations

As with any dictionary, there will be a balance to determine between comprehensiveness and space available. Nonetheless, it is valuable for a dictionary to provide enough information about folkloric aspects of language to enable users to understand more covert and less transparent references to particular words and phrases. To this end, three tactics are helpful: (1) to lemmatize as much as possible; (2) to include proverbs in citations; and (3) to include folkloric information, in both definitions and citations. In regard to the handling of descriptors of belief and doubt, care should be

taken to use those that are as neutral as possible. Nonetheless, indication should be made when a belief or practice is harmful or potentially dangerous. For retrieval strategies, a range of indicators of belief and doubt are useful search terms. In addition, some meta-category keywords such as *folklore* can be easily added to definitions and used as search terms.

References

- Ahye, Molly. 1983. *Cradle of Caribbean Dance*. Petit Valley, Trinidad: Heritage Cultures.
- Allsopp, Richard. 1996. *Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Allsopp, Richard. 2004. *A Book of Afric Caribbean Proverbs*. Kingston, Jamaica: Arawak Publications.
- Baptiste, Rhona. 1993. *Trini Talk: A Dictionary of Words and Proverbs of Trinidad and Tobago*. Port of Spain: Caribbean Information Systems and Services.
- Brunvand, Jan Harold. 1968. *The Study of American Folklore: An Introduction*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Cassidy, Frederic G. and R. B. Le Page. 1967. *Dictionary of Jamaican English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holm, John A. with Alison Shilling. 1982. *Dictionary of Bahamian English*. Cold Spring, NY: Lexik House.
- Jha, Jagdish Chandra. 1973. Indian Heritage in Trinidad, West Indies. *Caribbean Quarterly* 19,2: 28–50.
- Joseph, Edward L. 1838. *History of Trinidad*. London: A. K. Newman. (reprinted London: Frank Cass, 1970).
- Pickett, Joseph. 2007. Considered and Regarded: Indicators of Belief and Doubt in Dictionary Definitions. *Dictionaries* 28: 48–67.
- Simpson, Jacqueline, and Steve Roud. 2000. *A Dictionary of English Folklore*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, J. J. 1869. *The Theory and Practice of Creole Grammar*. Port of Spain: Chronicle Publishing Office. [Reprinted London: New Beacon Books, 1969.]
- Thompson, Deborah. 1983. Some Hispano-Trinidadian Customs Related to Birth, Marriage and Death. Unpublished Caribbean Studies Paper, St. Augustine, Trinidad: University of the West Indies.
- University of Florida Digital Collections. 2020. <<https://ufdc.ufl.edu/AA00010881/00001/5j>> last accessed 10 August 2020. [Image also available at <<http://www.kaieteurnewsonline.com/images/2010/06/untitled-1.jpg>>].

- Winer, Lise. 1992. Health and Medical Terminology in Trinidad and Tobago. *General Practitioners Association Trinidad & Tobago Medical Journal* 16: 32–39. [Reprinted in Winer 2007: 39–57].
- Winer, Lise. 2007. *Badjohns, Bhaaji & Banknote Blue: Essays on the Social History of Language in Trinidad and Tobago*. St. Augustine, Trinidad: University of the West Indies, School of Continuing Studies.
- Winer, Lise. 2009. *Dictionary of the English/Creole of Trinidad & Tobago*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Wong, Wesley. 1967. The Folk Medicine of Blanchisseuse, Trinidad. M. A. thesis, Brandeis University.

Folklore in the Glossaries of the English Dialect Society

Jonathan Roper

The English Dialect Dictionary (EDD), published between 1898 and 1905 under the editorship of Joseph Wright and consisting of 4,684 pages of entries, and generously illustrated with dialect quotations, is one of the great dictionaries of English. It is also an important source of folklore data. This was recognized early on: Elizabeth Mary Wright, the wife of the editor, produced a 1913 book drawing chiefly on the ethnographic evidence buried within the dictionary, and the dictionary has continued to be drawn as a source up to the present day by researchers such as Torsten Müller and Vera Stadelmann (2010), Marta Degani and Alexander Onysko (2012), Simon Young (2018), as well as J. B. Smith in numerous works. As one researcher has remarked, the *EDD* “was a dictionary, which, while not being perfect, has remained indispensable” (Markus 2010: 17). This contribution will not concentrate on the *EDD* however, but look rather at the dictionaries published by the organization which was behind the work, the English Dialect Society, and focus on the folklore to be found in its publications, works which the *EDD* drew on in part.

The English Dialect Society

Formed in 1873 and dissolved in 1896, the English Dialect Society (EDS) existed for less than a quarter of a century. Nevertheless, in this comparatively short period, the Society managed to publish 80 works, mostly glossaries and grammars, as well as assembling material for a general dialect dictionary of English, the *EDD*, which began to appear in print shortly after the Society was dissolved. Like many Victorian societies, such as the Camden Society, or the Ballad Society, the EDS saw one of its chief roles as serving as a “publication society”, i.e. a society which tasked itself with the re-publishing of old but relevant works, as well as making available in print for the first time items hitherto only found in manuscript. Unlike many other such societies however, it also published fresh data. The

publications of the Society fall into four “series”: Series A: Bibliographical, Series B: Reprinted glossaries, Series C: Original glossaries, and glossaries with fresh additions, and Series D: Miscellaneous. It is the original glossaries of Series C which are of particular interest from a folkloristic point of view, although there is some folklore data in Series B in the glossaries reprinted verbatim. The dictionaries that were republished in Series C “with fresh additions” also contain folklore data in their pages.

While the Society tried to achieve as geographically broad and deep a coverage as possible, in practice it was heavily dependent on its volunteers, and thus its coverage in the form of glossaries is uneven — the size of the areas under consideration varies greatly and the glossaries themselves vary substantially in length. On top of this, the skill of the volunteer lexicographers was also rather variable. Adding further to the variegated picture, the Society also published national (as opposed to regional) dictionaries on specialized areas of lexis, such as birdnames and plantnames (Swainson 1886, Britten and Holland 1880–1886). (A planned volume on fish names, due to be edited by Thomas Satchell, never appeared, nor did another on the names of animals, reptiles and insects, due to be edited by James Britten). In the great *EDD* itself, this unevenness was smoothed out to an extent by its editor drawing on other sources, many provided by a large team of correspondents. This said, the best of their publications are of enduring relevance to the historian of English language and culture.

In the late Victorian period, the links between folklore and dialect studies were particularly tight. Indeed one of the EDS volumes, the one on plantnames (Swainson 1885) was jointly sponsored by the EDS and the [British] Folklore Society. Not only was what is perhaps the best of the Victorian regional folklore monographs, *Shropshire Folk-Lore* (1883–1886) compiled from materials gathered by the editor of the *Shropshire Word-Book* (a dictionary that was not as it happened one of the EDS’s publications, Jackson (1879)), but numerous of the editors behind the EDS’s thirty seven regional glossaries were also interested in folklore. To give some examples, we can look briefly at some of these glossaries in chronological order, namely those of William Douglas Parish, Frederick Thomas Elworthy, Sidney Oldall Addy, Richard Pearse Chope, and Jesse Salisbury.

The first glossary to be distributed by the English Dialect Society was W. D. Parish’s *Dictionary of the Sussex Dialect and Collection of Provincialisms in Use in the County of Sussex*. Parish (1833–1904) spent his working life as a church minister near Lewes in Sussex. His was not a work commissioned by the EDS, but it was one they decided to distribute to their members, following its publication. Given its status as the first book

Society members received, and the fact that it was not drawn up according to the rules that Skeat and others had formulated regarding the Society's glossaries, the work is worth consideration as something that both was and was not a prototype for the series. Parish's book consisted of 148 pages: 122 of these were taken up by the dictionary proper as well as by the prefatory material and by the addenda to the dictionary. These 122 pages contain a good deal of folkloric data, for example entries under the letter "A" contain information about folk-belief on adders, the text of a charm against ague, and an example of local shibbolethic speech-play. The remaining 26 pages of the book consisted of a preface with acknowledgements, a list of authorities, an introduction that provided a broader linguistic-cultural picture of the county, the text of a folk play, a list of common local place-names elements, a list of local surnames, and to combine the two, a list of surnames with local place-name elements in them. The text of the play contains no dialect words and is given no lexicographical commentary – it is there in the dictionary as an unexplained free gift of a folklore text. Even Parish's introduction gives us some ethnographic observations, as well as information about pronunciation. The Reverend Parish was a founder member of the Folklore Society upon its establishment in 1878, four years after his glossary appeared. As he notes in the front matter to his work, he received at least 300 of his approximately 2000 entries from two other local scholars, Bessie C. Curteis, the daughter of a local Justice of the Peace and land-owner, and the Rev. John Coker Egerton, a fellow church minister. This is in addition from other help and advice from a wider set of scholars, including Professors Skeat and Bosworth, meaning that his use of the modesty topos in the form that "such a work could never have been done single-handed, and volunteers have come forward on all sides to help me" (ii) is perhaps not so much of a conventionalism as it often can be.

Frederick Thomas Elworthy (1830–1907) was the closest thing to a trained linguist among the glossarists we are considering here. He was a Council Member of the Philological Society, and a friend of the first editor of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, James Murray. A grammar Elworthy published on his local dialect (1877) was described by Murray as "the first grammar of an English dialect of any scientific value" (Matthew and Harrison 2004: *s.v.* 'Elworthy, Frederick Thomas'). Even this work contained folklore material in the form of examples of connected speech in the dialect. Elworthy had mastered A. J. Ellis's phonetic alphabet known as "Glossic", and use of it allowed him a finer-grained representation of

the sound of dialect speech. Here is the beginning of a local legend that Elworthy sets out in parallel local and standard English forms:

*Aay spoo-z yùe-v u-yuurd baewd dhu guurt oa·kn tree aup tu
Wuul·itn Paa·rk èo·d, waut dhai yùe-z tũ zai Lau·ũrd Pau·pum wuz
u·kuun·jurd ee·ntiue? ...*

I suppose you have heard about the great oak tree up at Wellington
Park wood, which they used to say Lord Popham was conjured into? ...

(Elworthy 1877: 96)

(Elworthy glosses *conjured into* here as “transformed into”, but perhaps “banished into” would be a better rendering.) In 1888 his own glossary appeared in print, *The West Somerset Word-Book. A Glossary*. At over 900 pages, it was the longest local dictionary that the English Dialect Society published. Elworthy was the son of a woollen manufacturer, and while he was an active churchman and a local magistrate, he did not actually have to work for a living, and thus had been able to devote “twelve years, more or less, constant work on the subject” (1888: xv). Every headword was accompanied by its pronunciation shown in Glossic. For the illustrative quotations, the order was reversed: they were first written out in Glossic, and then paraphrased (in the manner shown above) in Standard English. As there are no folklore appendices, the folklore data is only to be found under headwords. In the case of evil eye, a special interest of Elworthy’s, this could be extensive. Thus, *s.v.* ‘overlook’ [‘to bewitch; to injure with the evil-eye’], we find this account of the contemporary folk belief as found locally:

The belief in witchcraft and the evil eye is almost universal among the lower class.

Within the past year (1883) a girl living close by was evidently in consumption, and after being some time in the hospital, of course gradually getting weaker, her mother took her away, and spread a report that they had starved her in the hospital. Speaking of this to an under-gardener who lodged at the mother’s, he said, “’Twad’n that they knows her wad’n a-starved; her’s overlooked, and they knows, and zo do I too, who ’tis. ’Tis th’ old Mary _____, her’ve a-witched ever so many by her time”. The girl died soon after leaving the hospital. Such stories are very common in this neighbourhood.

Another instance of a like kind has occurred quite recently (1887). A child, as often happens, pined away and died, but all through its illness, and since its death, the parents insist that the child was overlooked, and they point out the person who caused the child’s death.

At this moment there is more than one person in the neighbourhood, doing a thriving trade as a white witch, i.e. one who can overcome the evil eye, and frustrate the malice of black witches.

(Elworthy 1888: 548)

Likewise, *s.v.* ‘lily-hanger’ [‘a cow’s teat’] we find the following “very common old riddle”:

Two hookers, two lookers,
Vower stiff standers,
Vower lily-hangers,
And a whip-about.
Answer – Cow.

(Elworthy 1888: 438)

Elworthy’s ethnographic interests did not go uncultivated. By 1899, he had joined the Folklore Society, and was writing on folklore topics. One way in which Elworthy is particularly notable is that although he was away from Somerset during his education, and later again while travelling, he was a profoundly local figure, who was born and lived and died in the town of Wellington.

Sidney Oldall Addy (1848–1933) spent his working life as a solicitor in Sheffield. Addy’s glossary of Sheffield and its neighbourhood appeared in 1888 (and a Supplement to it appeared in 1891). The title of the volume makes clear its folklore contents: it contains “a selection of local names, and some notices of folklore games, and customs”, as well as being a glossary of the dialect of Sheffield and the surrounding area. In fact, the glossary proper, together with its addenda and errata take up the lion’s share of the work (especially if one includes in the count the 66-page supplement to this work published 3 years later). Under the heading of the letter “A” we find information about a “feast, or wake, ... still kept up at Crookes on the first of May” (*s.v.* ‘ale-field’) and a rhyme about the ash-tree (*s.v.* ‘ash-keys’). Furthermore, we find that in this dialect dictionary there are also 10 pages on “Folk-lore, Customs, etc.” and 2 more on “The place where ‘Robin Hood’ was born”. This is not surprising when we consider that Addy was indeed a real folklorist (he is one of the most significant folktale collectors in England), who, a few years later in 1895 was to publish a separate work on local folklore (1895). Unusually for EDS glossarists, he often references Grimm’s *Deutsche Mythologie*, especially when attempting to explain the original meaning of local place-names.

Another glossarist with folklore interests was Richard Pearse Chope (1862–1938). Chope was born and brought up in north Devon, but after

university he lived in London, working as a civil servant in the Patent Office. In 1891 he published his EDS glossary. Whereas some glossarists took an entire county as the frame of their research, Chope took a single Devon parish, Hartland, albeit an unusually large parish of 16,700 acres (approximately 6,750 ha.), writing that this was “because it is the only part of the county with which I am familiar”. (1891: v). Given this compass, the work is understandably shorter than other EDS volumes – 123 pages in total, 64 of which make up the glossary proper. In addition, he provides a (dialectological) introduction of 14 pages, and “Folklore Notes” (covering a lot of ground in its 7 pages, including witchcraft, death omens, Christmas, and weather sayings) and a 36-page additional glossary of words shared with the neighbouring county. In the glossary itself there is also space for folklore data, for example under the headword “airy-mouse”, Chope includes a rhyme shouted at dusk “by children run[ning] about throwing caps and stones at the bat” (24). Chope continued his folklore interests by drawing up a plan to produce a volume of printed extracts of Devon folklore for the Folklore Society, and later by serving as Recorder of Folklore (1925–1936) for the Devonshire Association, the local organisation most interested in folklore amongst all of the regional English learned societies.

