

Alan Kirkness

## **Eruditio interest – scholarship matters**

### **The (neo-)latinate legacy in scholarly historical dictionaries of west-european vernaculars in the modern era: questions of etymology.<sup>1</sup>**

I am speaking to you as a non-european ex-lexicographer and digital alien, speaking in English with a deal to say about Latin, and addressing (in the main) practising european lexicographers who are necessarily digital immigrants, if not natives. So I approach my role with due caution. In the words of the prolific English poet Anon:

Teach not thy parent's mother to extract  
The embryo juices of the bird by suction.  
The good old lady can that feat enact,  
Quite irrespective of your kind instruction.

In more idiomatic words: I am not here to teach grandmother to suck eggs; or to put it bluntly: to tell you what to do. Rather, I should like to raise questions, make observations, and put forward some suggestions.

Let me approach my topic from three angles. First, for me, with what is known as my upside-down view of the world map, Europe is the antipodes. It appears as a small distant north-western appendage on the vast continent of Asia, as an entity, if not a unity. Proximity has meant that cultural encounter and exchange is constant and ongoing. I am as much interested in what is common to (western) Europe as in what is diverse within Europe, certainly in terms of culture, language and lexicography. This has determined my choice of topic. In those terms any competence I can claim is limited and mixed, so bear with me if I have to restrict myself to modern germanic and romance standard languages in western Europe and their traditions of historical scholarly lexicography with particular reference to English, German and French.<sup>2</sup> Very regrettably, I have to leave aside encyclopedias, which I regard as an integral and vital part of historical scholarly lexicography, and concentrate on dictionaries of language.<sup>3</sup> Historical dictionaries are cultural artefacts that tell history through words, just as historical museums tell history through objects.<sup>4</sup> I know that there is much more to European cultures, languages and lexicographies than that. I am conscious, for example, that there are seemingly infinite different types of dictionaries, that Norway has two standard languages, Nynorsk and Bokmål, and that in Spain Catalan at least must be distinguished

---

<sup>1</sup> The text represents an expanded version of the talk given in Berlin, which was shortened because of time constraints. Extensive footnotes and a select bibliography have been added.

<sup>2</sup> The languages of eastern central, south-eastern and eastern Europe are beyond my ken, regrettably, hence my restriction to western Europe. My treatment of Europe is therefore one-sided, as the magisterial history by Norman Davies makes convincingly clear; see Norman Davies: *Europe. A History*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press 1996, especially his introduction, pp. 1–46 and his map of East – West fault lines on p. 18.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. Haß 2012.

<sup>4</sup> See Neil MacGregor: *A history of the World in 100 objects*. London: Allen Lane / Penguin 2010, p. xiii: “Telling history through things is what museums are for.”

from Castilian. A comprehensive historical dictionary of modern English must needs be much more than a dictionary of the language of England or indeed Britain, and fortunately the *Oxford English Dictionary* online or OED<sup>3</sup> now incorporates as a matter of course at least what might be called the first-language Englishes of many nations<sup>5</sup> – the question of the so-called new Englishes rather remains open. Modern standard German is pluricentric with three main geopolitical centres in German-speaking Switzerland, Austria and present-day Germany. I emphasise the attribute “present-day” to acknowledge the complex and ever-changing political landscape of “Germany” in the New High German period. A comprehensive historical dictionary of modern standard German is therefore necessarily an international undertaking. In this context it bears mention that the first edition of Grimms’ *Deutsches Wörterbuch* DWB was first published in Leipzig by a Swiss, that later, for example, Moriz Heyne in Basle and Viktor Dollmayr in Vienna worked on it, and that both the first edition and the new edition survived the split between East and West Germany along with another important historical dictionary, the *Goethe-Wörterbuch*. I do wonder how the often laid charge against the DWB, that it was a national, even nationalistic dictionary, really stacks up, certainly when the actual dictionary articles are examined, not least since they relate to such a lengthy period when German nationalism was not an issue compared with the short period in which it was?

Second, I am not a practising lexicographer, but I believe I am familiar enough with the triple nightmare of space, time and money that haunted the first leading editor of the OED, James Murray, and that usefully sums up the main external constraints placed on lexicographers. From my observations, the conflict between lexicographers seeking to set and maintain scholarly standards on the one hand and publishers interested in (tangible) commercial returns or managers focussed on (speedy) outcomes on the other hand has been and is inevitable. All the evidence indicates that precise planning of large reference works in advance, for instance, is subject to so many imponderables as to be unrealistic or impossible. To quote but one example: Charles Scribner, publisher of the *Dictionary of Scientific Bibliography* DSB:

My own experience as a publisher of the DSB has given me a good deal of insight into the planning of long-term projects. The truth of the matter is that at the start no-one can imagine how long they are going to take. Perhaps it is just as well that our chronological depth perception fails us so often when we look into the future. We might never begin many worthwhile projects if we knew ahead of time their actual completion dates. Dan Boorstin, the Librarian of Congress, commented on this remark saying that it constituted a proof of the existence of God.<sup>6</sup>

In European historical lexicography there are few, if any, exceptions to this rule. I will spare you details. Accounts such as the biography of James Murray caught in the web of words<sup>7</sup> provide an object lesson and should, I suggest, be compulsory reading for all concerned. There is no way of telling in advance what personnel changes there might be, what particular problems the source materials might throw up, or what particular difficulties individual lexical items might confront the lexicographer with once editorial work begins. In historical lexicography the best laid schemes of mice and men go oft awry. It is incumbent on lexicographers to set realistic time lines and goals and to review progress regularly. It is incumbent on publishers and managers to be equally realistic and not to make unreasonable

---

<sup>5</sup> On the use of the plural Englishes see further note 19 below.

<sup>6</sup> Charles Scribner, Jr.: Foreword: Publishing the Dictionary of Scientific Bibliography. In: Rettig 1992, p. ix. DSB, Vol. 1–16, 1970–80; Supplement, Vols. 17–18, 1990; New DSB, Vols. 1–8, 2007. Complete DSB as e-book, 2007.

<sup>7</sup> See Murray 1979.

demands or unwarranted criticism. If they want standards maintained but progress speeded up, for instance, they must first and foremost train and appoint more lexicographers and / or concentrate staff resources on but a few major projects rather than spreading them thinly over a greater number. In this context, comparisons between different west-european dictionary projects can be instructive: the (large) number of lexicographers and others who worked on the *Trésor de la langue française* TLF, for instance, or who are working on the OED online<sup>8</sup> and in institutes in Nancy and Leiden compares markedly with the (small) number of lexicographers working, for example, on the new edition of the DWB. Given the quality of the work and the sheer amount of material covered, the progress of the revised DWB commands respect in my view. People power is the key here; not, I am convinced, the computer.

Which brings me to my third approach. I am a digital alien to use a current expression, with no hope of becoming a digital immigrant and no intention of ever trying to be a digital native. Nonetheless, I am in absolutely no doubt that the computer has opened up entirely new possibilities for lexicographers, including those writing scholarly historical dictionaries, and for the users of such dictionaries, at least in their digital or (retro)digitised versions, on CD or DVD or especially online on the internet. These users have much more varied and sophisticated access to the lexicographical data, which can now be updated regularly across the alphabet. I am a convinced advocate of e-dictionaries, especially as many now feature on websites that offer a great deal more than just the dictionary text itself and especially if they offer a flexible printing option. It is an absolute boon, to mention but a few examples of outstanding dictionaries, to have desktop access to *The Century Dictionary Online* or the OED and not have to use the beautiful, but wrist-breaking printed tomes. The same holds good of the online TLFi and *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* WNT and their Scandinavian counterparts, and the first edition of Grimms' DWB. By the same token, I am both frustrated by and incredulous at the lack of digitised versions of two indispensable historical dictionaries of modern standard German, the new edition of Grimms' DWB and *Deutsches Fremdwörterbuch* DFWB, and I still seem to be largely dependent on printed historical and / or etymological dictionaries of modern Italian and Spanish. In short, online access, preferably open access, to websites incorporating historical scholarly dictionaries of european standard languages must be a given today, that seems to me to be incontrovertible. Equally, however, computerphoria seems to me to be misplaced; many questions remain. Rapid change and planned obsolescence are features of our digital age, as are international charters and conferences on the long-term preservation of digital heritage.<sup>9</sup> Sixteenth century dictionaries are still available today five centuries later as an integral part of historical lexicography: what of today's dictionaries even fifty years hence? Electronic text corpora can provide masses of basic material and sophisticated sorting procedures, more than enough to submerge even the most workaholic lexicographer: what about meaning- or word-class-related filters, directed reading programmes and supplementary extra-corpus material? Electronic editorial templates provide a means to and a check on overall consistency: do they risk becoming procrustean straitjackets?<sup>10</sup> The list of questions could easily be expanded. Of

---

<sup>8</sup> Over 70 editors in Oxford and New York, backed up by technical and library staff, research assistants, consultants and readers.