In 1893, Jesse Salisbury (described in the 1891 census as a “bookseller and newsvendor”) published his dialect glossary of the corner of Worcestershire where he grew up. He now lived and worked in London, so he had to rely on his own memory as well as the suggestions of his brother and niece as to local usage. Once again, the title of his EDS glossary reveals the presence of folklore: *A glossary of words and phrases used in S. E. Worcestershire, together with some of the sayings, customs, superstitions, charms &c. common in that district*. Like Chope’s work, it covers a smaller area than many other glossaries in the series, and is thus shorter than many of those. Indeed, the glossary proper only covers 49 pages. An appendix on “Customs, Charms, Remedies, Signs, Superstitions, etc.” takes up 17 pages. In other words, folklore material takes up almost a fifth of this dictionary and this is before counting the folkloric material in the dictionary proper, or in other appendices such as those on “Local Appellations of Towns, Villages” or “Names of Fields”, or for that matter, even in the “Introduction”, where a verse from a song about the rag-man turns up. His folklore appendix includes three interesting folktales given at length, as well as many details about customary behaviour. One such runs:

Upon entering a neighbour's house during the progress of a meal, it is (or was) customary for the visitor to say, "Much good may it do you".

(Salisbury 1893: 62)

It is revealing of the *EDD*'s step-motherly treatment of the appendices to EDS glossaries that while, a Lancashire parallel to this greeting sourced from a piece of dialect literature is noted in the Dictionary *s.v.* 'much', no reference is made there to this note, which after all is a linguistic and ethnographic observation made by an EDS glossarist. In any event, this greeting is just the kind of quotidian detail that is overlooked by so many historians that we might hope to find in sources such as these. But we can also note Salisbury's absence from his native district lead him to uncertainty on what time period he is describing ("it is (or was) customary"). This raises the question of whether in this and other matters his book is a record of the past or of (his) present day.

These five examples show us the broad range of EDS glossarists and the nature of their folkloric data. The authors might be born-and-bred residents, incomers, or exiles from the areas they wrote about – each of these roles had its advantages and disadvantages for documenters of language. They might have been out-and-out folklorists like Addy, imbued with contemporary research paradigms, or they might be innocent of any such research agendas, like Jesse Salisbury. They might work alone, or they might have received notable contributions from other local scholars. The geographical areas they covered might range from the size of a parish to that of a county, and their glossary sections could range from less than 50 pages to more than 850 pages in length. Regardless of this variety, these works also shared much. Folklore and folklife data might be found in these glossaries' headwords, definitions, and illustrative quotations. And such data could also be found in appendices dedicated to folklore, and in the works' introductions.

First Language, then Culture

While these five compilers were diverse in background and approach, there is a common pattern to their development, which can be expressed in a maxim: first language, then culture. Elworthy wrote in the foreword to his dictionary:

The work has, however, been a labour of love, and has brought me into closer contact with my humbler neighbours than any other

pursuit could have done; so that I have become familiar not only with their forms of speech but with their mode of thought.

(Elworthy 1888: xii)

It would seem that it was via familiarity with “forms of speech” that Elworthy gained familiarity with “modes of thought”. This order, vernacular language, then vernacular culture, seems to be the pattern with so many researchers at that time to judge by the bibliographical evidence. When we consider our five glossarists, we can see that while Parish’s dictionary appeared in 1875, his piece on “East Sussex Superstitions” was due to have appeared in the journal *Folk-Lore* in the 1880s (in the event the much-heralded piece never appeared, but the principle of language first, then culture is still evident here). Elworthy’s published three works on Somerset dialect in 1875, 1879 and 1888, but his first ethnographic work, his monograph on the evil eye, appeared seven years after the last of these (1895). Addy’s dictionary (1888) and his addenda to it (1891) appeared before his *Household Tales and Traditional Remains* (1895) from largely the same geographical area. While Chope’s glossary appeared in 1891, he served as Recorder of Folklore for the Devonshire Association was only very much later, 1925–1936 (e.g. Chope 1929). Salisbury is slightly an odd-man-out here, in that he seems not to have published another work, but this does not contradict our observation. We can also take the examples of other researchers, such as Margaret Ann Courtney published her *Glossary of Words Used in Cornwall: West Cornwall* with the English Dialect Society in 1880, while her folklore work *Cornish Feasts and Fasts* appeared in 1890 (“revised and reprinted from the *Folk-Lore* Society journals, 1886–87”). And if we look at English cases fully outside the English Dialect Society, we can see that our pattern is once again evident. William Barnes composed his Dorset glossary in 1863, but was not to produce his chief prose statement on folklore (the “Fore-Say” to Udal’s *Dorsetshire Folklore*) for another a quarter of a century (this was authored in 1886, but not published until Udal 1922). John Nicholson of Hull published his study on the *Folk Speech of East Yorkshire* (1889) a year before his volume on the *Folk-lore of East Yorkshire* (1890). And Sarah Hewett wrote her *The Peasant Speech of Devon* in 1892, almost a decade before her book covering “Devonshire customs, characteristics and folk-lore” (1900). But there is no need to labour the general point further, as such a course of development is natural enough: first you notice local words, then you starting thinking about how they fit into local life.

Of course, many collectors did not make such a clear distinction between language and culture. Salisbury wrote that he “for some years previously, [had] been collecting scraps and fragments concerning the locality, but with no definite object in view” (1893: v), and this phrase *scraps and fragments concerning the locality* is no doubt a faithful description of what many of these people were doing, rather than strictly gathering words or customs. Similarly, Salisbury’s inspiration, an EDS volume from the same county (Chamberlain 1882) had “greatly delighted him” because of the many “old home words, sayings and customs, which we so familiar to me in my younger days” (1893: v). In other words, he was inspired by words, pemia and customs, by *both* dialect *and* folklore. The nearest any researcher of dialect and folklore comes to making an explicit remark as to why they proceeded in this order is found in Sternberg (1851: xv–xvi). His claim that the “value and utility of provincial glossaries is now so fully established” as to not need an justification, but that the study of folklore by contrast needs one, is telling, and can be taken to as suggesting that writers would more naturally gravitate to the established topic of local language, before they would venture to the less-established one of local cultural tradition.

Folklore in Illustrative Quotations: A Case Study

To demonstrate the value of this lexicographical material as a ethnographic source, we can take the case of “catching the owl”. This was a custom in which a dupe was invited to come along on an owl-catching expedition, only to be drenched in water. While some customs are lovingly detailed in a variety of sources, this disreputable custom hits none of the ethnographic magic buttons of seeming archaic (or at least quaintly old-fashioned), pagan (or at least pre-Christian) or ethno-specific (or at least picturesque). Nevertheless it was a traditional custom, and a most definite part of English rural culture.

Which historical sources can we use to find out about this custom? Not, it appears, in the works of the folklorists until very recently (Smith 2008, 2018), who either did not learn about it, or knew about it but were not interested in it. In England there is, notoriously, no national folklore archive, in contrast to the majority of northern Europe nations. Given this state of affairs, the presence or absence of data in books and journals becomes especially important. Owl-catching is absent from Brand-Ellis, the book Thoms called the *vade-mecum* of folklorists, and is not to be

found in the chief book-form surveys of English folklore published since the founding of the Folklore Society, those by Thistleton Dyer (1878), Arthur Wright (1928), Christine Hole (1940), Violet Alford (1952), Russell Ash (1973), and Roy Palmer (1991), nor is it to be found in the highly praiseworthy *Dictionary of English Folklore* (2000). But, by (ideological) contrast, it is to be found in some of the writers on English folk-life, such as Sturt (1901) and Raymond (1906).

There is another place that we can find data on this custom is in the Original Glossaries series of the English Dialect Society. For instance, in the folklore section preceding the glossary of Hartland, Devon, we can read:

CATCHING THE OWL. A trick very commonly practised upon fresh farm lads. The lad is told by his fellow-servants to hold a fine-meshed sieve over his head at the mouth of a “tallat”, whilst they go up into the “tallat” to rouse the owl, which is supposed in some mysterious manner to fly into the sieve and get caught. Instead of catching the owl, however, the poor lad receives a shower of water or some more obnoxious liquid from a pail which the others have previously placed in the “tallat” for the purpose. Of course, this is always done on a dark night, so that the lad has no inkling of what is coming; and if he has no knowledge of the habits of owls, there is nothing to excite his suspicions.

(Chope 1891: 18–19)

In the EDS volume for Cheshire, between the headwords “catch grass” and “catching weather” we find:

CATCHING THE OWL, a practical joke very often put upon a novice at a farm house by his fellow servants. The novice is persuaded to hold a riddle (sieve) at the “owlet hole” in the gable end of the building. He is told to hold it very fast, as an owl is a very strong bird; and whilst all his efforts are directed to catching the owl, as he supposes, somebody pours a bucket of water (often filthy water) over him.

Elsewhere in the same glossary, *ullet hole* [i.e. ‘owlet hole’ as above] is defined as “a hole left in the gable of a farm building so owls can destroy the mice there” (Holland 1884–1886: 58, 373). And finally in Jesse Salisbury work on the dialect of south-east Worcestershire, we find in an appendix “Customs, Charms, Remedies, Signs...”:

“Catching an owl” is a practical joke in which there are usually three actors, two being confederates. The one upon whom the joke is intended to be played carries a sieve, and one of the confederates a

lantern; the third man, provided with a bucket of water, keeps out of sight, and stations himself in a hay loft, or similar situation overhead. The man with the lantern then takes the one carrying the sieve to a spot well-overlooked from the door of the hayloft; telling him that there is an owl in the loft, which will fly down at the light of the lantern, and when it does so he is to catch it in the sieve. The victim is instructed to hold the sieve up over his head, and the man with the lantern standing behind him throws the light into the centre of sieve. This is the signal for the man with the bucket, who then pours its contents into the sieve and completely drenches the poor victim.

(Salisbury 1893: 69)

The glossaries provide us with excellent data – and both the commonality and the variation that the three accounts display bespeak their reliability. The variability shows they are not copies of one another, and the unity shows we are talking about the same phenomenon.

In the history of English folklore studies a narrower range of materials has been identified as folklore than might be identified as such. This neglected material includes, but is not limited to, disreputable topics. But this is not a problem affecting only folklore studies. To be sure, while some of the kind of things that were studied in Europe by people working as folklorists did get picked up in an English context by historians or sociologists, or in rural memoirs and folk verse, mentions of owl-catching are absent from cultural-historical, social-historical, and sociological studies of English culture just as much as they are from the works of English folklorists. In other words, it is not purely a matter of disciplinary history and the filters and blinkers of a locally-underdeveloped discipline of folklore studies, but it is a broader phenomenon affecting other cultural researchers.

Here dictionaries can provide a valuable corrective. To put it simply, when the focus is on vocabulary rather than on culture, we may be getting a broader view. Of course, the typical size of dictionary entries may mean that a broader view is also a shallower one, but when used in combination with other sources of data, the picture is nevertheless enhanced. One of the very earliest, if not the earliest, mention of this practice comes in an entry in a dictionary of non-standard English compiled by Francis Grose in the late eighteenth century. This is an instructive case as it shows the potential riches of folklore to be found in dictionaries of slang. Grose edited two dictionaries of non-standard English, one was of slang, *A Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue* (1785), and the other was of dialect *A Provincial Glossary, with a Collection of Local Proverbs, and Popular Superstitions*

(1787). Perhaps counter-intuitively to simple-minded notions of slang as urban and dialect as rural, the entry on owl-catching (a rural practice) appears only in the slang dictionary *s.v.* 'owl'. Upon reflection, it may seem less unusual given that the disreputable (indeed cruel) nature of the custom fits in more with our ideas of the registers covered by slang than those covered by dialect. Slang dictionaries are good hunting grounds for folklore, especially for the less respectable forms of folklore.

The Use of the English Dialect Society Publications by Joseph and Mary Wright

The work of the English Dialect Society reached its culmination in the publication between 1898 and 1905 of the six volumes of the *English Dialect Dictionary*. This work was not simply a reprise of the information of found in the EDS's existing publications. Its editor, Joseph Wright had other sources to draw upon, not least of which was data from a team of correspondents who supplied reports of dialect speech, and from a volunteer team of readers who had gone through a large amount of relevant literature in a search for dialect material. He also needed to synthesize the sometimes overlapping information found in the EDS publications under common headwords. There was no room in the dictionary for the appendices typical of the local volumes which, as we have seen, often carried the richest folklore data, including the scripts of folk drama (as in Parish 1874) and the full texts of legends and songs (as in Salisbury 1893).

We can look at his practice by taking up once again the example of *catching an owl*. Under the headword "owl", we find among the *owl-* compounds *owl-catching*, which is defined as "a kind of practical joke". The term *owl-catching*, while perfectly transparent, seems not to be one that was vernacular – it seems rather to originate with a writer on local customs. Given all the other sources known to Wright refer to *catching a/the owl* rather than to *owl-catching*, the choice of headword here seems a little misleading. The definition too is also not especially helpful, being about the most minimal it could be – presumably he thought the illustrative quotations could do the heavy lifting as far as the definition of the practice was concerned. So let us turn to his illustrative quotation, which comes from the writer on local folklife, John Coker Egerton:

As soon as it was dark they proceeded with their friend to search the barn for owls. The holder of the sieve they very carefully put exactly under the beam with strict orders to stand still while they went up to

turn the owls out. He had not stood long where he was placed before the buckets were emptied and thoroughly explained to him a yokel's idea of owl-catching in Southover barn.

(Egerton 1884: 35)

Incidentally, we might note that Egerton is describing something that happened “many years ago” (1884: 35). He then adds another example that happened “forty years ago”, the clear implication being that this is a practice that is past and gone. None of the historicity of this is transferred to the dictionary definition by Wright, where all that would have been needed was the addition of a term such as “formerly” in the word's definition.

Under the same headword, “owl”, but this time in the section for Phr[ases], we find “*to catch the owl*, a kind of practical joke”. Here the key role of the illustrative quotation in presenting the sense of dialect words is made explicit by the words “see below” appearing in lieu of a definition. When we look below, we find the following report from *EDD* correspondent W. P. M. [W. Percy Merrick]:

The victim would be told that there was an owl in the stable loft and asked to help catch it. He would be placed immediately under the entrance, with a sieve upon his head, while his companion entered the loft, taking a pail of water to frighten out the owl. Of course the water descended on the victim's head.

Elsewhere in the dictionary, while under the headword “catch” as verb there is nothing relevant to us, under the headword “CATCHING, *p[a]r[tic]ip[le]*”, we find under the compound-form 3 “– the owl”. This is defined tersely as “a practical joke; see below”. Below this we find two of the three defining sentences from taken from Robert Holland's *EDS* glossary with very minor orthographic changes. The missing part of Holland's text runs “a practical joke very often put upon a novice at a farm house by his fellow servants”. Arguably, it was reasonable to omit this as we have the detail that a “novice” is the victim within the shortened citation, and the description of it as a “practical joke” within Wright's definition. Nevertheless, we still lose the important contextual information that this is a trick performed by established farmhands on new farmhands at the farm house, and is thus an example of workplace prank typical of occupational folklore. We may also gain the impression that it is a very scattered practice geographically (found only in Cheshire, Sussex and the West Midlands), whereas it seems to have been a much more generally distributed practice: in this sense the *EDD* geographical designations can give a false

sense of precision to the locating of a practice which is actually found more or less everywhere.

To summarize, Wright's dictionary does contain records of a workplace prank that has been overlooked by so many other researchers. His three records referring to this practice are scattered in three different places in the dictionary rather than in a single location (albeit two of the records are in the same large entry, and the third has a cross-reference to one of the first two). While he has not attempted a definition himself, he has made use of the citations of others to fill out the sense on these three occasions. The most surprising thing is that only one of these citations is from an EDS glossary. Presumably, he has not made use of information from two other EDS volumes because this data was not to be found in the glossaries proper, but rather in their introductory material and appendices. Of course, documenting vernacular culture was only ever a by-product of the goal of documenting vernacular language for Wright in his role as *EDD* editor, but it is nonetheless remarkable how little overlap there is between the data in the EDS publications and the data in the *EDD* for this custom.

Less than a decade after the publication of the final volume of the *English Dialect Dictionary*, Joseph Wright's wife, Elizabeth, wrote a monograph, entitled *Rustic Speech and Folk-Lore* (1913), a title highly redolent of its day. Out of the book's twenty-two chapters, there were seven straight folklore chapters cover the following topics: "Supernatural Beings", "Superstitions", "Charms and Medical Lore", "Divination", "Birth, Marriage, and Death Customs", "Customs Connected with Certain Days and Seasons", and "Games", as well as four chapters which straddle the categories of folklore and "Rustic Speech": "Corruptions and Popular Etymologies", "Popular Phrases and Sayings", "Weather Lore and Farming Terms" and "Plant Names and Names of Animals". There are a further eleven chapters which deal chiefly with dialect matters giving the book a roughly fifty-fifty balance between lore and language, though inevitably these categories overlap.

Unfortunately the apparatus of the book is severely lacking. There is no index, no notes and no referencing, although the book does contain a "select" bibliography. This makes it hard to trace her sources. The suspicion arises that is like so many English folklore works of its time, and after, it is a hodgepodge of firsthand information, common knowledge, and scissors and paste. Yet it is more valuable than the general run of such books. About her sources she writes in the Preface that

in the chapters devoted to folk-lore I have not attempted to do more than chronicle certain superstitions and popular beliefs, leaving to

my readers the fascinating pursuit of tracing superstitions to their sources, and of bringing to light hidden grains of truth in apparently silly beliefs. ... In dealing with popular customs I have selected those that are less well known, and others concerning which I have myself collected information, and have omitted many which are accessible in works such as Hone's *Year Book* and Chamber's *Book of Days*.

(Wright 1913: v–vi)

Such language gives the appearance that she read widely for this work, but this would seem to be an exaggeration. Much of the meat of the eight pages of her chapter on “Divination” for example, can be found in the *EDD*, *s.vv.* ‘ash *sb.2*’, ‘aye-no-bent’, ‘drutheen’, ‘dumb’, ‘pick-folly’, ‘pig *sb.1*’, ‘pippin’, ‘scald *v* and *sb.2*’, ‘she’, ‘tinker-tailor grass’, ‘what’s your sweetheart’, and ‘yarroway’. Further confirmation of this book’s dependence on the *EDD* is its use of the same set of geographical abbreviations as the *EDD*, e.g. ‘Nhp’ for Northamptonshire, or “nCy” for “North Country”. Thus the work can be seen as an attempt to take a selection of the folklore data previously buried in the dictionary and to put it forth in monograph form. This move from dictionary to monograph is intriguingly the opposite of the journey undertaken by one of the other key books documenting English vernacular culture, John Brand’s *Observations on Popular Antiquities* (first edition 1777), which underwent substantial enlargements and transformations in succeeding editions over the years, before it was finally turned into a dictionary of folklore (one most definitely at the encyclopedic end of the spectrum) by W. Carew Hazlitt in 1905.

At times Wright’s dependence on the *EDD* lets her down. Take her discussion (1913: 257) of what she represents to be a love divination, involving a ball of cowslips and a rhyme “Tissy-ball, tissy-ball, tell me true, How many years have I to go through?”. It is found in Burne’s work on Shropshire folklore (1886: 530), and in Gomme’s work on “traditional games” (1894: 13), both of which are in her list of authorities, but she clearly did not get it from either of these works. If she had consulted them, she would have read that the “years I have to go through” are not years until marriage, but years to live. In other words, it is not a love divination, but a death divination. Here we have a classic example of how using a dictionary as an ethnographic source, without recourse to any supplementary evidence, can be profoundly misleading. Limitations of space may mean that the main body of a dictionary will not contain all the information one might wish, even in an era of a more unbuttoned lexicography. But here she had the opportunity to go *ad fontes* which she did not take up, to the detriment of her work. It is also worth observing that although she had

spoken of dealing with popular customs “that are less well known” there is no mention of owl-catching in her volume, presumably not on the grounds of familiarity but of those of decorum. Indeed the whole topic of pranks is not touched upon in her monograph.

Over the years, the Annual Reports of the English Dialect Society (e.g. Skeat 1876: 13) noted the formation of sister organisations: the Verein für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung [*The Society for Low German Linguistic Research*] (1874) and the American Dialect Society (1889). Both of these organizations still exist. The English Dialect Society, on the other hand, in a short-sighted move, was dissolved in 1896, as though social and spatial variation in British English had finally ceased once they had gathered materials for their dictionary. Nevertheless, in the English context the most serious approach to folklore has remained the linguistic one (though here we must mention the key exception of folksong scholarship, which is a special and independent case). The three attempts to establish folklore surveys and centres in English universities during the twentieth century (University College London, Leeds, Sheffield) all originated within departments of English, rather than from, say, departments of Anthropology, Drama, Religious Studies, or Sociology. The centre at Leeds was an “Institute of Folklife and *Dialect Studies*”, and one in Sheffield was a “Centre for English Cultural Tradition and *Language*” (my italics in both instances). In both cases the folkloric was balanced by the dialectal. In their time, the heads of both of these centres wrote pieces in the journal *Folklore* articles programmatically linking the study of folklore and dialect: “Folklore Material in the English Dialect Survey” (Sanderson 1972) and “English Dialects and Folklore: A Neglected Heritage” (Widdowson 1987). This pairing was most pithily put in title of the Sheffield centre’s journal: *Lore and Language*. This focus on lore and language was not a random development, but is prefigured in earlier scholarly practice, most notably the presence of folklore in the works of the English Dialect Society.

Some of the more serious English folklorists have long been aware of the possible richness of local dialect dictionaries as a folklore source. Peter Opie (1964: 82) writing in the journal *Folklore* remarked that “some of the dialect glossaries such as Moor (1823), Brockett (1829), Forby (1830), Sternberg (1851), and Baker (1854), are richly rewarding” in terms of the folklore data to be found in their pages. Opie added that “Wright’s *English Dialect Dictionary* is a mine of information”, and he and his wife Iona certainly drew upon all of these works for their publications in the fields of childlore, popular rhymes, and superstitions. And yet there is in his account an odd gap amounting to almost half a century between the

last sources the last of the local dictionaries to be named (1854) and the appearance of the first volume of Wright's great work (1898). One reason for this is presumably the assumption that the EDS Original Glossaries do not need to be mentioned as Wright's dictionary must entirely subsume them. As this chapter has attempted to show, folklorists should look at these glossaries, as they contain much data that did not reach the works erected upon their foundations by the Wrights. It might also prove fruitful for folklorists to look at post-EDS dialect dictionaries, i.e. local glossaries published in twentieth and twenty-first century England for information vernacular culture collected by the editors collateral to their documentation of vernacular language. Furthermore, other linguistic research, including national linguistic surveys and unpublished university dissertations on local dialects, may be worth examining. Just as dialectologists at Freiburg have been able to repurpose oral history interviews as linguistic evidence (e.g. Kortmann and Wagner 2005: 1–20), so it should prove possible to continue repurposing linguistic material as folklore data.

At a comparative level, it might be worth investigating whether the pattern described here of researchers first being interested in language, then culture, applies in other contexts. The cases presented in this chapter were quite specific involving lay researchers in the nineteenth century who were interested first and foremost in a particular locality. Such a progression may not apply to those researching at a higher level, such as the national or even the large-scale regional level. It may well not apply for professional researchers, especially those whose research objects are conditioned by their funders and their co-researchers. But perhaps it would prove true for lay researchers in contexts far from nineteenth-century England, but in which a scholar's work is similarly endowed with pathos from two related sentiments: i) this has not really been documented before, and, ii) this is all going to disappear soon.

References

- Addy, Stanley Oldall. 1888–1891. *A Glossary of Words used in the Neighbourhood of Sheffield, including a Selection of Local Names, and some Notices of Folk-Lore, Games, and Customs*. London: Trübner.
- Addy, Stanley Oldall. 1895. *Household Tales: with Other Traditional Remains: Collected in the Countries of York, Lincoln, Derby and Nottingham*. London: David Nutt.
- Alford, Violet. 1952. *Introduction to English Folklore*. London: Bell.

- Ash, Russell. 1973. *Folklore, Myths and Legends of Britain*. London: Reader's Digest Association.
- Barnes, William. 1863. *A Grammar and Glossary of the Dorset Dialect*. London: The Philological Society.
- Barnes, William. 1922 [1886]. Fore-Say. In Udal 1922: 1–16.
- Brand, John. 1777. *Observations on Popular Antiquities: Including the Whole of Mr. Bourne's Antiquitates Vulgares, with Addenda*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: J. Johnson.
- Britten, James and Robert Holland. 1878–1886. *Dictionary of English Plant-Names*. Parts I–III. London: Trübner.
- Burne, Charlotte. 1883–1886. *Shropshire Folk-Lore: A Sheaf of Gleanings*. London: Trübner.
- Chamberlain, Edith. 1882. *A Glossary of West Worcestershire Words*. London: Trübner.
- Chope, Richard Pearse. 1891. *The Dialect of Hartland, Devonshire*. London: Kegan Paul/Trench/Trübner.
- Chope, Richard Pearse. 1929. *Index to the Folk-Lore in the Transactions of the Devonshire Association, volumes I–LX*. Exeter: Southwoods.
- Degani, Marta and Alexander Onysko. 2012. Giving Voice to Local Cultures: Reflections on the Notion of "Dialect" in the *English Dialect Dictionary*. In Facchinetti 2012: 55–72.
- EDD = Wright 1898–1905.
- Elworthy, F. T. 1875. *The Dialect of West Somerset*. London: Trübner.
- Elworthy, F. T. 1877. *An Outline of the Grammar of the Dialect of West Somerset*. London: Trübner.
- Elworthy, F. T. 1888. *West Somerset Word-Book: A Glossary*. London: Trübner.
- Elworthy, F. T. 1895. *The Evil Eye: An Account of this Ancient & Widespread Superstition*. London: John Murray.
- Facchinetti, Roberta. 2012. *English Dictionaries as Cultural Mines*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
- Gomme, Alice Bertha. 1894–1896. *The Traditional Games of England, Scotland, and Ireland: With Tunes, Singing-Rhymes, and Methods of Playing According to the Variants Extant and Recorded in Different Parts of the Kingdom*. London: David Nutt.
- Hazlitt, W. Carew. 1905. *Faith and Folklore: A Dictionary of National Beliefs, Superstitions and Popular Customs, Past and Current, with their Classical and Foreign Analogues, Described and Illustrated*. London: Reeves and Turner.
- Hewett, Sarah. 1892. *The Peasant Speech of Devon: With Other Matters Connected therewith*. London: E. Stock.
- Hewett, Sarah. 1900. *Nummits and Crummits: Devonshire Customs, Characteristics, and Folk-Lore*. London: Thomas Burleigh.
- Holland, Robert. 1884–1886. *A Glossary of Words Used in the County of Chester*. London: Trübner.

- Hole, Christine. 1940. *English Folklore*. London: Batsford.
- Jackson, Georgina. 1879. *Shropshire Word-Book: A Glossary of Archaic and Provincial Words, etc., Used in the County*. London: Trübner.
- Kortmann, Bernd, Tanja Herrmann, Lukas Pietsch and Susanne Wagner. 2005. *A Comparative Grammar of British English Dialects. Agreement, Gender, Relative Clauses*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kortmann, Manfred and Susanne Wagner. 2005. The Freiburg English Dialect Project and Corpus (*FRED*). In Kortmann, Herrmann, Pietsch and Wagner 2005: 1–20.
- Markus, Manfred, Clive Upton and Reinhard Heuberger. 2010. *Joseph Wright's English Dialect Dictionary and beyond: Studies in Late Modern English Dialectology*. Peter Lang: Frankfurt-am-Main/New York.
- Matthew, H. C. G. and Brian Harrison. 2004. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Müller, Torsten and Vera Stadelmann. 2010. From Cock-throwing to Croquet: Games and Sports in Joseph Wright's *English Dialect Dictionary*. In Markus, Upton and Heuberger 2000: 167–186.
- Nicholson, John. 1889. *Folk Speech of East Yorkshire*. London: Simpkin Marshall.
- Nicholson, John. 1890. *Folk-Lore of East Yorkshire*. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent.
- Opie, Peter. 1964. Proposals for a Dictionary, Arranged on Historical Principles, of English Traditional Lore. *Folklore* 75,2: 73–90.
- Palmer, Roy. 1991. *Britain's Living Folklore*. Newton Abbott: David and Charles.
- Parish, William Douglas. 1874. *A Dictionary of the Sussex Dialect and Collection of Provincialisms in Use in the County of Sussex*. Lewes: Farncombe.
- Raymond, Walter. 1906. *The Book of Simple Delights*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Salisbury, Jesse. 1893. *A Glossary of the Words and Phrases Used in South East Worcestershire*. London: J. Salisbury.
- Sanderson, Stewart. 1972. Folklore Material in the English Dialect Survey. *Folklore* 83,2: 89–100.
- Simpson, Jacqueline and Steve Roud. 2000. *A Dictionary of English Folklore*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skeat, Walter William. 1876. *English Dialect Society, Third Annual Report: For the Year 1875*. Bungay: John Childs.
- Smith, J. B. 2008. From Owl-Catching to Hands-in-Pockets: A Glance at Some Vanishing Somerset Customs. *Notes and Queries for Somerset and Dorset* 367: 202–205.
- Smith, J. B. 2018. Putting the Owl to Roost: A Traditional Newfoundland Prank and Some European Analogues. *Tradition Today* 7: 74–78.
- Sturt, George. 1901. *The Bettesworth Book*. London: Duckworth.