<sup>9</sup> See UNESCO Charter on the Preservation of the Digital Heritage 2003; The Moscow Declaration on Digital Information Preservation 2011; and the upcoming UNESCO conference on The Memory of the World in the Digital Age: Digitization and Preservation, September 2012 in Vancouver.

<sup>10</sup> See the well-known quotation from Ralph Waldo Emerson's essay on Self-Reliance (1841): "a foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds."

the many potential benefits of e-lexicography<sup>11</sup> let me mention but one notable positive here: space no longer needs to be a nightmare. In telling history through words, historical e-dictionaries can and should in my view move away from extremely condensed text riddled with abbreviations and symbols towards discursive treatment in full sentences with a degree of redundancy to make the text more explicit and hence more reader-, yes: reader-friendly, for example, by explaining semantic distinctions and shifts in words rather than relying so heavily on numbers, letters, commas and semicolons and the like. In short: they should spell things out in plain language and eschew lexicographese or dictionarese: advanced learner dictionaries (of English) provide object lessons in this respect. I note in this context that the literature on the applications and possibilities of computer technology in lexicography far outweighs that on the art and craft of lexicographers. I note further that at both national and supranational level (government) funding for computer-based networks, systems and projects<sup>12</sup> and for IT specialists, even for updated hardware, seems to be much more readily available than salaries for lexicographers. This may be just an impression, but I consider the seeming one-sidedness of funding to be mistaken and I am convinced that such funding should be invested first and foremost in lexicographers. For – and remember it is historical scholarly lexicography that is under discussion here – it is humans, i.e. historical scholars<sup>13</sup>, who write dictionaries and it is humans who use or even read them. That has been and is the case, regardless of whether the work first appears in print form or is digital from the outset, and it will remain the case. Computers can assist the lexicographers and enhance their work in many ways; they cannot replace them nor can they, in my view, usefully accelerate their work in what really matters. Which is what? What matters? What is the standard that is not only a means to an end – as arguably the many technical standards currently being discussed are – but also the essential end in itself? In my view, what matters is scholarship.

Which is the main title of my talk: **Eruditio interest – scholarship matters**. Even a reductionist attempt to define scholarship is clearly fraught with difficulty, but an idealised historical lexicographer-cum-scholar must obviously have – *inter alia* and at the very least – a profound linguistic and textual knowledge of the language being documented, an ability to understand texts in their historical context and to analyse the meaning (of autosemantic or content words) or function (of synsemantic or function words) of lexical items as used in context<sup>14</sup>, an ability to synthesise the results (of perhaps hundreds of individual analyses) through generalisation and abstraction and to formulate them in a way that is both accurate, i.e. reflects actual usage, and user- or reader-friendly, i.e. is comprehensible to the user / reader. S/he must have encyclopedic or world knowledge and literary skills in order to understand general content words and explain their meaning and their semantic shifts perhaps

---

<sup>11</sup> Dale Hoiberg, Editor-in-Chief, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. sums up highlights and advantages of digital products very aptly in his blog Britannica goes all-out digital posted on 13 March 2012 on the Britannica blog. He mentions the following: expanded coverage, continuous revision and updating, supplemental materials, full-text searching, hypertext linking, links to external sites on the Internet, multimedia, and interaction with users.

<sup>12</sup> See e.g. the Academic Network of Internet Lexicography / Wissenschaftliches Netzwerk

“Internetlexikografie” funded by the German Research Council DFG and its first report: Annette Klosa / Carolin Müller-Spitzer (eds.): Datenmodellierung für Internetwörterbücher. 1. Arbeitsbericht des wissenschaftlichen Netzwerks „Internetlexikografie“. In: OPAL Online publizierte Arbeiten zur Linguistik. Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Mannheim, 2 / 2011.

<sup>13</sup> I leave aside any reference to the current debate on (lexicographers as) philologists and / or (historical) linguists; see e.g. Sylvia Adamson and Wendy Ayres-Bennett: Linguistics and Philology in the twenty-first century: Introduction. In: Transactions of the Philological Society 109 / 3 (2011), pp. 201–206.

<sup>14</sup> This raises the question of how much context might be needed for a proper understanding of an individual lexical item: traditional paper slips with perhaps one or two lines or modern one-line KWIC concordances may well not be sufficient or even be misleading. At all events, ready access to the whole source text, where necessary, seems at least advisable.

over many centuries, and technical expertise to understand specialist terms (in many different disciplines and fields) and define their use in specific contexts, again perhaps over time. In respect of etymology as the tracing of the origin and history of lexical items, s/he must not only have knowledge of older stages of the language and an ability to reconstruct unattested forms, but also knowledge of the other languages that have impacted on the language being documented, or at least familiarity with the scholarly historical dictionaries of those languages.<sup>15</sup> I return to this last point later. That is a tall order indeed, impossibly tall for any one person today given today's demands on and expectations of lexicographers. Teams which include specialists in different areas – or at least have access to consultants in such areas – alongside generalists are needed if scholarly standards are to be met. The standard of scholarship is, in my view, primarily a factor of the number and range as well as the knowledge and experience of the lexicographers, as is in large measure the pace of production. In this regard, it cannot be emphasised enough that scholarly historical lexicography of high quality is and will remain very time consuming. The more primary and secondary material it is based on, the better its quality, but the longer it will take. Time remains a nightmare.

I have formulated my main title in Latin and in English. One reason is that the cultural encounter between Latin and the vernaculars (of western Europe) is the major focus of my talk. Another is the profound and ongoing influence of Latin on such vernaculars: if one language had to be nominated as the dominant donor language to modern west-European vernaculars, it would have to be Latin. A third is that English now seems, first, to be assuming some of the *lingua franca* roles once played by Latin, certainly as the language of science and academe.<sup>16</sup> Remarkably, botanical Latin, long established as an independent form of Latin, has now – since January 2012 – been joined in the official description of new taxa of organisms by English.<sup>17</sup> English has become, second, a major donor language in Europe and elsewhere: anglicisms, including latinate anglicisms, have become a prominent and at times contested feature of present-day European vocabularies.<sup>18</sup> Indeed, English has become as multi-headed a hydra as Latin once was, and it is now current and appropriate to talk about the English languages or use the plural Englishes.<sup>19</sup> This development has been

---

<sup>15</sup> For a slightly expanded view on the work of the scholarly historical lexicographer (of German) see Alan Kirkness: Grimms lexikographisches Echo. Zur Erschließung, Erhaltung und Entwicklung des kulturellen Erbes der Lexikographen Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm. In: Sprachwissenschaft 29 / 3 (2004), pp. 345–382, esp. pp. 348–351.

<sup>16</sup> This is a current and very widely debated topic; as an introduction to the vast and growing literature on it see e.g. Ammon 2001, Ammon / McConnell 2002 and Ostler 2010; on possible consequences for other vernaculars and their status, in this case German, see e.g. Ammon 1998. The ramifications of the loss of Latin to English are far-reaching. A pertinent case in point is the following comment from the doyen of Neolatin studies, Jozef IJsewijn: “The loss of Latin as the international academic means of communication was and is a heavy blow to all scholars and scientists who speak a minor language. As a native speaker of Dutch myself, I know the problem firsthand. Latin put us all at the same level, since everybody had to learn it and, writing in Latin, one could never hurt the linguistic sensitivity of native speakers. Now, to be born in an English-speaking country is an immense privilege, and to compete with such privileged persons is almost impossible. Fortunately, there are many among them who understand the problems of their non-English colleagues and in a most generous way put part of their own time at the service of those in want of help.” (IJsewijn 1990, I, p. VII.)