- Swainson, Charles. 1886. *The Folk Lore and Provincial Names of British Birds*. London: Elliot Stock.
- Thistelton Dyer, T. F. 1878. *English Folk-Lore*. Hardwicke and Bogue.
- Udal, John Symonds. 1922. *Dorsetshire Folklore*. Hertford: S. Austin.
- Widdowson, J. D. A. 1987. *English Dialects and Folklore: A Neglected Heritage*. *Folklore* 98,1: 41–52.
- Wright, Arthur. 1928. *English Folklore*. London: Benn.
- Wright, Elizabeth Mary. 1913. *Rustic Speech and Folk-Lore*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, Joseph. 1898–1905. *The English Dialect Dictionary: Being the Complete Vocabulary of All Dialect Words Still in Use, or Known to have been in Use during the Last Two Hundred Years*. London: Henry Frowde.
- Young, Simon. 2018. Joseph Wright Meets the Boggart. *Folk Life* 56,1: 1–13.

Folklore in the *Dictionary of Newfoundland English*

Philip Hiscock

“O. P. B.”. That was my answer in the early 1970s when anyone asked what kind of black-flecked tobacco I was rolling my cigarettes with. “O. P. B.”, I’d say, and they would puzzle at me. “Other people’s butts!” I’d explain. And they’d look at me with some combination of disbelief, pity, horror, disgust, and whatever. But it was true. I was a poor student at Memorial University of Newfoundland (MUN), addicted to tobacco but unable to pay for even cheap loose tobacco, let alone ready-made cigarettes. So I would patrol the university’s cafeterias each morning and evening, and ten minutes’ busy work would fill the metal case I had in my back pocket – it looked like a liquor flask without the neck – and I would roll my own almost costless cigarettes. I must have stank. The tobacco from douted¹ butts has a rank, tarry smell that is unmistakable, and I carried that tobacco with me everywhere. And I rolled new smokes from it everywhere too. I quit smoking eight or ten years later, so I am a lucky man to be writing this in my late sixties. For an addict, it was not bad tobacco. There were probably twenty brands of cigarettes available to purchasers back then but, with the university crowd, only a half dozen were the most popular ones. So, although I was smoking tobacco from many different brands, it added up to a fairly consistent flavour, a kind of essence of MUN’s preferred tobaccos. It didn’t taste like any one of those brands of fresh tobacco, but – at least for me – it neither stirred very far from nor tasted very much like any one of them. And I got my fix of nicotine regularly.

I bring this up because I am writing this piece on doing ethnography – learning about and writing about local culture – through the *Dictionary of Newfoundland English*, and the two things seem so similar to me. Doing ethnography through the dictionary is possible, like getting your hit of nicotine from O. P. B., but it is difficult, often impossible, to see the

1 ‘Dout’ is in the *DNE*: to extinguish a fire [like a cigarette].

ethnographic reality from which the dictionary draws. Edited and compiled by George M. Story, William J. Kirwin and John D. A. Widdowson, the *Dictionary of Newfoundland English (DNE)* was co-published by Breakwater Books (St. John's) and the University of Toronto Press in 1982. A second edition was published in 1990 and included a supplementary section of about 140 pages, bringing the entire work to 770 pages. The *DNE* was based on scholarly work that started systematically in the 1950s with a great deal of support along the way by MUN, and by Canadian federal government supports like Canada Council for the Arts (Webb 2016 has a chapter, pp. 26–83, devoted to the *DNE*'s context, inception and development). In 1998 a version of the *DNE* went online as part of the MUN Faculty of Arts's Heritage Web Site.² This was the work primarily of Ray Lambe, with the direction of William Kirwin. Maintained and improved over the succeeding years, primarily by Vince Walsh, the *DNE*'s online presence is now very close to the original (only the International Phonetic Alphabet symbols are missing). It has been and remains a magnet for tens of thousands of Internet visits (or "hits") every month,³ while allowing searches that were very difficult with just the paper edition. These include finding all uses of a word, not just in the headwords, but also in the citations and editors' notes.⁴

Starting in about 2005 the management committee (of which I was a member) of the English Language Research Centre (ELRC), MUN's successor unit to the "Dictionary Room", began a project to digitise its bank of unpublished citation slips. This had been the plan of the editors, though somewhat general in their published Introduction: "[...] the complete file of materials is to be preserved for the use of other students of the language" (Story, Kirwin and Widdowson 1982: xiv). We roughed up a set of database fields and started work on the project – which grew in our hands. Within a year, the number of fields had nearly doubled. Our database was then thoroughly overhauled by Don Walsh, programmer and IT manager at MUN Library's Digital Archives Initiative (DAI), and several years were spent plugging in the digitised slips, nearly 100,000 of them. Coordinated through several years by the part-time managers of the ELRC, Jenny Higgins and Suzanne Power, the digitisation work was mainly done by about two dozen different student employees. Starting in 2015, a final

2 The Memorial University of Newfoundland Faculty of Arts restyled itself the "Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences" in 2017.

3 Vince Walsh, email correspondence, 27 September 2017.

4 The *DNE*'s online version is at <www.heritage.nf.ca/dictionary/a-z-index.php>.

consistency clean-up and data check was made, and this, largely done by and supervised by Chris Mouland with support by the Dean of Arts Office and the Maritime History Archive, drew to a close in late 2017. Now, as the editors had hoped in 1982, this body of citation slips has been made available (through the university's Digital Archives Initiative).⁵

Lexis and Lexicography

The *DNE* compilers were primarily interested in lexis, the body of *words* that they saw as reflective of a separate dialect of English in Newfoundland and Labrador (1982: xi–xii).⁶ Thus for the purposes of the dictionary – and although such things do appear there from time to time – they were not as interested in collocatory forms, phrases, proverbs, curses, and the like. Thus, for example, popular bits of linguistic folklore like local *blasons populaires* about others' speech habits do not get discussed in any systematic way. Nonetheless, such *blasons populaires* are common in Newfoundland and Labrador, an integral part of the ethnographic reality of speech in the province.

In Bonavista Bay, for instance, locals in the Charleston area make fun of people from the larger town of Bonavista, about seventy kilometres away, with stories like that told to me by my father's friends Charlie and Pearl Fry in April 2004. Bonavista people, they informed me, said

5 The DAL is an online bank of unpublished or out-of-print materials related to the history and culture of Newfoundland and Labrador. In the meantime, the ELRC "Word Form" corpus with limited searches (by headword only in late 2018) can be found at the Newfoundland and Labrador Heritage Website <www.heritage.nf.ca/dictionary/wordform>.

6 The official constitutional appellation of the Province of Newfoundland (one of ten provinces and three territories of Canada) changed in December 2001 when an amendment to the federal Constitution Act renamed it the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. The government of the province had already for about thirty years been called the "Government of Newfoundland and Labrador" and some official documents and signage (like motor vehicle registration plates) reflected that fact. Vernacular usage in part followed right after the constitutional change with a very rapid uptake of the new name in, for instance, the schools. By the early 2000s almost all my university students were using the full, new name for the province.

There were ramifying vernacular discussions like what the abbreviation would be (in fact the Canadian Post Office settled that matter right away with its official postal abbreviation, NL, which was accepted nearly universally), and what to call citizens of the province (a matter that is still one of hugely divergent popular discussion). For instance, in early December 2017, a local politician, running for the leadership of the provincial conservative party referred to his support from many "Newfoundland and Labradorians". (CBC Morning Show, CBN St. John's, 6th December 2017). There are at least a couple of other demonymic variations in contention.

all sorts of things peculiar to their community. For instance, Bonavista people were known for saying dismissively, “G’way, du!”. And there was the old fellow from Bonavista who was showing his son how to start the boat engine he was giving him: “Goo fard. Preeze down ard. Give her a snig and three fops.”

G’way, du shows the still in-living-memory of the use of a thou-form, *du*.⁷ This does not appear in the *DNE*, and nor does the popular attention to it as a marker of old-fashionedness, hominess or otherness. But, preserved in the unpublished citation slips, is a note in Kirwin’s hand and attached to a story about the speech of the “old fellows” in a woods camp. The note reads:

Dees and dines.

This is a folklore genre: the folk reciting artificial dialect for amusement. A Dorset man had a similar garbled recitation for me. [I] don’t know how it could be used or written up.⁸

A typed addition, perhaps by Story, at the bottom of the slip reads, “Also [a] member of the [MUN] Board of Regents has a wonderful one: Car-bonear”. The slip is dated 28th and 29th December 1979. Next to this slip is the text of one such report from Boyd Trask, a student of Herbert Halpert’s in 1967–1968 when, as part of his third-year course, Introduction to Folklore, he wrote:

Twillingate people were noted for saying “dees” and “dines”. Two of those men were in a lumber camp. They wanted a hair cut. One said to the other, “Dees cut dines hair, dines cut dees one does days, willie wuh shee?” Meaning – “If you will cut my hair, I will cut your hair one of those days, will you?”⁹

You, reader, can no doubt feel Kirwin’s chagrin at the “garbled” nature of the reportage in such mere folklore. Such morphological – and

7 Other thou-forms have been seen in NLE, in particular *dee*, used both in address as in the Frys’ report, and nominatively, as in Harold Paddock’s report from Long Island, Notre Dame Bay of “Bist dee goin’ up de Bight tonight?”. I still often hear *dee* used thus in the area of Trinity Bay around Butter Cove. See Clarke 2010: 88–89 for an outline. By the way, it has been suggested by a reader that the tag *du* might simply be the command, “Do!” That this is not so can easily be heard in the intonation of the phrase in which *du* is clearly a pronoun of address.

8 The card is <www.heritage.nf.ca/dictionary/wordform/view.php?id=18632>. The reference to Dorset is to Kirwin’s sabbatical year there in 1966–1967 (Webb 2016: 57).

9 Boyd Trask’s source was a 75-year-old man from Elliston, adjacent to Bonavista. Fifty years later, in the 21st century, jocular imitation of neighbouring local speakers is still common in the area. <www.heritage.nf.ca/dictionary/wordform/view.php?id=18633>

socio-cultural – matters are only rarely treated in the *DNE*, and this one is not. With Kirwin’s damning annotation, it was consigned to the unused files.

To return to the Frys. *Goo fard. Preeze down ard* may be purely a phonological, rather than lexical, deviation from Standard English: *Go forward. Press down hard.* (But Reid, Oldford and Abbott [2000] has *prise* defined as “to push on a lever” suggesting a lexicalisation of that or similar pronunciation.) *Snig* certainly is lexical, referring to a light tap; a slightly different meaning is found in the *DNE*: “a chop or cut”. (The *DNE* editors did have a report of *snig* used exactly in this Bonavista way, as a light tap, but with only one report they left it out of the dictionary.) A *fop*, I am informed by the Frys, is a fast and harder knock; it is not in the *DNE* nor in its unpublished collection. Some of the lexical parts of this bit of local linguistic comment – like *fop* – are missing from the *DNE*. More importantly, the entirety of it, as a jocular statement about a neighbouring and large community’s speech, is not there. If we were to wonder which is more ethnographically relevant, the individual parts (words) or the situated whole, I would suggest the latter, the entirety, is.

Those interested in larger customary forms like beliefs and customs are served less well by the *DNE*. Such things only appear as secondary and accidental riders of verbal horses that carry a word they were illustrating. Similarly, larger oral genres, such as songs, legends and tales, only appear as sources for the use of words. Thus, for instance, the verb *to faggot* [‘to gather into protected piles’] has as one of its citations a quote from the radio recitation “King David” (from the Ted Russell series *Chronicles of Uncle Mose*) transcribed and included in a published collection of these radio programmes. (King David was the lead goat in the local herd.)

King David’d have ’em [the goats] all out to the brow of the hill before
the rain started [...] and before the rain did come every quintal of fish
on every flake in Pigeon Inlet’d be faggoted up and safe.

(Russell 1977: 43)

Here, the *DNE* leads the would-be ethnographer to a fictional, though highly celebrated, series of stories, written in the late 1950s and 1960s, suggestive – as Peter Narváez has discussed – of a romanticised outpost world of a generation earlier but still within living memory (Narváez 2011b).

Similarly, at *puck* [‘to hit or punch’] (often given as *poke*) we find a quotation from an early printing of Mark Walker’s song “Fanny’s Harbour Bawn”.

He stood no hesitating, but struck immediately;
 This damsel mild, stood like a child, to witness the fray.
 A pain all in my chest there struck before twas very long,
 My person pucked and darling took on Fanny's Harbour Bawn.

The editors are quoting from an early 1902 collection of local songs compiled (and self-published) by James Murphy, *Songs and Ballads of Newfoundland, Ancient and Modern* (1902: 73). I don't think Walker – the song's maker – was using the word *puck* in a particularly self-conscious (“celebratory”) way here, although his use of language seems carefully constructed to reach a certain literary register. Perhaps this does give us a good understanding of how the word was being used when he wrote the song in the 1870s. As I have written elsewhere (Hiscock 2002), this song probably is based on some experience of the author – he did fish for at least one summer at Fanny's Harbour (a Newfoundland fishing station on the Labrador Coast [Pitt 1984]), and as we know from intensive oral historical recording by Clara Doyle Rutherford (2010), there was a great deal of courtship, and changing of minds by courters and courted alike, on the Labrador Coast during the summer fishery. However, like most works of artistic creation, the song represents a stylised version of the ethnographic reality it might point at. Like Russell's story, the song must be seen as a fiction, a fiction used as a source of lexical O. P. B. by the *DNE*.¹⁰

Nonetheless, in the *DNE*, the leftover cigarette butts of writers of non-fiction, gatherers of local information, could likewise be the source. At the entry for “face clock” we see a quotation from Peter Scott's 1975 *Edible Fruits and Herbs of Newfoundland*:

The Dandelion has a number of common names in Newfoundland.
 These include Dumbledor, Faceclock, and Piss-a-beds.

(Scott 1975: 39)

Neither Scott nor the *DNE* editors give any indication of the wideness of spread of these terms, nor their register (humorous, vulgar, poetic, etc.). When reading the entry, we are left with simply the understanding that someone authoritative (Peter Scott) reported the words.

10 As I make some edits on this chapter, on 18th September 2018, I hear a man on the local CBC radio programme *CrossTalk*, on this day devoted to local sayings, use the phrase *poke in the face* and gloss it with “I mean he punched me”. It was a rather unself-conscious report of that word since he was actually reporting on his own use of *by* to a non-Newfoundlander, which use led to the poke.

Vernacular Lexicography

The *DNE* was not the first, nor indeed the last dictionary of Newfoundland English. Since its publication, two very substantial dictionaries, neither one academic in method, and both popular in their intended audience, have appeared. Ron Young, the culture-enthusiast owner/editor of the very successful regional magazine *The Downhomer* (later just *Down-home*) drew heavily on the *DNE* for his *Dictionary of Newfoundland and Labrador: A Unique Collection of Language and Lore* which pulled together many other suggestions by readers and recollections from his own childhood in Twillingate (Young 2006). Two years later a somewhat smaller dictionary, but with a broader approach to Newfoundland language was published by Nellie Strowbridge as *The Newfoundland Tongue* (Strowbridge 2008). Other smaller ones have also appeared, perhaps even less inclined to comprehensiveness or academia. Among these latter is one put together by three Bonavista high-school students (Reid, Oldford and Abbott 2000); it is discussed below. In 2015 Russell Bragg, who has an MA in Linguistics, published a little book called *Traditional Newfy Talk: the First English Language of North America*. The main part is another dictionary (in two parts: NLE to Standard, and reverse), but it also has a short section on phonology and syntax. Bragg's dictionary is more like the vernacular dictionaries of Newfoundland than like the *DNE* in that it does not rely on cited actual uses of words, but, rather provides essentialised and decontextualised definitions. Its general linguistic section is not nearly as systematic nor comprehensive as Sandra Clarke's 2010 *Newfoundland and Labrador English*. Rather than attempting to be ethnographically authentic (that is, relying on cross-reference research in other regional and standard dictionaries to decide on whether an item should be withdrawn, as the *DNE* editors did), these popular dictionaries attempt to be true to their writers' senses of what is local (or "regional") in their experience.

Before these rather more modern popular dictionaries, were several small local works made by people who, like the later compilers, were not lexicographers. The Newfoundland government published a booklet for three decades which included a small vernacular dictionary. Compiled by L. E. F. English, *Historic Newfoundland* (later *...and Labrador*) was first published in 1955 (and continued until the early 1980s). It was distributed free of charge, primarily through government-operated museums and tourist information offices. Partly, it relied for source material on what had been previously the best known of these: P. K. Devine's *Folk Lore of*

Newfoundland in Old Words, Phrases and Expressions: Their Origin and Meaning, published in 1937. Devine has been called one of Newfoundland's first folklorists, a designation that could be placed as well on a half-dozen other popular enthusiasts and even some academics, in the half century before him. Devine's work was well received by the public. For two decades, he had published stories of local culture and oral tradition, and his 1937 work was successful. (In 1997, the MUN Folklore Dept published a facsimile edition of it, together with a short introductory essay by me.) In a review of the original book, and particularly the dictionary part of it, Joe Smallwood in his media role as "The Barrelman", said this newly published dictionary was a tribute to Newfoundlanders that ranked with some of the other great local writers, naming historians and other cultural researchers.¹¹ As can be seen below, he went on to criticise some parts of it for their lack of rigour with regard to the words' peculiarity to Newfoundland (Smallwood 1937; see also Narváez 2011a and Hiscock 1994). Problems of apparent-but-untrue one-to-one relationship of dictionary-to-local language were part of how Joe Smallwood had reviewed P. K. Devine's dictionary in 1937.

If ever there is a second edition [of Devine's work], I'd suggest the dropping of a number of words Mr Devine has included – ordinary words whose use and meaning in Newfoundland are identical with those anywhere else.

"Balderdash" surely means the same in Canada, South Africa or the States, as in Newfoundland. "Bamboozle" is surely an American slang? "Blather" or "Blether" is a widely-used slang word in Britain, with the same meaning as here. "Dank" for moist or damp is a perfectly orthodox word. "Hustings" means the same things everywhere, and "flummox", and "lift".

Nothing should go in a collection of Newfoundland word-lore but words and phrases found exclusively in Newfoundland, or common words used in Newfoundland with a distinctively local meaning or connotation. But these are very minor points in a work so valuable as this brochure.

(Smallwood 1937: 3)

Devine wrote no clear definition of what he considered for inclusion. And there are other problems with Devine. My own pet peeve is that, like

11 Joe Smallwood was an erstwhile politician and journalist who would later use his Barrelman persona as a springboard to become the first premier of the province of Newfoundland. A short biography can be found in Narváez 2011a

many vernacular lexicographers, he did not define his words very well, sometimes for example giving a context for a word without actually saying its meaning. What we have in Devine is a good picture of what Devine felt represented the folk speech of some older Newfoundlanders, filtered through his experience of the Newfoundland world and indeed of the non-Newfoundland world, his social contacts, and probably his idea of good entertainment. Like all vernacular dictionaries, it paints a better picture of the compiler's own performance of culture than of what he purports: that of the culture around him.

Currency and Celebrity

When the *DNE* compilers made decisions about the use of the contents of Devine's dictionary in their own, as often as not they merely noted his listing as one of the citations, conveniently four decades before their own, but often without a clear sense given of what the item meant or how it was used. After all, they were smoking Devine's butts here. As they were, too, with so many of their published citations: the butts found in published records, in Folklore students' term papers or "Folklore Survey Cards", in performances and conversations recorded on audio tapes, and so on.

One of the reasons for excluding specific words from the *DNE* was when the compilers sensed what they called "an exaggerated currency" due to the word's celebration. In the Introduction to the first edition they wrote:

A large number of words collected over the years have been excluded on the grounds that they seem, on balance, adequately covered in other dictionaries. Among these are certain words and idioms of considerable regional celebrity to which the recent advent of the electronic mass media has given an exaggerated currency and which, on examination, we do not find to be distinctive (*proper thing, rampike, up she comes*).

(Story, Kirwin and Widdowson 1982: xiv)

The aims of the compilers of the *DNE* evolved over the twenty-five years between starting the project in the 1950s and its publication in 1982. Indeed, in the eight years between editions, their outlook changed, paying some attention to the "celebrity" of certain words in the popular imagination, a celebrity, or meta-usage, that had grown in the intervening years. During the years of its collection, the *DNE* tended to get reports (from students, for instance) that reflected current popular notions of

what was indeed traditional. This is a perfect example of metafolklore, or the folklore of folklore, about language. To some extent the corpus reflected that metafolklore. But whenever the editors noticed it, they tended to discount it, especially if they knew it existed in its non-meta form elsewhere. Hence a comment in the introduction to the second edition about celebrity driving change:

[...] we find little evidence of the retreat of the traditional vocabulary which is so often predicted and [we suggest] that many regional writers are actively extending the metaphorical uses of the Newfoundland vocabulary.

(Story, Kirwin and Widdowson 1982: 632)

Many of the words that shifted from the main sections of their files into the Queried and Withdrawn sections were in fact words that had achieved some sort of celebrity but, on close examination, were seen to be part of the larger English lexis. Nonetheless, celebrity was responsible for many words being reported, and rather less “meta” (=celebrated) stuff remaining popularly invisible and subsequently unreported to the *DNE* editors. Perhaps the limited celebrity of the Frys’ *fop* kept it from being reported to the *DNE*.

Like Smallwood’s complaint about over-inclusion in Devine, we might say the same about all vernacular dictionaries. For example, *Bonavista’s Dictionary and Sayings*, compiled by three enthusiastic high-school students in 2000 contains contains *arse*, *balderdash* and *beer gut* on its first page. On the other hand, it also includes a couple of examples of H-lessness (*’ark* and *’ash*), the verb *barmp* [‘to blow a vehicle’s horn’], and the nouns *bavins* [‘bit of small wood for burning’] and *baywop* [‘someone “who lives around the bays of Newfoundland”’] on the same page.¹²

On the first page of their Introduction (Story, Kirwin and Widdowson 1982: xi), the *DNE*’s editors point out the tacit shift, and research gap, involved in at least some of their lexicographical predecessors in documenting regional Englishes. The shift was from stating they are looking for what makes those regional lexes distinct, to actually drawing their documenting words from published sources, that is relying on the collection methods, such as they were, of previous authors, usually with no such systematic desire. The *DNE* editors then point out that their dictionary does exactly that, but also relies on the great body of tape-recorded interviews

12 Reid, Oldford and Abbott (2000: 1). I recorded an interview with Craig Reid about the compilation of his dictionary and about its contents in early 2002.

with local speakers of Newfoundland and Labrador English that is to be found at MUN's Folklore and Language Archive (MUNFLA), a substantial archive of vernacular culture that was established in 1968 (Hiscock 1984). Through its life as a regional dictionary, this reliance on informal spoken language documents, has been popularly played up as a big difference from earlier dictionaries. However, as Bill Kirwin liked to point out, a light perusal of its pages shows that less than a third of its citations were from tape recordings; the vast majority came from earlier published sources, like other dictionaries.

Also early in their Introduction, the editors laid out the main criteria for words' inclusion in the *DNE*:

[...] our guiding principles in collecting have been to look for words which appear to have entered the language in Newfoundland or to have been recorded first, or solely, in books about Newfoundland; words which are characteristically Newfoundland by having continued in use here after they had died out or declined elsewhere, or by having acquired a different form or developed a different meaning, or by having a distinctly higher or more general degree of use.

(Story, Kirwin and Widdowson 1982: xii)

Left out of this list is a potential criterion which led many people to suggest words to them: having a celebrity of locality; in fact this is a main popular criterion for defining a "Newfoundland word". (And it continues. In recent years a flurry of web pages and social-media groups have become repositories of celebrated apparently-local NL language.) Words were often recommended to the editors but, upon their examination, were found not to fall into any of the categories quoted above and so were moved from the *DNE*'s main word-and-citation files, first (while they were merely suspicious) to their "Queried" files and thence (when the suspicions were confirmed to their satisfaction) to their "Withdrawn" files. In terms familiar to folklorists, what the editors were hoping to collect were examples of unambiguous folklore; what they often found themselves given, and rejecting, was folklorism. Since celebrity, to whatever extent, was a main driving force in the submission of such rejected forms, in the decades since the publication of the *DNE*, the Queried and Withdrawn sets have been useful in understanding Newfoundlanders' senses of the differences between their vernacular speech forms and those of other regions.

Returning to the matter of the official – and now widely-accepted vernacular – name of the province, Newfoundland and Labrador, E. R. Seary was quite clear that his names study (organised and operated out of the

same “Dictionary Room” the *DNE* came from) did not do a good job of describing Labrador family names: he published it as *Family Names of the Island of Newfoundland* (1977; 2nd edn 1998). He simply did not have access to the same kinds of historical records for Labrador as he did for Newfoundland, partly a result of the fact that much of civil documentation was conducted not by government employees there, in Labrador, nor indeed by Labrador churches headquartered in St. John’s, but rather – at least in large measure – by the Moravian church which had no footprint at all on the island of Newfoundland. For Seary, the Labrador records simply were not available and his book reflected the lack.

Likewise, the *DNE* did a lesser job at documenting Labrador words than most Labradorians would have liked. The *DNE* editors did include Labrador terms where they could, but the compilers did not have access to a large number of tape recordings from that area, nor did they themselves travel regularly and frequently among speakers of Labrador English. Much of the celebrated literature of the province, of course, documents trips to the Labrador Coast (simply “the Labrador” in some parlance) and they searched those sources, allowing them to report on at least some Labrador terms and special usages.

Teaching Folklore Using the Dictionary

From the late 1980s, for about thirty years, I fairly regularly taught courses at Memorial University of Newfoundland in “Newfoundland and Labrador Folklore”. The official calendar title, approved by MUN’s Senate in the 1980s, was simply “Newfoundland Folklore”, reflecting an earlier island-centric notion of the province’s entirety. But I had visited the coast of Labrador first in the mid-1970s and was taken by its strong traditional culture, one very separate, and self-consciously so, from that of the island of Newfoundland. I included Labrador materials regularly.

My “NL FL” courses were primarily at a second-year undergraduate level, a lecture course, but included two others at a fourth-year undergraduate level and at the graduate level, the latter including students in both our MA and PhD programmes. All these courses required students to engage in real fieldwork (interviewing people and writing papers based on their interviews and surveys), and the two higher-level courses also required students to show their findings to the class in fairly formal presentations.

For several years around 2000 to 2005, I required the students to buy a copy of the *Dictionary of Newfoundland English* and to read it. The introductions to both the first and second editions were part of the course lectures (as of course was the scattered¹³ word), but what almost without exception scared new students was my requirement that they *read* the *Dictionary* and produce a research paper based on it. I assigned one of a series of semantic areas to each student and she or he was required to go headword-by-headword through the full *DNE* – both the first edition and the supplement – and compile and discuss all the words in that category.

This was a student assignment that, from my point of view as teacher, had two main advantages. One was to get the students seeing how folklore and vernacular language were reflected in what was popularly (and academically) seen as one of the greatest works of documentation of traditional culture in the province. This served the course's central aim well: to have the students learn about traditional culture in the province.

A second advantage was that the students could think critically about the *collection* of these reported items of traditional culture. I did not want them to think that all things in the Dictionary were to be understood as representing equal parts of traditional culture, equally distributed around the province. I encouraged them to think about how words got reported to the *DNE* compilers – by people who were struck by matters of difference from the received standard English around them, often at that time, the 1950s through 1980s, in the form of the popular forms of English broadcast on radio and television.

Frequently raised by my students was the extent to which the *DNE* was, by its nature of collection and the era of collection, the mid-twentieth century, a gendered work, one that reflected men's worlds more than women's (or children's) worlds. There is some truth in this, but there is no doubt that – given its time – the *DNE* might have been much more gendered in this way. Much of its source material was interview tapes conducted and put together by Herbert Halpert, John Widdowson, many of their folkloristically-attuned colleagues, and their students, so the *DNE*'s citation file reflected a broadly scoped view of vernacular culture as seen by mid-twentieth-century folklorists like Halpert. Halpert was a developer of childlore in North American folklore studies, so children's lore and

13 *Scattered* is treated quite well in its various forms in the *DNE* with a general meaning given that is not far from that of Standard English, something like widely dispersed. Its locality, that is its sense by its users that it is local, comes partly from the collocatory uses (like *the scattered one*) and its commonly simplified pronunciation: *the scatter one*.

language were part of what he encouraged his students to collect, document and report, allowing for insiders' views of what he essentially saw as an outsider. So too women's culture. And by the late 1960s there was a fairly good supply of interviews with women in the MUN Folklore and Language Archive. One of Halpert's master's students from that time, Hilda Chaulk Murray wrote her thesis (1972) on the lives of girls and women in the Trinity Bay community, Elliston, she grew up in; it was based on many field interviews. Murray's materials were available to the *DNE* compilers and they used them. About 110 entries include quotations from her 1979 book closely based on the thesis. So the gender skew was not as bad as it could have been.