<sup>17</sup> See e.g. Gideon F. Smith, Estrela Figueiredo & Gerry Moore: English and Latin as alternative languages for validating the names of organisms covered by the International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants: The final chapter? In: TAXON 60 (5) October 2011: 1502–1503. On botanical Latin see Stearn 1992. The scientific name in binomial nomenclature remains Latin, and it has to be said that botanical English is thoroughly and for the layperson incomprehensibly latinate.

<sup>18</sup> See e.g. Görlach 2001 for a wide range of European languages; Höfler 1982 and Rey-Debove / Gagnon 1984 for French; Anglizismen-Wörterbuch 1993–1996 and Sörensen 1995 for German.

<sup>19</sup> See by way of introduction Hansen et al. 1996, Crystal 1997, McArthur 1998 and McArthur 2002.

recent and rapid; Latin on the other hand developed its many guises over millenia, as the following quotation – it is only one amongst innumerable possible quotations – indicates:

The Latin language has existed for some 3,000 years and has exerted an influence that is nothing less than astonishing. Its classical form, the literary language of the Roman Republic and Empire and the vehicle of a great literature, is still taught in schools and universities. Its vulgar or popular forms were the precursors of the Romance languages – Italian, Spanish, French, Portuguese, Catalan, Provençal, Sardinian, Romansh, Rumanian, and their many dialects. Its medieval form was Europe’s lingua franca, offering the incomparable advantage of a living language common to the whole of Western Christendom and transcending local linguistic variations. Its revived “classical” form was the learned language of humanism and of early modern Europe until late in the seventeenth century. The present “deadness” of Latin can in no way obscure its historical role as the West’s culturally preeminent instrument of thought and expression for well over 1,500 years. What is perhaps most remarkable about its survival is that it continued to be learned and used for literary, scholarly, liturgical, administrative, and many mundane purposes long after it had ceased to be anyone’s native language.<sup>20</sup>

Let me comment on two issues that arise here. The first comment is brief. It concerns the spate of books aimed at the educated public that have recently appeared in different languages on Latin, its history and its status. This surely reflects a widespread recent decline in the learning and teaching of classical Latin – let alone classical Greek – at all levels of education: no longer can a classical education be assumed, even amongst academics in the widest sense. Hence the recent advocacy and the need for such advocacy of Latin, particularly but not exclusively of classical Latin.<sup>21</sup> Hence also warnings about the poor knowledge of Latin leading even to serious mistakes and misinterpretations among scholars.<sup>22</sup> The point is well made and must be taken.

The second comment is not brief. It goes to the heart of the matter I want to discuss, which I have tried to sum up in my subtitle: **The (neo-)latinate legacy in scholarly historical dictionaries of west-european vernaculars in the modern era: questions of etymology**. It begins with the axiom or truism that the study of Latin influence on or latinisms in modern west-european vernaculars has been and is extensive and intensive.<sup>23</sup> I should speak of classicisms rather than latinisms here in order to allow for the demonstrated and pervasive influence of classical Greek, directly on classical Latin in antiquity and in the modern era mediated and transmitted predominately through Latin, quite particularly through Neolatin. Present-day vernaculars have immediate access to classical Greek as a source especially of word-formation items, including those not represented or mediated by Neolatin as such. These items are usually, and rightly, termed neoclassical. Nonetheless, I prefer to retain (neo-)latinate here to emphasise the role of Latin and particularly Neolatin. As for Neolatin, I accept the current broad definition of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies IANLS: “writings in Latin since the beginnings of Humanism”<sup>24</sup>. In Italy this relates to the

<sup>20</sup> Mantello & Rigg 1996, p. 3.

<sup>21</sup> As a small selection of such books see e.g. Vossen 1992, Lindberg 1993, Fuhrmann 1995, Janson 2003–2006, Weeber 2006, Stroh 2007, Ostler 2007, Maier 2008, Leonhardt 2009.

<sup>22</sup> See e.g. Walther Ludwig: Über die Folgen der Lateinarmut in den Geisteswissenschaften. In: *Gymnasium* 89 (1991), pp. 139–158; Jürgen Leonhardt: Zum Verhältnis von Latein und Geisteswissenschaften. In: *Classicum* 3 / 98, pp. 164–168 (see also Sieben Thesen zum Verhältnis von Latein und Geisteswissenschaften: In: *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* 1 (1999), pp. 283–288).

<sup>23</sup> To give just one example in illustration, see the following very different selected works on latinisms and / or graecisms in German: Hemme 1904 / 1979, Wittstock & Kauczor 1979, Kytzler & Redemund 1992 and <sup>6</sup>2002, Bartels 1996, and Kytzler et al. 2001; and compare the contrast programme provided by *Neues Lateinisches Lexikon* 1998.

<sup>24</sup> Taken from the English version of Article I.A. of the Statutes; the French version is: les écrits en latin depuis les débuts de l’Humanisme; and the more explicit Latin statutes read as follows: *Voces illae «Neolatinus» et «Latinitas recentior» litteras significant Latine cultas a primordiis Humanismi Italici.*

age of Dante and Petrarch in the fourteenth century; in other regions Humanism and Neolatin followed sooner or later. In respect of the modern era I see the middle of the fifteenth century as a watershed marked *inter alia* by the invention of printing, the fall of Constantinople with the concomitant migration of Greek scholars from the eastern Empire to the Latin west, followed by the Renaissance and Reformation.<sup>25</sup> If I were engaged on a comprehensive study of classicisms in (west-)european vernaculars in the modern era – or writing a scholarly historical dictionary of or including such classicisms – I would want to cover the five centuries from 1450 / 1500 to 1950 / 2000. It is only the classicisms of this period that are considered here with particular reference to questions of etymology.

Neolatin was a pan-european phenomenon. It was the dominant language of European scholars in the Republic of Letters<sup>26</sup> until the late seventeenth century and in many cases well beyond that. It must be differentiated from written medieval Latin – as opposed to spoken vulgar Latin as the precursor of the romance languages –, but the break does not seem to have been as great as is sometimes suggested: Neolatin continues a tradition of graecisms, neologisms and vernacularisms that marked learned and scientific vocabulary in medieval Latin.<sup>27</sup> There was also much interaction between the vernaculars and Latin with works being translated in both directions and vernacular traditions continuing and developing alongside Latin in learned usage, for example, in medicine in English.<sup>28</sup> Similarly, the study of Neolatin is a pan-european phenomenon. To a non-neolatinist it appears as a comparatively recent and rather diffuse field of study which is difficult to oversee and is now served in addition to individual studies *inter alia* by an international association which holds triennial international congresses<sup>29</sup>, university departments, institutes and centres<sup>30</sup>, informed and informative

<sup>25</sup> On the influence of Latin (and Greek) on the previous period see e.g. Bolgar 1973.

<sup>26</sup> There is a vast literature on the Republic of Letters / Respublica Litteraria or Literarum; Bots & Waquet 1997 offer a useful synthesis; for an up-to-date and very readable brief introduction with further bibliographical references see Anthony Grafton: A Sketch Map of a Lost Continent: The Republic of Letters. In: Republics of Letters: A Journal for the Study of Knowledge, Politics, and the Arts 1 / 1 (May 1, 2009), pp. 1–18.

<sup>27</sup> On medieval Latin see e.g. Mantello & Rigg 1996 and Stotz 2002.