Nonetheless, the popular notions of "Newfoundland Folklore" were very often shaped by an even earlier popular culture in Newfoundland that certainly was man-centred. Neil Rosenberg has written, for example, on the view of the Newfoundland world presented in the middle decades of the twentieth century by Newfoundland's most well-known song collector and distributor, Gerald S. Doyle (Rosenberg 1991). Rosenberg has shown that androcentric songs were central to the Doyle collection through each of its iterations (five editions over about fifty years). My own work about the iconic Newfoundland song "I's the B'y" similarly shows that the popular (and academic) work of presentation of Newfoundland folklore at the middle of the twentieth century, skewed that song away from an earlier form that seemed to view the world through the eyes of members of both sexes, to one that was almost entirely male-oriented, a skew that fit well with the popular culture of the time (Hiscock 2005).

The students in my Folklore of Newfoundland and Labrador classes dove into the assigned project and almost without exception discovered that it was a pool they loved swimming in. Some told me at the beginning of their terms that – despite its cost and that it was a *dictionary!* – they didn't mind buying the book because – this being Newfoundland where all things Newfoundland are widely appreciated – they could give the book to a parent or grandparent as a Christmas present afterwards. Later, many of them decided they enjoyed reading the dictionary so much they kept it for themselves. I expect that it sits like a bright yellow flag on some of their bookshelves or coffee tables, where it is available for conversation on social occasions. The great popular writer Ray Guy suggested of the *DNE*'s sister publication, Searly's *Family Names of the Island of Newfoundland*, that it held a place of pride in the homes of many families, next to the

family Bible in that respect.¹⁴ As many of my students knew, the *DNE* holds a similar place in the minds, and homes, of Newfoundlanders.

My list of assigned semantic topics was fairly haphazard: foods from salt-water, foods from woods, insults, personality types, children's play... It was not quite random, as it included topics I knew were there, but certainly was fairly disparate. To the students, it seemed like a random list, and being assigned such topics seemed to catch their interest. Some of the most engaging student papers I have read came from this assignment.

It is this general topic that I address here. It is a fairly simple task to go through the *DNE* and list words pertaining to a given topic and I have done that on many occasions. Past that, it is a short step to using the *DNE*'s citations as a kind of index of the generally published work, and even of unpublished interviews, questionnaire responses and manuscripts in archival regional collections (but especially in the MUN Folklore and Language Archive, MUNFLA). This is the core of using the *DNE* as a folklore collection method, an ethnographic tool. It is however like my technique of smoking O. P. B. tobacco as a student. It reuses the work of others – sometimes naive observation, sometimes rigorous documentation, and always sucked through the editors' filters.

Smoking others' butts is useful. It's cheap, often stronger than the fresh tobacco it came from because it filtered what was inhaled by the original smokers. But of course, it is just what they have left behind, now decontextualised from the originals, and heavily perfumed by the process of their having smoked it. So too with relying on the citations served up by the *DNE*. It is a rich source of strong cultural documentation. It is what the editors thought, very deliberately, were the best examples of the usages they were compiling and illustrating. In compiling the Dictionary, they were filtering the real world as represented in their collections. Using the *DNE*'s unpublished citation collection is a good tonic to that filtering process. For every citation published, there are about two more citations unpublished, left behind sometimes for reasons of redundancy (or their understanding of redundancy), but also for reasons of unreliability of sense: the compilers simply were not sure if someone's report really represented anything beyond a mishearing, or a creative one-off, or something else they did not want in the Dictionary.

14 Guy's comment, used originally in a 1977 review in the St John's newspaper, *The Evening Telegram*, has since been used as a blurb on the cover of the book; see for example, the 1996 edition.

The creative one-off deserves some thought. Newfoundland English is a popular matter of discussion – speakers are knowledgeable about their language and enjoy talking about it. It is often said popularly, esoterically, about Newfoundlanders that they are very creative in their language, that they enjoy hearing the language played with. Folklorists pay close attention to the art in performance of culture, placing “artistic communication” (Ben-Amos 1971) at the centre of what constitutes regional and local folklores. No doubt some of the familiar (and celebrated) words/terms in the *DNE* were devised as originally one-off creative poetic terms. I am thinking for example of *silver thaw* for freezing rain and the rime that coats surfaces as a result, a term in constant use for at least 250 years, and – if the printed record is to be relied on as evidence – often glossed as a local term throughout that period. Thus, the poetic and the self-consciously local nature of the term are both flagged in the performance of the word, but not in the dictionary, at least not directly.

Comprehensiveness and Representivity

What went into the *Dictionary* is popularly thought of as having been universal in some sense. Of course it was not. “What’s not in the *DNE*” (that is, stuff they missed) is a popular topic for discussion over coffee, or a beer, or on local radio phone-in shows dealing with local language. I myself have been asked to appear on the province-wide CBC noon-time radio programme, with its hour-long phone-in format, several times a year to take calls from listeners on the vernacular speech of Newfoundland and Labrador. Though real missed examples do occur, most examples given fall into several categories familiar to the *DNE* compilers: widely-known informal language, forms that *are* in the *DNE* but somewhat hidden by its organisation, one-off artistic devices, and so on. There is no logically drawn line between those one-off creative explosions of speech, and what happens when listeners think something like “That’s nice. I think I’ll use that myself”, and the term becomes local. And then, as it spreads, regional. There are many words that the compilers dropped for lack of evidence of widespread regionality.

Certain curses or impolite language rarely came to the attention of the compilers though they may have fit the general criteria for inclusion. The polite informants/contributors they had (often students of theirs, or professional acquaintances), and the tone of language and content in the publications they scoured, would likely not have included certain kinds of

scatological speech (though *scutters* appears, for diarrhoea, but primarily for sheep, and not *scuts*, as in *That's the scuts!*), nor informal or dysphemistic or childhood language of sexual activity. (*Spunk* for 'semen', a Britishism much less-used in North America, probably would have gone in the *DNE* were it not for someone's shyness, either the contributors' or the compilers', or both. It does not appear on any of the Withdrawn slips. Similarly, the word *cunnyhopper* used in its mid-twentieth-century meaning of general disparagement of a person with no regard to their promiscuity.)

The myth here of universality looms large in such faux exposés. That myth, a bit of modern folklore or meta-folklore in itself, was actively resonated by the Dictionary's lack of locational information for its contents. Of course, and outside my gambit here, the media pronouncers also assume, and leave their viewers or listeners to assume, that if some deviation from Standard English in current speech is not in the Dictionary, then it cannot be exemplary of "Newfoundland English". In fact, the *DNE*, to the extent that it is a way to view past culture, of course reflected past contexts. In the present era we have a growing pan-Newfoundland speech (and culture buttressing it), and many items in the *DNE* have indeed disappeared from active or widespread speech, being irrelevant to present activity or concerns.

There is a migratory, contemporary, legend about a professor who, returning a writing assignment, accuses a student of having wielded his dictionary like a pepper shaker throughout the paper, shaking words down at random throughout his text. Some criticism by local speakers of writers incorporating Newfoundland English in their writing is like this. For instance, the American writer Annie Proulx set her novel *The Shipping News* (1993) in a Newfoundland community. The community was fictional, but its geographic placement was clear – somewhere near the northern tip of the island of Newfoundland. Local people know that some of the words in the *DNE* are associated with Irish-settled areas (like those around St. John's) and seeing those words in the mouths of characters at great remove from that cultural context was jarring.

More recently, in 2012, the Western Canadian-based advertising company Pattison tried to make its presence felt in Newfoundland. It chose to put up billboards advertising nothing but itself, each one with a word or phrase of some local celebrity. Although there was some local complaint, I saw nothing public calling attention to the campaign. Two or three years later, just before Christmas 2014, they used the same technique in a series of billboards advertising Captain Morgan Rum which they said was "As East Coast as Mummering at Granny's". Morgan is not an especially prized

rum – in 2017 for instance it did not have even half the market share the leading product (Lamb’s Rum) had (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation 2018). But the association with the local custom of mummering (with one of the local word forms, mummering, not the standard English word *mumming*) and the use of an old-fashioned name for grandmothers, *Granny*, plus other visual cues, allowed them to bring the street cred of Captain Morgan’s up a notch. Or so they hoped.

Near the end of the second decade of the twenty-first century, social media make publication of non-academic and even impromptu interviews calling attention to local language easy and widespread. See for example an interview with some people from LaManche (not Witless Bay as reported) on the Southern Shore in 2016: (Radio Bean 2016). Similarly, well-planned interviews with local performers make it to social-media popularity, like this 2012 one with actor Alan Hawco (Strombo 2012) and another from 2011 with comedian Mark Critch (O’Neill 2011). Rather more home-made lessons in local speech have also proliferated on social media; see for example, (Lloyd-Hayes 2011). The local interest in local speech has not diminished. “Celebrity” of at least some words and phrases continues and even increases as time passes.

A big difference between my smelly tobacco tin and the bright yellow *DNE* is that the latter re-analysed the materials. It’s like washing the tobacco between the butts and the storage tin. One of the *DNE*’s washes was regionality. It is often noted that it may have been impossible for the *Dictionary of Newfoundland English* to serve both as a compilation of lexis and as an atlas, showing geographic boundaries. It is possible, for at least some of their citations, to narrow down a place from which the word is reported, but both a lack of space and a lack of such data meant the editors had no intention of trying to give that kind of regional information (Story, Kirwin and Widdowson 1982: xviii). This lent energy to a shift in popular notions in Newfoundland in the late twentieth century, away from a comparatively strong vernacular sense of variety and local difference around the Island, and around Labrador, to a comparatively strong sense of unity in the culture that is passing, or has passed. By the early twenty-first century, I was teaching students who assumed that all Newfoundland folklore was alike, who believed that in a previous era “everybody” had gone mummering, or that “everyone” had used “all” the words in the *DNE*. Periodically, especially at key anniversaries of the *DNE*’s publication, reporters are sent out to the streets to talk to passers-by about how many words they know picked randomly from its pages. Without exception these forays turn up almost universal bafflement about the words.

Thus the media presenters pronounce that the *Dictionary* represents a time now long gone and that Newfoundland no longer has a significantly different dialect.

Already by 1990 when the second edition with its supplement was published, the editors of the *DNE* were able to comment on what they saw as a growing interest in a kind of secondary use of traditional Newfoundland speech. New celebration of words had grown up in the eight years since their original publication. Dialect words were being used as cultural flags, by actors and artists, by businesses, and for what might be simply called the presentation of self – an active enregisterment of some parts of the lexis identified in their dictionary. And so it continues. O. P. B. again.

References

- Ben-Amos, Dan. 1971. Toward a Definition of Folklore in Context. *Journal of American Folklore* 84: 3–15.
- Bragg, R. A. [Russell]. 2015. *Traditional Newfy Talk: The First English Language in North America*. Halifax: Nimbus.
- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. 2018. Remembering Wince Worthman – The Man Who Brought Lamb’s to Newfoundland. <www.cbc.ca/news/canada/newfoundland-labrador/wince-worthman-lambs-1.4570326>. Published 11 Mar 2018, accessed 13 Nov 2020.
- Clarke, Sandra. 2010. *Newfoundland and Labrador English*. Dialects of English. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Devine, P. K. *Devine’s Folk Lore of Newfoundland in Old Words, Phrases and Expressions: their Origins and Meaning*. St. John’s: Robinson, 1937. Reprinted (with preface by Philip Hiscock) Memorial University of Newfoundland Folklore and Language Publications, St. John’s, 1997.
- English, L. E. F. 1955. *Historic Newfoundland*. St. John’s: Newfoundland Dept. of Tourism.
- Hiscock, Philip. 1984. Folklore and Language Archive. In *Encyclopedia of Newfoundland and Labrador*, vol. 2. Ed. J. R. Smallwood, et al. St. John’s: Newfoundland Book Publishers.
- Hiscock, Philip. 1994. The Barrelman Radio Programme, 1937–1943: The Mediation and Use of Folklore in Newfoundland. PhD thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Hiscock, Philip. 2002. Taking Apart “Tickle Cove Pond”. *MUSICultures*, June 2002. ISSN 1920–4221. <journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/MC/article/view/21623/25112>.
- Hiscock, Philip. 2005. “I’s the B’y” and Her Sisters: Language, Symbol and Crystallization. In *Bean Blossom to Bannerman, Odyssey of a Folklorist: A Festschrift for Neil V. Rosenberg*. Ed. M. Lovelace, P. Narváez, and D Tye.

- St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland Folklore and Language Publications. 205–242.
- Lloyd-Hayes, Mike. 2011. A Lesson in Newfanese (Newfoundland English). Video recording [1:29]. <www.youtube.com/watch?v=u5LETMGvskw>. [Most recently accessed 9 August 2020.]
- Pitt, Janet E. M. 1984. "Fanny's Harbour". In J. R. Smallwood, C. Horan, R. Pitt, and B. Riggs, eds, *Encyclopedia of Newfoundland and Labrador*, vol. 2. 14–15.
- Murphy, James. 1902. *Songs and Ballads of Newfoundland, Ancient and Modern*. St John's: James Murphy.
- Murray, Hilda E. L. Chaulk. 1972. The Traditional Role of Women in a Newfoundland Fishing Community. MA Thesis. MUN. <research.library.mun.ca/7135/1/Murray_HildaEL.pdf>.
- Murray, Hilda E. L. Chaulk. 1979. *More Than 50%: Women's Life in a Newfoundland Outport Community, 1900–1950*. Breakwater, St. John's.
- Narváez, Peter. 2011a. Joseph R. Smallwood, "The Barrelman": The Broadcaster as Folklorist. In *Sonny's Dream: Newfoundland Folklore and Popular Culture*. St John's: MUN Folklore and Language Publications. 218–238. (Article originally published 1987.)
- Narváez, Peter. 2011b. Folk Talk and Hard Facts: The Role of Ted Russell's "Uncle Mose" on the *Fishermen's Broadcast*. In *Sonny's Dream: Newfoundland Folklore and Popular Culture*. St John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland Folklore and Language Publications. 239–263. (Article originally published 1992.)
- O'Neill, Cailin. 2011. A Newfoundland Language Lesson with Mark Critch, Candice Walsh and Travel Yourself. Video recording [9:20]. <www.youtube.com/watch?v=zqLuIXwsLDw>. [Most recently accessed 9 August 2020.]
- Radio Bean. 2016. The Way People Talk in Newfoundland. Uploaded to YouTube 24 September 2016. Audio recording [4:40]. <www.youtube.com/watch?v=VR1tuy0MmnY>. [Most recently accessed 9 August 2020.]
- Reid, Craig, Robert Oldford, and Michael Abbott. 2000. *Bonavista's Dictionary and Sayings*. [Bonavista, privately printed].
- Rosenberg, Neil V. 1991. The Gerald S. Doyle Songsters and the Politics of Newfoundland Folksong. *Canadian Folklore canadien* 13.1: 45–57.
- Russell, Ted. 1977. *Tales from Pigeon Inlet*. Ed. Elizabeth Russell Miller. St John's: Breakwater.
- Rutherford, Clara Doyle. 2010. *The Place of the Labrador Fishery in the Folklife of a Newfoundland Community*. MA thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Folklore <collections.mun.ca/cdm/ref/collection/theses4/id/93843>.
- Scott, Peter. 1975. *Edible Fruits and Herbs of Newfoundland*. St John's: Oxen Pond Botanic Park, MUN.
- Seary, E. R., with Sheila M. P. Lynch. 1977. *Family Names of the Island of Newfoundland*. Memorial University of Newfoundland. 2nd edition

- (with correction by William J. Kirwin) published 1996 by J. R. Smallwood Centre for Newfoundland Studies (MUN, St John's) and McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.
- Smallwood, Joseph. 1937. From the Masthead by the Barrelman. *Daily News* 12 November 1937, p. 3.
- Story, George M., William J. Kirwin and John D. A. Widdowson, eds. 1982. *Dictionary of Newfoundland English*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Story, George M., William J. Kirwin and John D. A. Widdowson, eds. 1990. *Dictionary of Newfoundland English*. 2nd (expanded) edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Strombo. 2012. Allan Hawco on How to Speak Like a Newfoundlander. [Extract from television series *George Strombouloupoulis Tonight*]. Video recording [3:21] <www.youtube.com/watch?v=MHB32Il7Ce8>. Most recently accessed 10th August 2020.
- Strowbridge, Nellie. 2008. *The Newfoundland Tongue*. St John's: Flanker.
- Webb, Jeff. 2016. *Observing the Outports: Describing Newfoundland Culture, 1950–1980*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Young, Ron. 2006. *Dictionary of Newfoundland and Labrador: A Unique Collection of Language and Lore*. St. John's: Downhome Publishing.

Contributors

Jasmina Dražić is associate professor at the Department of Serbian Language and Linguistics at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad. Her theoretical research focuses on Lexicology and Lexicography.

Anne Dykstra worked as a lexicographer at the Fryske Akademy in Leeuwarden from 1983 until his retirement in 2014. He obtained his doctorate with a dissertation on the nineteenth-century lexicographer J. H. Halbertsma and his *Lexicon Frisicum*.

Jeremy Harte is a member of the Council of the Folklore Society, and has organised its annual Legendary Weekends since 2005; his books include *English Holy Wells, Explore Fairy Traditions* and a forthcoming history of English Gypsies. He is curator of the Bourne Hall Museum at Ewell in Surrey.

Philip Hiscock's first degree was in Linguistics (1975), but he switched to Folklore for his MA (1987) and PhD (1995). From 1979 to 1999, he was Archivist at the Memorial University of Newfoundland Folklore and Language Archive (MUNFLA). From 2000 until his retirement in 2017, he taught Folklore full-time at Memorial University of Newfoundland, specialising in the folklore of language and in Newfoundland and Labrador folklore.

Zoja Karanović is full professor (retired) at the Department of Serbian Literature and Language at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad. She has been a Fulbright Fellow at Yale and Michigan universities, and has lectured widely elsewhere internationally. Her theoretical research focuses on traditional Serbian culture and folklore.

Diarmuid Ó Giolláin is a professor of Irish Language and Literature and concurrent professor of anthropology in the University of Notre Dame. Among his publications are *Locating Irish Folklore: Tradition, Modernity, Identity* (2000), *An Dúchas agus an Domhan* (2005), and *Léann an Dúchais: Aistí in Ómós do Ghearóid Ó Crualaoich* (2012, edited with Stíofán Ó Cadhla). He guest edited *Irlande après Arensberg et Ó Duilearga*, a special number of *Ethnologie française* (2011,2), and recently re-edited

the original essays in *Irish Ethnologies* (2017), with a new preface by Martine Segalen.

Haralampos Passalis is a teacher of Greek language currently working part-time as guest lecturer at the University of Amsterdam (Department of Modern Greek Studies) and as headmaster of the Greek School “Athena” located in Amsterdam. He is also an external researcher at the Centre for the Greek Language (KET)-Department of Greek Medieval Lexicography (Thessaloniki-Greece). His personal research interests mainly focus on lexicography, teaching Greek as a foreign language and on rites and customs in traditional Greek culture.

Jonathan Roper works as a folklorist at the University of Tartu. He wrote *English Verbal Charms* (2005) and edited *Alliteration in Culture* (2011).

Timothy R. Tangherlini is a professor in the Department of Scandinavian at the University of California, Berkeley. The author of *Danish Folktales, Legends and Other Stories* (2013), he has published widely on aspects of Nordic folklore and the history of the discipline.

Lise Winer is Professor Emerita, McGill University, Canada, in second language education. She has published many works on the sociolinguistic history of Trinidad & Tobago, and is the editor of the *Dictionary of the English/Creole of Trinidad & Tobago*.

Indexes

Persons

- Adams, Ann 24, 184
Addy, Sidney Oldall 190, 193, 195, 196, 205
Afanas'ev, Alexandr 30
Alcover, Antoni Maria 13, 17
Alford, Violet 198, 205
Anagnostou, Spyridon 152, 153, 157, 158, 169
Antich, Bàrbara Sagrera 17, 33
Ash, Russell 198, 206
- Baker, Anne Elizabeth 204
Barnes, William 196, 206
Ben-Amos, Dan 224, 227
Bergin, Osborn 43
de Bhaldraithe, Tomás 53, 54
Bødker, Laurits 19, 33
Bollerup, Laurids 76
Boorde, Andrew 87
Boswell, Wester 90, 105
Bosworth, Joseph 24, 191
Bragg, Russell 215, 227
Brand, John 140-144, 197, 203, 206
Britten, James 24, 190, 206
Brockett, John Trotter 204
Burgess, Harry 22
Burne, Charlotte 203, 206
- de Carvalho Neto, Paulo 19, 33
Chope, Richard Pearse 190, 194, 196, 198, 206
Clarke, Sandra 212, 215, 227
Codallo, Alfred 179
Comyn, David 45
Coneys, Thomas de Vere 42
Considine, John 20, 33, 148
Cooper, Henry 90
Cooper, Matty 90
Corkery, Daniel 44, 56
Courtney, Margaret Ann 196

Critch, Mark 226, 228
Crofton, Henry 10, 87-90, 104, 105, 106

Dahl, Vladimir 13, 17, 19, 27, 28, 30, 33, 83
Davies, Owen 26, 33
Degani, Marta 189, 206
Deichmann, Jacob 64
Devine, Patrick 215, 216, 217, 218, 227
Dinneen, Patrick 9, 10, 12, 39, 43-50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58
Douce, Daniel 19, 33
Doyle, Gerald 214, 222, 228
Dražić, Jasmina 11, 109, 116, 127
Duijff, Pieter 130, 148
Dyer, Thistleton 198, 208
Dykstra, Anne 11, 28, 33, 129, 130, 134, 148

Egerton, John Coker 24, 191, 200, 201
Ellis, Alexander John 191
Ellis, Henry 140, 141
Elworthy, Frederick Thomas 190, 191, 192, 193, 195, 196, 206
English, L. E. F. 215

Fallmerayer, Jakob Philipp 162
Fallon, Samuel William 19, 27, 28, 33
Farmakidis, Xenophon 151, 152, 153, 158, 159, 160, 164, 165, 167, 169
Farmer, John Stephen 20
Feilberg, Henning Frederik 10, 12, 59, 60, 61, 64, 69, 70-83
Filipović, Milenka 126, 127
Fischer, Fr. 76
Forby, Robert 204
Fry, Charlie 211
Fry, Pearl 211

Ganader, Christfried 23
Georgiadou, Kassiani 151
von Goethe, Johann Wolfgang 139
Gomme, Alice 203, 206
Greimas, Algirdas 17, 21, 34
Grimm, Jacob 131, 132, 133, 136, 148, 149
Grimm, Wilhelm 131, 132
Grøn, A. 76
Grønborg, Ove L. 76
Grose, Francis 20, 34, 199
Guy, Ray 222, 223

Hagerup, Eiler 69, 71, 74, 83
Haicéad, Pádraigín 51
Halbertsma, Joost Hildes 11, 12, 20, 21, 24, 29, 34, 129-149
Halbertsma, Tjalling 130
Halliday, William Reginald 94, 104, 105
Halpert, Herbert 212, 221, 222
Hancock, Ian 85, 87, 105
Harte, Jeremy 10, 85
Hasdeu, Bogdan Petriceicu 29, 34
Hawco, Alan 226, 229
Hazlitt, W. Carew 203, 206
Helle Anton Thor 28, 34
Henley, William Ernest 20
von Herder, Johann Gottfried 109, 132
Hewett, Sarah 196, 206
Higgins, Jenny 210
Hiscock, Philip 13, 26, 209, 214, 216, 219, 222, 227
Hjelmstjerne, Henrik 63
Hole, Christine 198, 207
Honko, Lauri 91
Hopkins, Gerard Manley 10, 44
Hyde, Douglas 42, 43, 57

Japicx, Gysbert 129
Jensen, J. A. 63, 65, 76, 84
Johnson, Samuel 14, 19, 20, 34, 57, 90, 141, 206
Jones, Malcolm 21, 34
Joyce, James 44, 45, 46, 57

Kamp, Jens 76
Karadžić, Vuk 11, 17, 20, 34, 109-112, 114-128
Karanović, Zoja 11, 109, 116, 127
Karolides, Paulos K. 153, 154, 170
Keating, Geoffrey 44, 45, 47, 48, 57
Kirwin, William 210, 212, 213, 217, 218, 219, 226, 229
Kjær, Jens 76
Konstantinović, Radomir 125, 127
Kopitar, Jernej 109, 110
Korais, Adamantios 156
Kovlsgaard, C. M. C. 76
Kristensen, Evald Tang 10, 59, 76-81, 84

Labov, William 30, 34

Lambe, Ray 210
Langebæk, Jacob 63, 64, 84
Leach, Maria 19, 34
Leerssen, Joep 41, 57, 131, 132, 136, 148, 149, 170, 171
Leland, Charles 10, 90, 105
Lhuyd, Edward 40
Lock, Esmerelda 94
Lolle, Peder 62
Lönnrot Elias 17, 34
Loukas, Georgios 152, 153, 158, 159, 169, 170, 171
Loukatos, Demetrios 162, 163, 168, 170
Lyngby, Kristen 69, 71, 73, 74, 75, 83
Lyster, T. W. 45, 46, 101, 105

Mac Cooney, Art 47
MacLochlainn, Alf 45, 46, 47, 50, 57
Macpherson, James 41, 50
Madsen, P. Kr. 76
Mansikka, Viljo Johannes 30
Marryat, Frederick 94
Matras, Yaron 87, 105
Merrick, Percy 201
Merriman, Brian 47
Mohnike, Thomas 131, 148, 149
Molbeck, Christian 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 71, 73, 79, 84
Møller, J. P. 76
Moor, Edward 204
Moore, Jane 24
Moth, Matthias 61, 62, 63, 64
Mouland, Chris 211
Müller, Torsten 189, 207
Murphy, James 214, 228
Murray, Hilda Chaulk 222, 228
Murray, James 48, 191

Narváez, Peter 213, 216, 227, 228
Nicholson, John 196, 207
Nutt, Alfred Trübner 9, 56, 205, 206

Ó Beaglaoich, Conchubhar 40
O'Brien, Flann 49
O'Brien, John 41
Ó Bruadair, Dáibhí 51
O'Clery, Michael 40

Ó Cróinín, Donncha 55, 57
Ó Cróinín, Seán 55, 57
Ó Dónaill, Niall 53, 54
O'Donovan, John 42
Ó Giolláin, Diarmuid 9, 10, 39
Ó hEithir, Ruairí 50, 57
Oinas, Feliks 17, 30, 34
Okely, Judith 86, 105
Ó Loingsigh, Amhlaóibh 55, 57
Olrik, Axel 80
Onysko, Alexander 189, 206
Opie, Peter 94, 105, 204, 207
Ó Rathaille, Aogán 43, 44, 45
O'Reilly, Edward 41, 42
Ó Súilleabháin, Eoghan Rua 44, 45

Palmer, Roy 198, 207
Papazafropoulos, P. 12, 152, 153, 155, 156, 162, 164, 171
Parish, William Douglas 12, 22, 24, 27, 31, 190, 191, 196, 200, 207
Paspatis, A. G. 152, 153, 156, 162, 165, 167, 171
Passalis, Haralampos 11, 151, 155, 162, 171
Pedersen, Christiern 60, 83, 84
Peege, Juhan 19, 34
Permiakov, Grigorii 28, 35
Perrault, Charles 94, 105
Pickett, Joseph 25, 35, 182, 186
Plotnikova, Anna 110, 126, 128
Plunkett, Richard 40
Politis, Nikolaos 162, 166, 170, 171, 172
Power, Suzanne 210
Proulx, Annie 225

Rafferty, Antaine 47, 57
Ranke, Leopold von 110
Ray, John 27, 35, 210, 222
Raymond, Walter 198, 207
Richmonds, George 20
Roberts, John 92, 93, 103
Roberts, Sarah 92
Røjkjær, Lavst 76
Roper, Jonathan 12, 14, 17, 22, 24, 30, 35, 44, 189
Rosenberg, Neil 222, 227, 228
Rostgaard, Frederik 63, 64, 84
Roud, Steve 177, 178, 182, 186, 207

Russell, Ted 198, 206, 213, 214, 215, 227, 228
Rutherford, Clara Doyle 214, 228

Sakelarios, Athanasios 158
Salisbury, Jesse 22, 26, 32, 35, 190, 194-200, 207
Samber, Robert 94, 105
Sampson, John 10, 85, 88-104, 106
Satchell, Thomas 190
Sayers, Peig 56
Scott, Peter 214, 228
Simpson, Jacqueline 177, 178, 182, 186, 207
Skeat, Walter William 24, 191, 204, 207
Smallwood, Joe 216, 218, 227, 228, 229
Smart, Bath 10, 89, 90, 106
Smith, J. B. 35, 189, 197, 207
Stadelmann, Vera 189, 207
Stephens, George 17
Sternberg, Vincent Thomas 17, 21, 26, 35, 197, 204
Story, George 210, 212, 217, 218, 219, 226, 229
Strøm, Ole 64
Strowbridge, Nellie 215, 229
Sturt, George 198, 207
Swainson, Charles Anthony 24, 190, 208
Syv, Peder 10, 60, 61, 62, 63, 84