<sup>28</sup> On various aspects of this multifaceted topic see e.g. Grant 1954 on vernacular works translated into Latin to ensure international circulation; McConchie 1997, Bracke & Deumens 2000, and Taatvitsainen & Pahta 2004 on English medical usage in the early modern period; and Dixhoorn & Sutch 2008 on vernacular learned and literary societies in early modern Europe. See also Guthmüller 1998, Trine Arlund & Johann Ramminger (eds.): Latin and the Vernaculars in Early Modern Europe. In: Renæanceforum 6 (2010), Ann Blair: La persistance du latin comme langue de science à la fin de la Renaissance. In: Roger Chartier (ed.): Sciences et langues en Europe. Paris: École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales 1996, pp. 21–42, Isabelle Pantin: Latin et langues vernaculaires dans la littérature scientifique européenne au début de l'époque moderne (1550–1635). In: *ibid.*, pp. 43–58.

<sup>29</sup> Societas internationalis studiis neolatinis provehendis / International Association for Neo-Latin Studies, founded in 1973 at the second International Congress for Neo-Latin Studies in Amsterdam in 1973. The first congress was held in Leuven/Louvain in 1971, and the next (fifteenth) congress will be held in Münster in 2012. The proceedings of the congresses are published in the series Acta Conventus Neolatini (Louvaniensis, Amstelodamensis etc.).

<sup>30</sup> See e.g. the Seminarium Philologiae Humanisticae, founded at Leuven/Louvain in 1966 by Jozef IJsewijn (1932–1998), doyen of modern Neolatin studies and first president of the International Association, and responsible for the periodical Humanistica Lovaniensia; the Istituto per il Lessico Intellettuale Europeo e la Storia delle Idee ILIESI as part of the Italian National Research Council, founded in Rome first informally in 1964, then in 1970 as the Centre for the Study of the European Intellectual Lexicon and reorganised in 2001, which houses multiple databases and is responsible *inter alia* for triennial conferences, the series Lessico Intellettuale Europeo (more than 100 volumes since 1969), and from 2012 a new online journal Lexicon Philosophicum; and the Centre for the Classical Tradition CCT in the Seminar of Greek and Latin Philology at the University of Bonn, led by Marc Laureys, co-editor with Karl August Neuhausen of the Neulateinisches Jahrbuch.

companions and surveys<sup>31</sup>, specialised periodicals<sup>32</sup> and databases<sup>33</sup>, most of which are situated in different European countries. Neolatin studies seem to date to have focused primarily on the edition and analysis of literary texts; the lexicological and lexicographical documentation and description of Neolatin vocabulary or vocabularies does not appear to be very advanced as yet.<sup>34</sup> In this respect classical Latin and medieval Latin have much longer traditions with international support and are hence better served in comparison.<sup>35</sup> Writing in

<sup>31</sup> See first and foremost IJsewijn 1977, IJsewijn 1990, IJsewijn & Sacré 1998; also Jensen 1995, Waquet 1998–2004. See further e.g. Walther Ludwig: Die neuzeitliche lateinische Literatur seit der Renaissance. In: Fritz Graf (ed.): Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie. Stuttgart, Leipzig: Teubner 1997, pp. 323–356, Heinz Hofmann: Neulateinische Literatur: Aufgaben und Perspektiven. In: Neulateinisches Jahrbuch. Journal of Neo-Latin Language and Literature 2 (2000), pp. 57–97, and Hans Helander: *SO Debate*. Neo-Latin Studies: Significance and Prospects. In: Symbolae Osloenses. Norwegian Journal of Greek and Latin Studies 76 / 1 (2001), pp. 5–102.

<sup>32</sup> See e.g. *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, which publishes articles on Neolatin topics in Latin, English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish, as well as critical editions of Neolatin texts with translations and commentaries. It contains an *Instrumentum Lexicographicum Neolatinum* and the annual, systematically ordered bibliography of Neolatin studies *Instrumentum bibliographicum neolatinum*, accompanied by critical notes, and is supplemented by the series *Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia*. Vols. 1 to 16 were edited by the late Henry de Vocht from 1928 to 1961 as a series of monographs on the history of humanism at Leuven / Louvain. As from vol. 17 (1968) *Humanistica Lovaniensia* appears annually as a *Journal of Neo-Latin Studies*. See also *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch. Journal of Neo-Latin Language and Literature*. Ed. by Marc Laureys & Karl August Neuhausen. Vol. 1 (1992) to 13 (2011).

<sup>33</sup> In addition to the databases of the Istituto per il Lessico Intellettuale Europeo e la Storia delle Idee ILIESI see e.g. Peter Zeeberg & Lars Boje Mortensen: The database of Nordic Neo-Latin literature on the world wide web introduction and status 1997. In: *Symbolae Osloenses* 72 (1997), pp. 185–189; Inger Ekrem: Norwegian Neo-Latin Material 1519–1898. In: *ibid.* 73 (1998), pp. 218–226. See also the Heidelberg / Mannheim projects CAMENA (*Corpus Automatum Multiplex Electorum Neolatininitatis Auctorum / Digitale Bibliothek lateinischer Texte der Frühen Neuzeit*), TERMINI (*Vernetzter Wortschatz lateinischer Wissensliteratur der Frühen Neuzeit*) and THESAURUS ERUDITIONIS (*Handapparat frühneuzeitlicher Lehrbücher und Nachschlagewerke*), now part of the eAQUA project (*Extraktion von strukturiertem Wissen aus Antiken Quellen für die Altertumswissenschaft*) and designed to be part of an experimental encyclopedia EVRECA (*Encyclopaedia Virtualis Recentioris Aevi*):

<http://www.uni-mannheim.de/mateo/camenahtdocs/eureca.html>.

See Reinhard Grühl: Das Wissensnetz der frühen Neuzeit. Von der virtuellen Bibliothek zur virtuellen Enzyklopädie. In: Charlotte Schubert, Gerhard Heyer (eds.): *Das Portal eAQUA – Neue Methoden in der geisteswissenschaftlichen Forschung*. (Working Papers Contested Order 1). Leipzig 2010, pp. 56–70.

<sup>34</sup> For a linguistic study of academic Neolatin see e.g. Benner & Tengström 1977. For lexicography see Hoven 1994, 2006; Johann Ramminger's online database *Neulateinische Wortliste. Ein Wörterbuch des Lateinischen von Petrarca bis 1700* (NLW):

<http://www.neulatein.de> or <http://www.lrz.de/~ramminger/>;

the regular *Instrumentum Lexicographicum Neolatinum* published in *Humanistica Lovaniensia*. The Centre for the Study of the European Intellectual Lexicon in Rome plans a large-scale *Thesaurus mediae et recentioris latinitatis* TMRL as a data base, see e.g. Giuseppina Totaro: The *Lessico Intellettuale Europeo* and its activities. In: *Revue Informatique et Statistique dans les Sciences Humaines* 30 / 1–4 (1994), pp. 223–241, esp. pp. 225–226 with further literature in note 6. See also the following work: Marta Fattori & Massimo Luigi Bianchi (eds.): *Lessico filosofico dei secoli XVII e XVIII*. Vol. 1–4. *A – bulla*. (*Lessico Intellettuale Europeo* 57, 63, 73, 77). Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo 1992–1999.

<sup>35</sup> In addition to the standard Latin – vernacular dictionaries such as Lewis & Short and the Oxford Latin Dictionary for English and Georges for German, the lexicography of classical Latin down to around AD 600 is centred on the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* TLL. The twenty or so Latinists working in the Bavarian Academy of Sciences and Humanities in Munich on the thesaurus, which was first conceived in 1894 and has been appearing in fascicules since 1900, have now completed the letter P and are working on the letters N and R. Now published by De Gruyter, the thesaurus is thus some two-thirds completed. Since 1949 it has been an international project supported by more than 30 academies and learned societies and an international Commission for the Publication of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Medieval Latin was long served by the *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis* by Charles du Cange (1678) as revised by Léopold Favre in the nineteenth century and is now the subject of a series of dictionaries of regional medieval Latin based in different European countries. See e.g. *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch bis zum ausgehenden 13. Jahrhundert* for the German-speaking area, which is based at the Bavarian Academy in Munich, has been appearing in fascicules



2001 about the importance of Greek in the coining of new words in the sciences in the Neolatin period, Hans Helander sums up as follows:<sup>36</sup>

Thus, what is traditionally called 'scientific Latin' will on closer examination turn out to be 'Latin' words formed on Greek word elements. There are so far very few investigations into this world of neologisms [...] The best dictionary in this field is actually the *Oxford English Dictionary*, which will usually supply us very generously with etymologies, semantic distinctions and first occurrences of *termini technici*; it is true that the entries are English words, but the normal background, up to the beginning of the 18th century, will be that the word was coined as a purely 'Latin' word (from Latin or Greek morphemes) which then some time afterwards appeared as an English word in the English literature. The elucidation of the growth of Latin vocabulary in scientific and learned texts should be seen as one of the most important areas of Neo-Latin philology. In general, it must be said that the investigation of the learned discourse in factual literature, e.g. in the dissertational academic prose, is one of the most interesting and urgent tasks.

This summation is central to our topic, but first we must turn from Neolatin as such to modern west-european vernaculars. Elucidation of the growth of Latin vocabulary in scientific and learned texts (notably up to the beginning of the 18th century) indeed remains important to Neolatin philology. Equally, however, elucidation of the growth of (neo-)latinate vocabulary in scientific and learned texts (from the beginning of the 18th century at the very latest and preferably or essentially from the middle of the 15th century!) is one of the most important areas of vernacular philology in western Europe. West-european scholars now very seldom write in Latin, they use their vernacular and in some domains increasingly use English. And not only do they tap into the seemingly inexhaustible lexical resources of Neolatin deriving ultimately from classical Latin and Greek, but they also have recourse directly to classical Latin and Greek in developing vocabularies, terminologies and nomenclatures.<sup>37</sup> Those resources are now available to them in the vernaculars, and widespread word-formation on a (neo-)latinate basis and the ready transfer of lexical items so formed between vernaculars are two pervasive features of modern scientific and scholarly discourse – and a major reflection of ongoing cultural encounter and exchange between the different scientific and scholarly communities. Allow me to use the tags Eurolatin and euroclassicisms to sum up these phenomena<sup>38</sup>. The supranational nature of such items has received much attention. It has led to them being studied *inter alia* as internationalisms<sup>39</sup> and being incorporated into International Scientific Vocabulary ISV.<sup>40</sup> It plays a vital role in the EuroCom project, which aims at receptive intercomprehension in the three main European

---

since 1959 and is currently approaching the end of the letter G. The Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources for Great Britain, which is a project of the British Academy now housed in Oxford and covering the period AD 540 to AD 1600, began appearing in fascicules in 1975 and has reached the letter S with an anticipated completion date of 2014. Dictionaries covering medieval Latin in Finland, Italy and Yugoslavia have been completed, others are in various stages of publication. Under the auspices of the Union Académique Internationale UAI a Comité Du Cange at the Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes as part of the CNRS in Paris is overseeing the publication of a *Novum Glossarium Mediae Latinitatis* NGML, covering Latin in the rather restricted period AD 800–1200 but not restricted to any one region; publication began in 1957 with the letter L and has now reached the letter P.

<sup>36</sup> Helander: op. cit (see note 31), pp. 34–35.

<sup>37</sup> Terminology courses based on Greek and Latin word-formation items are found in different language communities: for German see e.g. Werner 1972 and Arens 1973, for English e.g. Nybakken 1959 and Flood 1960.

<sup>38</sup> See e.g. Munske & Kirkness 1996; also: Alan Kirkness: Eurolatin and English today. An examination of the nature, history and roles of classicisms in English and other European languages. In: *English Today* 49 / Vol. 13 No 1 (January 1997), pp. 3–8.

<sup>39</sup> See e.g. Braun et al. 1990 and Braun et al. 2003; for a more pedagogical approach to internationalisms see e.g. Ellegård / Olofsson 1966 and Ellegård 1982. On europeanisms see e.g. Koppenburg 1976.

<sup>40</sup> See e.g. Philip. B. Gove: The International Scientific Vocabulary in *Webster's Third*. In: *Journal of English Linguistics* 2, 1 (1968), pp. 1-11; for more detail see notes 68 and esp. 70 below.

language families, romance, germanic and slavic. Of the seven so-called sieves on which this project is founded, the first two: international and pan-romance lexis, and the seventh: eurofixes are inherently latinate or euroclassical in nature.<sup>41</sup> Such items may not only be a bridge to interlingual comprehension, they may also be a barrier, namely when they are *faux amis* or false friends.<sup>42</sup> It is, further, no coincidence that the vocabularies of many constructed international auxiliary languages are strongly latinate in character.<sup>43</sup> Within the different vernacular traditions attitudes towards and approaches to (neo- and euro-)latinate items and their study have been extraordinarily varied, and this variation is reflected directly in both lexicology and lexicography. I should like to depict briefly some of the main trends in this variation, at least in French, German and English, but I have to paint with a broad brush so the picture will necessarily be a generalised outline only and will lack sharp focus in detail. I must leave aside the whole question of calques and semantic loans.<sup>44</sup>

In French eurolatinisms have traditionally been regarded as learned words / *mots savants*<sup>45</sup> and contrasted with indigenous items inherited via vulgar Latin – *mots populaires* – on the one hand and borrowings – *mots d'emprunt*, *emprunts* or *mots étrangers*<sup>46</sup> – on the other. They are an integral part of mainstream French lexicology and lexicography and are not included, for instance, in dictionaries of foreignisms.<sup>47</sup> French purism is not directed against them, but first and foremost against anglicisms, real or imagined, or against mixed language or *franglais*<sup>48</sup>, and indeed they seem to be a welcome source of substitutes for unwelcome anglicisms.<sup>49</sup> Learned word-formation items are the subject of both academic<sup>50</sup> and more popular studies.<sup>51</sup>

The German tradition is very different. Indigenous items or *Erbwörter* stem from Germanic; borrowed items, including those from Greek and Latin, were long classified as loan words or *Lehnwörter* if fully assimilated to indigenous patterns and as foreignisms or *Fremdwörter* if not, and there was a long tradition of the exclusion of foreignisms from mainstream German

<sup>41</sup> The trademark Eurocom® stands for EuroComprehension, an acronym for European intercomprehension. For details see the series Editiones Eurocom, esp. Klein & Stegmann 2001, McCann et al. 2003 and Meißner et al. 2003. On the role of English see e.g. Joachim Grzega: The Role of English in Learning and Teaching European Intercomprehension Skills. In: *Journal for EuroLinguistics* 2 (2005), pp. 1-18.

<sup>42</sup> Lists are easily found online on the internet. Examples are French *sympathique* or *génial* and German *sympathisch* or *genial* compared with English *sympathetic* or *genial*. See also e.g. van Roey et al. 1995. False friends are a frequent topic in additional language acquisition and are highlighted in some modern learner dictionaries, see e.g. Josette Rey-Debove: *Dictionnaire du français*. Paris: Le Robert & Clé International 1999, pp. 1109–1149.

<sup>43</sup> Notable examples are Interlingua, Glosa and Interglossa.

<sup>44</sup> *Inneres Lehngut* in German. For a detailed analysis of various types see e.g. Notburga Bäcker: Probleme des inneren Lehnguts dargestellt an den Anglizismen der französischen Sportsprache. (= Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 58). Tübingen: Gunter Narr 1975.

<sup>45</sup> See e.g. Guiraud 1968 and Stefanelli 1992, esp. pp. 199–218: Die gelehrte Übernahme lateinischer Lexeme in die romanischen Sprachen. Cf. also *parole dotte / semi-dotte* in Italian as opposed to *parole popolari / ereditarie*; *cultismi* is also used in this sense (*cultismos* is used commonly in Spanish, *cultismes* sporadically in French).

<sup>46</sup> See e.g. Guiraud 1965.

<sup>47</sup> See e.g. Walter & Walter 1998 – which does, however, include latinisms borrowed from other languages such as English.

<sup>48</sup> See esp. (René) Étiemble: *Parlez-vous franglais?* Paris: Gallimard 1964, <sup>2</sup>1973.

<sup>49</sup> A few examples among many: *oléoduc* for *pipeline*, *logiciel* for *software* and *matériel* for *hardware*.

<sup>50</sup> Notably e.g. Höfler 1972 and Cottez 1978.

<sup>51</sup> See e.g. Jean Bouffartigue & Anne-Marie Delrieu: *Trésors des racines grecques*. (= Collection le français retrouvé 2). Paris: Belin 1981; *Trésors des racines latines* (= Collection le français retrouvé 3). Paris: Belin 1981; also Jacques Cellard: *Les racines latines du vocabulaire français*. Bruxelles: de boeck. duculout <sup>3</sup>2000; Jacques Cellard: *Les racines grecques du vocabulaire français*. Bruxelles: de boeck. duculout. <sup>3</sup>2004.

= Germanic-based lexicology and lexicography. Recently, scholars have largely broken with this tradition: foreignisms are being re-examined and reassessed<sup>52</sup>. They are now included as a matter of course in monolingual dictionaries, even while separate dictionaries of foreignisms or *Fremdwörterbücher* remain popular<sup>53</sup>. The term *Lehnwort* is now found especially in historical-diachronic studies – including <sup>2</sup>DWB – in a more extended sense that includes many former foreignisms<sup>54</sup>. German word-formation on a foreign or borrowed and quite particularly on a latinate basis of coining (*Fremd-* or *Lehn-Wortbildung*) has received much attention of late.<sup>55</sup> Popular attitudes seem more resistant to change: the concept and expression *Fremdwort* remain firmly entrenched, as does the polarity *Fremdwort : deutsches Wort*, suggesting that German foreignisms are not German. Amongst scholars change may be partial: attempts to refocus on the semantics of latinate foreignisms, especially those originating in scientific and academic usage, as hard words or *schwere Wörter*<sup>56</sup>, for instance, were unsuccessful; German scholars working on anglicisms in Europe, for example, have omitted anglicisms of graecolatin or eurolatin origin from their purview, thus limiting their documentation of the influence of English as a donor language.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>52</sup> The German literature on the foreignism as a lexicological category and on foreignisms is vast. See e.g. Braun 1979 (which includes pp. 9–31 the seminal article by Peter von Polenz first published in 1967: *Fremdwort und Lehnwort sprachwissenschaftlich betrachtet*), Stichel 2001, and esp. Eisenberg 2011.

<sup>53</sup> See e.g. Alan Kirkness: *Das Fremdwörterbuch*. In: *Wörterbücher Dictionaries Dictionnaires. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*. Vol. 2. (= *Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science* 5.2). Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter 1990, pp. 1168–1178.

<sup>54</sup> For a revised view of foreign influence on German in the New High German period, including items of (Neo-)Latin origin and latinate neologisms borrowed from other vernaculars or coined in German, see von Polenz 1994 (esp. pp. 77–106), 1999 (esp. pp. 391–411), and 2000 (esp. pp. 209–228).

<sup>55</sup> See e.g. Hoppe et al. 1987, Müller 2005 and Müller 2009. Of particular interest in our context are recent publications by Gabriele Hoppe on the history and development of latinate word-formation items and patterns in that i) they not only focus on the modern vernaculars, especially German and French, alongside Neolatin but also consider classical Latin and Greek, and ii) they provide rich documentary material from original sources with comprehensive inventories of the complex lexical items formed with those items; see e.g. Gabriele Hoppe: *Das Präfix ex-*. Beiträge zur Lehn-Wortbildung. Mit einer Einführung in den Gegenstandsbereich von Gabriele Hoppe und Elisabeth Link. (= *Studien zur deutschen Sprache* 15). Tübingen: Gunter Narr 1999; *Aspekte von Entlehnung und Lehn-Wortbildung am Beispiel -(o)thek*. Mit einem Verzeichnis französischer Wörter auf *-(o)thèque* und Anmerkungen zu Eingangseinheiten von *-(o)thek*-Kombinationen. (= *amades - Arbeitspapiere und Materialien zur deutschen Sprache* 1/00). Mannheim: Institut für Deutsche Sprache 2000; „Reinigung und Fixierung“ – Etablierung neoklassischer Lehn-Wortbildung. Etymologisch-korrekte Wiederherstellung von fachsprachlichen *[itis]*-Lehnwörtern und ihren Ableitungen seit der Frühen Neuzeit. Herausbildung einer fachsprachlichen Lehn-Wortbildungseinheit *-itis*. (= *OPAL – Online publizierte Arbeiten zur Linguistik* 3/2010). Mannheim: Institut für Deutsche Sprache 2010.

<sup>56</sup> See Strauß & Zifonun 1985.

<sup>57</sup> This issue of latinate anglicisms is important in studies of English lexical influence on other languages. See Görlach 2001, p. xviii: “A word is included in the dictionary if it is recognizably English in form (spelling, pronunciation, morphology) in at least one of the languages tested. This principle excludes in particular most internationalisms coined with Latin or Greek elements (*administration, telephone*) and many words from other languages transmitted through English (*avocado, anorak*)”; p. xix: “*Internationalisms* also proved difficult. Words which are Latinate or neo-Greek and have nothing English in their form or pronunciation in any of the 16 languages are not included. Sometimes, however, an English pronunciation was attested in at least one language, making the word an anglicism and forcing its inclusion.” See also Görlach 2002, pp. 13–36: Ulrich Busse, Manfred Görlach: German, p.15: “English influences present a special problem where English words are coined from Latin/Greek elements and are commonly treated as ‘internationalisms’ by the receiver languages, that is, they are fully integrated on the basis of earlier internationalisms from other sources. These loanwords are excluded from the *Dictionary of European Anglicisms* and from our discussion: *telegram, television, telephone, or transistor* have nothing English in their German form. Therefore, only words like *teenager* which are characterized by their foreign spelling, pronunciation, and/or morphology are here named ‘Anglicisms’. This definition also excludes the field of calques: *Kreuzworträtsel* is a translation of English *crossword puzzle* – but its form is entirely German.” For other views on this question see first *ibid.*, pp. 108–127: John Humbley:

In English such items were early known as hard words or less commonly inkhorn terms, and special dictionaries of hard words were a feature of early English lexicography before such items became part and parcel of mainstream monolingual lexicography and lexicology. They have long featured in the scholarly study of English word-formation<sup>58</sup>, and popular works on Greek and Latin elements in English also abound.<sup>59</sup> Two aspects of the hard word tradition are worthy of further note. One is that they have been regarded as a language or lexical bar within the English-speaking and especially the English-writing community today in that they are largely restricted to speakers / writers with higher education qualifications.<sup>60</sup> There seem to be two main reasons for their “hardness”. The first is that they may have specialised or technical meanings not easily accessible to laypeople. Many classicisms originated namely in languages for special purposes LSP, especially the languages of the sciences and other academic idioms.<sup>61</sup> While many may have become part of general parlance and many others may have become integrated into educated usage, many others again have remained restricted to LSP and to academic use. As regards the latter, the Academic Word List, for instance, contains some 570 word families, more than 80% of which derive from Latin and Greek.<sup>62</sup>

---

French; p. 110: “In the *Dictionary of European Anglicisms* it was decided to concentrate on the Anglo-Saxon element in Anglicisms, which has the advantage of eliminating many problematic cases (which was the source for which: *telephone* or *téléphone*, *phonograph* or *phonographe*?). The elimination of many Latinate Anglicisms in French from the *Dictionary*, however, gives a rather unbalanced picture of the place of English borrowings in French. On the one hand, this vocabulary is also where many of the semantic loans take place, some deliberate, but many unconscious, resulting in often criticized polysemy (*réaliser*, *contrôler*, *délai* can all be used with English as well as French meanings). On the other hand, English can often use Latinate forms in a way unknown in French, especially in clippings. Thus, such loans as *pétrodollar* can be criticized as being contrary to French morphology.” For a second view see Roswitha Fischer; Introduction. Studying Anglicisms. In: Fischer & Pułaczewska 2008, p. 10: “Some scholars also distinguish between *anglicisms* and *internationalisms*, for instance the editor Görlach in his *Dictionary of Anglicisms* [...]. According to Görlach, *internationalisms* are words of Latinate or neo-Greek origin and have nothing English in their form or pronunciation. This is why they should be excluded from the category of anglicisms. However, whether the form of a word looks or sounds English often depends on the differences or similarities of the linguistic structures of the source and the target language. For this reason Görlach also included internationalisms if an English pronunciation was at least attested in one of the 16 languages documented. This solution is not quite satisfactory, because it does not seem reasonable to say that a word is an anglicism in one European language, while it is not in another. – Again, the choice is the author’s.” Cf. also Höfler 1982, pp. vi–ix.

<sup>58</sup> See e.g. Hatcher 1951, Marchand 1969 and Bauer 1983; cf. also the systematic treatment of many neoclassical word-formation items in the various editions of the OED, including prefixes, suffixes, connectives (*o* and *i*) and combining forms, a term first introduced *s.v. aero-* by the OED in 1884 and still the subject of considerable debate in studies of word-formation; see e.g. Dieter Kastovsky: *Astronaut, astrology, astrophysics: About Combining Forms, Classical Compounds and Affixoids*. In: R. W. McConchie, Alpo Honkapohja & Jukka Tyrkkö (eds.): *Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 2)*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 1–13; also Jane McCauley: *Technical Combining Forms in the Third Edition of the OED: Word-Formation in a Historical Dictionary*. In: R. W. McConchie et al. (eds.): *Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX)*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 95–104.

<sup>59</sup> See e.g. Ayers 1965, Krill 1993, Schleifer 1995 and Green 2003: Preface, p. xv: “As a result of both the accidents of history and the great esteem in which ancient Greek and Roman culture has been held in the European tradition, more than 60 percent of all English words have Greek or Latin roots; in the vocabulary of the sciences and technology, this figure rises to over 90 percent.”

<sup>60</sup> See e.g. Grove 1949, Corson 1985 and Corson 1995; also Leisi & Mair 1999, esp. pp. 41–77.

<sup>61</sup> See e.g. Drozd / Seibicke 1973, Kocourek 1982, Pörksen 1986, Porter 2003, Park 2006, Gunnarsson 2011. Cf. also Lothar Hoffmann / Hartwig Kalverkämper / Herbert Ernst Wiegand (eds.): *Fachsprachen Languages for Special Purposes. An International Handbook of Special-Language and Terminology Research*. Vol. 1–2. (= *Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science* 14.1, 14.2). Berlin New York: Walter de Gruyter 1998, 1999.

<sup>62</sup> The Academic Word List AWL was developed by Averil Coxhead, see A(venil) J. Coxhead: *An academic word list* (English Language Institute Occasional Publication 18). Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University

These items are taken from a range of texts from a range of disciplines, they are not technical terms found only in one or the other specialist field. Given the importance of English as a / the *lingua franca* of academe and especially of science, the list now plays a significant role in the teaching and learning of English as an additional language EAL, especially at advanced level. The second is that many such items are complex lexical items which are morphologically not transparent, but opaque, i.e. they are not easily motivated by speakers unable to use the form or expression side of an item, the *signifiant*, as a clue to its meaning or content side, the *signifié*. A main purpose of the terminology courses and general works on latinized word-formation items as found in LSP and academic usage is to describe the meanings and functions of the items as constituents in complex combinations and thus to enable students or laypeople to arrive at the meaning of an unknown whole – providing it is regularly formed – from a knowledge of the meaning of the parts they do know. The number of such word-formation items in frequent use is relatively limited, certainly when compared with the innumerable specialist terms formed with them, and this is also a reason for entering such items rather than all the many specialist combinations in general dictionaries. Evidence shows that speakers do try to motivate complex lexical items in this way, but establishing how successful they are in practice remains elusive.<sup>63</sup>

The second aspect is that latinized vocabulary in English has, as already indicated with reference to Hans Helander, long been an integral part of the English-language lexicographical tradition. Helander mentions notably the supply of etymologies, semantic distinctions and first occurrences of *termini technici* in the OED. But this supply is perhaps even more marked in the tradition of encyclopedic dictionaries that has been characteristic of American rather than British lexicography. I should like to consider now more closely questions of the supply particularly of etymologies. Ideally, in my view, etymology should cover both the origin (*étymologie - origine*) and the history (*étymologie - histoire*) of lexical items<sup>64</sup>, considering both their immediate origin or provenance (*étymologie proche*) and their ultimate source (*étymologie lointaine*) and, where relevant, intermediary steps. It should be meaning-related so that the different meanings of polysemous items are etymologised individually. It should consider, as integral to the history especially of lexemes, *signifiant*-related word families and *signifié*-related word fields, including, where relevant, lexemes proposed or introduced as substitutes for classicisms deemed to be foreignisms. In respect of euroclassicisms etymology is necessarily a European endeavour.<sup>65</sup> If we look only at the

---

of Wellington 1998; Averil Coxhead: A New Academic Word List. In: TESOL Quarterly 34, 2 (2000), pp. 213–238. It is now the basis for innumerable print and electronic materials on English vocabulary teaching and learning.

<sup>63</sup> On transparent and opaque items see e.g. Ullmann 1962, esp. pp. 80–115; on motivation and the ability of speakers to motivate or analyse complex items see e.g. Rettig 1981.

<sup>64</sup> I use lexical items as a cover term to include individual lexemes, word-formation items and multi-word items. My views on etymology are strongly influenced by the etymological tradition in Romance linguistics (Walter von Wartburg, Kurt Baldinger et al.) which is being actively continued *inter alia* at the laboratory for analyse et traitement informatique de la langue française ATILF in Nancy. Not only has a Dictionnaire Étymologique Roman DEW been being prepared since 2007 by a team of some 35 romanists from seven European countries, but a team of some 20 etymologists in Nancy and elsewhere has also since 2005 been revising selected TLF etymologies in the project TLF-Étym. On the DEW project see e.g. Éva Buchi, / Wolfgang Schweickard: Romanistique et étymologie du fonds lexical héréditaire: du REW au DÉRom (Dictionnaire Étymologique Roman). In: Carmen Alén Garabato et al. (eds.) : La Romanistique dans tous ses états. Paris: L'Harmattan 2009, pp. 97–110; Wolfgang Schweickard: Die Arbeitsgrundlagen der romanischen etymologischen Forschung: vom REW zum DÉRom. In: Romanistik in Geschichte und Gegenwart. 16, 1 (2010), pp. 3–13. On the TLF-Étym project see e.g. Éva Buchi: Le projet TLF-ÉTYM. In: Estudis romànics: estudis de literatura catalana. 27 (2005), pp. 569–571. While the former project concentrates on hereditary Romance lexical items, the latter focusses *inter alia* on the Latinized lexical heritage in French.

<sup>65</sup> Here again I must leave aside the whole question of calques and semantic loans, see note 44 above.

chronologically first meaning attested of a lexical item, a classicism or (neo-)latinism in German, for example, might derive from classical Greek, in which case Latin, including Neolatin, is a likely intermediary; it might be transferred from Latin, classical, medieval or Neolatin; it might be transferred from one of the modern vernaculars, in this case perhaps French or English in particular; or it might be coined as a neologism in German on a

(neo-)latinate basis. What applies to German applies equally to most other west-european vernaculars, except that the modern donor languages will differ as the case may be.<sup>66</sup> I simply take it as axiomatic that all such items in general or educated usage will be entered and etymologised in scholarly historical dictionaries, regardless of whether they originated as technical terms. More problematic are items which originate and largely remain as technical terms in different fields. The use of “largely” here hints at the problem of setting limits: each dictionary will doubtless have a different policy on what and how much to include from the scientific and technical periphery of vernacular lexis.

There would seem to be two main issues facing lexicographers in respect of latinate or neoclassical technical terms: which should be entered and how should they be etymologised? History provides lessons, as so often, and in this particular case I take instruction from the history of English-language scholarly lexicography. On the first issue Dwight Whitney, writing in 1889 in the preface to *The Century Dictionary*, made the case as follows (p. vi) – and in my view his arguments carry even more weight in the 21st century, especially if we add mention of the biological or life sciences:

Another notable increase in the vocabulary [included in the dictionary] is that due to the admission of the many terms which have come into existence during the present century – especially during the last twenty years – in connection with the advance in all departments of knowledge and labor, scientific, artistic, professional, mechanical, and practical. This increase is nowhere more conspicuous than in the language of the physical sciences, and of those departments of study, such as archaeology, which are concerned with the life and customs of the past. Not only have English words been coined in astonishing numbers, but many words of foreign origin or form, especially New Latin and French, have been imported for real or imaginary needs. To consign these terms to special glossaries is unduly to restrict the dictionary at the point at which it comes into the closest contact with what is vital and interesting in contemporary thought and life; it is also practically impossible, for this technical language is, in numberless instances, too closely interwoven with common speech to be dis severed from it. A similar increase is noticeable in the language of the mechanical arts and trades. The progress of invention has brought nearly as great a flood of new words and senses as has the progress of science. To exclude this language of the shop and the market from a general English dictionary is as undesirable as to exclude that of science, and for similar reasons. Both these lines of development have therefore been recorded with great fullness.

The second issue concerns etymology. In what follows, I concentrate on etymology in a narrow sense, on the origin of lexical items (*étymologie – origine*). Historical dictionaries have traditionally focused as a matter of course on the history of items (*étymologie – histoire*), including, where appropriate, recording movement away from the periphery towards or to the centre of lexis. Is it important to establish authorship (*paternité*), i.e. to establish who coined a particular item in which vernacular, which will obviously predetermine the etymological classification of the item in other vernaculars? James Murray, like Whitney writing in the 1880s, recognised the problem, but had his doubts. After

---

<sup>66</sup> On the Scandinavian languages see e.g. Hans Helander: Language Contact outside Scandinavia V: Loans from Latin and Greek. In: Bandle et al. 2005, Vol. 2, pp. 2086–2095, esp. pp. 2090–2091. Cf. also Dag Gundersen: Nordic language history and natural and technical sciences. In: *ibid.*, 2002, Vol. 1, pp. 435–441, esp. pp. 438–439.

discussing the (avowedly questionable<sup>67</sup>) identification of main words as naturals, denizens, aliens and casuals and distinguishing between the (popular) adoption and (learned) adaptation of borrowed items in terms of morphology, he introduced a further etymological category, modern formation (OED<sup>1</sup>: General Explanations, p. xxxi):

Much of the terminology of modern science is identical, or as nearly so as the forms of the languages permit, in English and French, in English, French, and German, or sometimes even in most of the European languages. It would often be as difficult as useless to ascertain in which language a particular scientific term first appeared in print, this being, linguistically, a mere accident: the word was accepted as common property from the beginning. In such cases, *modern formation* (mod. f.) is employed to intimate that it is uncertain in what modern language, English or continental, the word was first used; it may indeed have occurred first in some modern Latin work, either of English or foreign authorship.

Philip Babcock Gove, editor in chief of *Webster's Third New International Dictionary W<sup>3</sup>* and inheritor of a rich tradition of encyclopedic dictionaries from *The Imperial Dictionary* of Ogilvie and Annandale to *The Century Dictionary* of Whitney (and his principal etymologist Charles Scott) and earlier editions of *Webster*, had a slightly different take on the issue in the 1960s. In his instructions on etymology in W<sup>3</sup> he elaborated on the category International Scientific Vocabulary ISV, the brainchild of his chief etymologist Charles Sleeth:

A very large body of scientific vocabulary found in English circulates freely also in French and German or both; at a slightly greater cultural distance, Italian, Spanish, Russian, Swedish, and occasionally other languages enter the picture. Scientific terms, and their compounds and derivatives, flow back and forth across language boundaries, constituting an *international scientific vocabulary* which we will find it necessary in 3d ed to recognize explicitly, by the abbreviation ISV. This abbreviation is to be used in 3d ed etys as a language label, in most respects on a par with any other language label, whenever it is convenient and accurate.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> Murray himself listed a number of caveats, *ibid.*: “There are no fixed limits between these classes, and the constant tendency is for words to pass upwards from the last [casuals] to the first [naturals]. But, while casuals and aliens from barbarous languages are readily and quickly naturalized, words from French and the learned languages, especially Latin, which are assumed to be known to all the polite, are often kept in the position of denizens for centuries [...] The words marked || in the Dictionary comprise *Denizens* and *Aliens*, and such *Casuals* as approach, or formerly approached, the position of these. Opinions will differ as to the claims of some that are included and some that are excluded, and also as to the line dividing *Denizens* from *Naturals*, and the position assigned to some words on either side of it. If we are to distinguish these classes at all, a line must be drawn somewhere.” For one recent commentary on Murray’s policy and practice see McConchie 1997, pp. 65–66, 136–137 and especially pp. 200–208 on the problem of naturalization, where McConchie backs up with a number of concrete lexical examples the following comments on p. 201: “What is less clear to the student of the completed OED is that hard-and-fast rules governing the treatment of such words were ever devised or put into effect. Not that final consistency would ever have been more than a pipe-dream; but the practice, as it is now enshrined in the pages of the dictionary, is a cacophony of indecision. It is certainly not that the editors were unaware of it – it simply seems to have been a problem that always evaded a final solution, and it still might have to be said in defence of Murray and his co-workers that where in practice no clearer solution was attainable, flexibility was itself the best answer.” The current revision OED<sup>3</sup> follows a different policy and practice; see John Simpson’s section on Etymology in the preface to OED<sup>3</sup> online and for details Philip Durkin: Root and branch: revising the etymological component of the *Oxford English Dictionary*. In: Transactions of the Philological Society 97 / 1 (1999), pp. 1–49. It might be noted *inter alia* that Murray’s category modern formation is now (March 2012) only found some 25 times in the text of OED online, mainly in respect of latinate word-formation items from the first edition that are still to be revised, but also of some inherited lexemes. On the policy on combining forms in OED online see Jane McCauley: Technical Combining Forms in the Third Edition of the *OED*: Word-Formation in a Historical Dictionary. In: R. McConchie et al. (eds.): Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project 2006, pp. 95–104.

<sup>68</sup> Philip B. Gove: Etymology in Webster’s Third New International Dictionary. In: Word. Journal of the Linguistic Circle of New York 22 (1966), pp. 7–82, especially §44., pp. 50–53, here p. 51.

Detailed instructions follow, including a differentiation between ISV and the label NL, the abbreviation for New Latin<sup>69</sup> or Neolatin, first introduced by the German romanist August Mahn in the 1864 edition and expanded in use by the chief etymologist of the 1909 edition, Edward Sheldon:

No word that can be regarded as borrowed unchanged from New Latin is to be given an ISV ety. Although New Latin is an international scientific vocabulary, it is distinct from our ISV (most notably in that its spelling is uniform among natives of all vernaculars). Do not use ISV when NL will serve.<sup>70</sup>

<sup>69</sup> Defined in W3 as Latin as used since the end of the medieval period; *esp.*: Latin as used in scientific description and classification.

<sup>70</sup> Gove, *op. cit.*, p. 53. Gove gives further information on ISV in his dictionary preface dated June 1961: "In the modern technical vocabulary of the sciences it is difficult if not impossible to adhere strictly to the principle of tracing step by step the line of transmission of a word, because such vocabulary has expanded rapidly in numerous fields and has been transmitted freely across language boundaries. Very few works of reference give full or systematic information about the language of origin of technical terms in any one field, and consequently it is impossible for the etymological staff of a general dictionary to garner and present such information about the technical terms of all fields. The present work attempts a new solution of this problem by introducing the label ISV (for International Scientific Vocabulary), for use in the etymology of such words when their language of origin is not positively ascertainable but they are known to be current in at least one language other than English. Examples of the use of ISV and further details about it are given in "Explanatory Notes", 7.6. Some ISV words (like *haploid*) have been created by taking a word with a rather general and simple meaning from one of the languages of antiquity, usually Latin or