Tangherlini, Timothy 10, 59, 61, 84
Temple, Richard Carnac 28
Thiele, Just Matthias 66, 75, 83
Thompson, Thomas William 94, 97, 104, 106, 183, 186
Thoms, William John 19, 32, 197
Trask, Boyd 212
Turunen, Aimo 19, 35

Vedel, Anders Sørensen 61
de Vries, Matthias 131
Walker, Mark 213, 214
Walsh, Don 210
Walsh, Vince 210
Widdowson, John 22, 35, 204, 208, 210, 217, 218, 219, 221, 226, 229
Wiedemann, Ferdinand Johann 20, 35
Wierzbicka, Anna 126, 128
Wilson, Duncan 110, 128
Winer, Lise 12, 25, 177, 180, 187
Wood, Abram 89, 105, 106

Wood, Betsy 101, 105
 Wood, Edward 89, 96
 Wood, Ellen 93, 101, 102
 Wood, Matthew 91, 92, 93, 100
 Wood, Saiforella 91, 100, 101, 102
 Wood, Sylvaina 100, 101
 Wood, Thomas 101
 Wright, Arthur 198, 208
 Wright, Elizabeth Mary 189, 208
 Wright, Joseph 20, 26, 35, 44, 97, 106, 189, 198, 200-208

 Young, Ron 215, 229
 Young, Simon 189, 208

 Zelenin, Dmitri 30
 Zois, Leonidas 152, 153, 166, 173

General Index

ætiology 90, 121-221
 agriculture 22, 54, 56, 112, 113n, 115n, 117, 160, 185
 alphabetical order, the advantages of 32
 amateurs and autodidacts 12, 24, 59, 88, 166-168, 215-216
 ancient Greek-modern Greek connections 11, 156n, 158n, 160-162, 164, 166
 anonymization 24
 appendices to dictionaries 9, 12, 18, 22, 32, 192, 194
 archaisms 28, 93-95, 102, 162, 164, 166
 ATU 333 94
 ATU 480 94
 ATU 500 49
 ATU 560 92
 authorship, single vs. multiple 18

 belief/doubt indicators 182-186
 best-practice recommendations 185-186
Bidrag til en Ordbog over jyske Almuesmaal 11, 59, 61, 71-82
 birdnames 88, 102-103, 119, 157, 180
 birth spoons 134, 141-143
 blason populaire 211
 blessings 155-157, 160, 161n, 163, 167
Bonavista's Dictionary and Sayings 218
 bread 111, 113, 118, 134-135, 142, 157

[*British*] *Folklore Society* 9, 190-91, 193-194, 198

Buddhism 133n, 146-147

cabbage 116

celebrity, *see* locally celebrated words

charms 12, 118-119, 151-152, 154-155, 157, 160, 163n, 167, 181, 194, 202

childbirth 137-138

childlore 204, 221

choices facing lexicographers 12

Christmas 70, 81, 96, 115-116, 118, 120, 135-136, 194, 222, 225

citations, *see* illustrative quotations

clergymen as collectors and researchers 10, 12, 24, 35, 40, 44, 62, 64, 69-70,
76-77, 130, 155, 161, 190-91

clothing 112, 115, 133

collectors 74, 82, 165-167, 197

contributors 10, 224

coverage, broad 19, 59, 190

coverage, comprehensive 32, 62, 66n, 71, 76, 82

coverage, uneven 29-32, 190

criteria for inclusion 178-79, 219

curses 52, 101, 118, 155, 158-160, 161n, 163n, 167

custom and belief 50-51, 91-92, 109-112, 118, 120-121, 157, 159, 167, 180-84,
191, 193, 197, 213

customary law 117

Danish dictionaries, history of 60-68

data collection 220-221

data as confirmatory/disconfirmatory 14, 30, 114-115, 125

death 143-45

definitions 11-12, 18, 20-21, 29-30, 62, 73, 75-76, 81, 109-110, 112, 114, 116,
135, 156-157, 159-160, 178, 180, 182-186, 195, 200-202, 215-216

demonology 121-122, 154

Deutsche Mythologie 132-133, 194

Deutsches Wörterbuch 110, 131

Dialect and Folk-Lore of Northamptonshire 17-18, 21

Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales 91-104

Diccionari català-valencià-balear 17

dictionary archives, unpublished 22-23, 210-11

dictionary data, as supplementary 14, 30-31

dictionary data, fragmentary nature of 29, 32

dictionary data, limitations of 14, 29-32

dictionary data, value of 14, 16, 30-32

Dictionary of American Regional English 30

Dictionary of Newfoundland English 30, 209-226

Dictionary of Old Norse Prose 23
Dictionary of the English/Creole of Trinidad and Tobago 177-186
Dictionary of the Sussex Dialect 24, 27, 31, 190-1
 dictionaries as inspiration 10
 dictionaries of folklore 19
 dictionaries of folkloristics 19
 dictionaries of lesser-used languages 20
 dictionaries, codifying 19-20
 dictionaries, dialect 12, 18, 20, 24, 26, 61, 64-66, 189-205
 dictionaries, general 19, 28
 dictionaries, historical 21
 dictionaries, plans for 63, 71-72, 82
 dictionaries, specialist 20
 digitization 23, 63, 184-5, 210-211
 distancing 182-184
 divinations 160, 202-203
 domains, cultural 70, 183-185

 emic/etic viewpoints 25, 182-184
 encyclopedic information 18, 29, 47, 134, 147, 178
English Dialect Dictionary 12, 44, 189-205
 English Dialect Society 12, 189-196, 198, 200, 204
 entries, longer 12, 18, 76, 80, 120, 152, 160, 167
 entries, multiple, topics divided among 29
 ethnographic present, the 26, 86
 etymology 61, 74, 97, 114, 131, 133-134, 136, 159-160, 180
 evil eye 119-120, 192-193, 196
 exorcism 101
 extinction of traditions 113

 fairies 51-52, 98, 122, 178
 farmers 67, 76, 93, 133n, 157,
 fauna, terms for 88-89, 93-94, 97, 119, 177, 180, 194, 202
 feasts 154, 193
 fiction 214
 fieldwork 10-12, 66n, 77, 90, 111-12, 130, 132-133, 147, 164-65, 168, 220
first language, then culture-paradigm 13, 27-28, 195-197
 fish names 180-81
 fishermen 76, 91, 140
Foclóir Gaedhilge agus Béarla 46-56
 folk life 69, 74, 112-113, 126, 159, 168, 198
 folklore archives 22-3, 166-167, 197, 219
 folklore of dictionaries, the 10
 folklore, scope of 177-178, 199

folklorists who were also lexicographers 17, 27-28
 folkloristics 197, 204
Folk Lore of Newfoundland in Old Words 215-17
 folktales 10-11, 22, 31, 49, 59, 77, 90-95, 104, 109, 123-124, 134, 158, 163n,
 193, 196
 folk drama 22, 31, 184, 200
 food 155, 160
 foreignisms 63, 113
 forests 137-139
 fortune telling 92, 101-103, 118,
 frightening figures 18
 Frisian-English connections 11, 137, 141-147
 Frisian language, history of 129-130

Gaelic League 42-43, 45, 47, 53
 games 81, 96-97, 154, 160, 163n, 193, 202
 genres prevalent in dictionaries 18
 geographical distribution 31, 71, 74-75, 180, 226
 Germanic languages 130
 gestures 160
 ghosts 98-99, 101, 123
 glossaries, folklore monographs with 9
 good luck 50, 98, 101-103
 grammar 53, 87, 89, 95
 grammars 13, 22, 28, 61, 110, 154, 157, 191
Greek Folklore Society 166
Greek Philological Society of Constantinople 156, 160, 161, 163, 169, 172
 greetings 119, 155n, 167, 195

hapax legomena 224
 headwords 18, 21, 43, 48, 62, 74, 112, 179, 192
 honeymoon 135
 households 116-117

 illustrative quotations 12, 18-19, 21, 29-30, 49, 104, 167, 179-181, 184, 197-
 200, 210-12, 219, 221, 223
 indicators, *see* labels
 Indo-European premise 11, 131
 informants 13-14, 22, 24, 64, 130, 165-166
 information, making explicit 25
 Irish Gaelic language, history of 39-43
 Irish Texts Society 9, 43, 45-46, 53

keywords, meta-category 184-86
 keywords, usage 185
 kinship terms 114-15, 125

labels 25, 182-184, 186
 laments 152
Leeds Archives of Vernacular Culture 22
 legends 70, 77, 97, 114, 121-123, 155n, 159-160, 163, 167
 lemmata, *see* headwords
 lemmatization 179, 181, 185
 lexicographic present, the 26-27
Lexicon Frisicum 11, 130, 132-147
 lexis 211, 218, 226
 linguistic land-grabs 26
 linguistic lumping and splitting 25
 linguistic revivalism 40, 42, 54
 loanwords 47, 63, 69, 88, 90n, 100, 102, 104
 local standard 226
 locally-celebrated words 214, 217, 219, 226-227
 location of folklore within a dictionary 9, 12, 18, 21, 160, 179, 181, 184
 location of folklore within an entry 9, 18, 21, 80

magic buttons, ethnographic 197
 material culture 47, 52-53, 81, 111, 113, 125
 metafolklore 218, 225
 metalanguage 9, 11, 24, 60-62, 64, 109, 130, 164
 misfortune 51, 119, 141
 morphology 60, 69, 87-88, 134n, 155, 158-159, 212
 MUN Digital Archives Initiative 210-211
 MUN Folklore and Language Archive 219
 mythology 11, 51, 121, 129, 132-133, 136, 167

nationalism 11, 25, 42, 132, 141
 neologisms 56, 95
 networks 10, 24-25, 59, 62, 64, 70, 74, 82
 neutral language 182-186
 non-standard language 12, 29, 32, 177, 182, 199
 nursery rhymes 155, 159

obscenity 11, 63, 114, 125, 224-225
 obsolescent, bias towards documenting the 27, 56, 67, 72, 92, 104, 205, 225
 omens 194
 oral sources 10, 12, 21, 31, 47, 56, 90-91, 111-12, 118, 132, 155-57, 159-60, 161n, 167, 205, 213-14, 218-19

orthography 20, 42, 53, 59, 61, 63, 65, 109, 111, 136
 over-inclusion 26
Oxford English Dictionary 48, 185, 191

paratexts 22
 paremiological minimum 28
Parnassus Philological Society 160, 165
 phrases 48, 155, 163n, 179, 211, 214, 225, 226
 personal names 50, 114n, 163
 phonetics and phonology 42, 59, 69, 71, 73-74, 91n, 111, 160, 191, 213, 215
 place-names 97, 191, 193-194
 plant-names 115-116, 177, 184, 194, 202, 214
 ploughing 115
 popular belief 155
 postnatal visits 142
 pottery 115
 pranks 197-201, 204
 predictions and prognostications 92, 144-145, 157-158, 160
 pregnancy 137, 143
 prescriptivism 53, 65, 164
 prayers 93, 121, 123, 159
 pronunciation 18, 53, 66, 68, 74-76, 191-192, 213, 221
 proverbs 19, 28, 30, 48-50, 62, 88, 109, 118, 155, 159, 160, 163, 163n, 167, 179,
 181-82, 185, 197, 211
 publication societies 189-190
 puns 45, 88, 155n, 157, 163n

questionnaires, ethnographic 62, 223
 questionnaires, linguistic 22

rain, invocation of 113
 readership 13, 24-25
 register 20, 214
 religion 183
 retrieval 12, 178-79, 184-85
 reuse of earlier dictionaries 10, 26-27, 31, 43, 223
 riddles 90-91, 97, 155n, 156, 158-59, 160, 163, 163n, 167, 193
 rites of passage 120-121, 134-135, 137, 155
Roget's Thesaurus 46
 romanticism 11, 131-132, 156n, 164
 rural 10, 22, 47, 49, 54, 64, 69, 77, 89, 111-113, 115, 125, 131, 134, 136, 142,
 159, 165, 197, 199-200
Rustic Speech and Folk-Lore 189, 202

saints 140, 142-143, 166
 seafarers 136
 shibboleths 181
The Shipping News 226
 slang 20, 199-200
 social media 226
 sound-recording, era of 30
 spelling, *see* orthography
Srpski rječnik 110-127
 stepping stones, dictionaries as 29, 223
 standard language 20-21, 25, 28, 42, 53, 59, 69, 72-73, 75, 80, 152n, 177-178,
 182, 192, 199, 213, 215, 221, 225-226
 standardization, language 19, 60, 63, 65, 88
 supernatural beings 179, 202
 superstition and religion 139
 superstitions 91, 102, 104, 133, 136, 138-139, 141, 143-147, 155-57, 159, 163,
 178, 181-82, 194, 196, 199, 202, 204
 superstitions as proof of nationality 136
 surnames 191, 220, 222
 surveys, folkloristic 217
 surveys, linguistic 13, 22, 204
 swear words 211, 214-215, 224

taboo 117, 137
 teachers as collectors and researchers 10, 59, 64n, 70, 76, 153, 157-158, 161,
 163, 168, 170, 221,
 teething 157
 thesauri 23, 46
thou-forms 212
 toasts 18, 154-155, 167
 tongue-twisters 114, 159-160
 tools and utensils 22, 114n, 115, 155, 160
 traditional dance 21, 179
 traditional healing 25, 151-2, 160, 180, 183, 194
 traditional song 10, 19, 21, 31, 48-49, 61, 94-95, 124-125, 155, 159, 160, 161n,
 163, 163n, 167, 194, 214
 tradition-bearers, conscious 103
 travel writing 114
 triviality threshold 32

under-documented areas 220, 224
 urban 20, 27, 55, 60, 113, 200
 use of dictionaries in teaching folklore 13, 220-223

vernacular lexicography 13, 215-217
views, mistaken, as valuable evidence 26
village layout 115
vows 167

weather lore 92, 113, 119, 155n, 160, 194, 202
weddings 21, 95, 119, 134, 137
West Somerset Word-Book 191-193
wind-egg 140-41
witchcraft 99-101, 136, 140, 182-183, 192-193, 194
women's culture 221-222
Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal 131
word class 21, 60, 62
word-lists 13, 18, 27, 76
work songs 160

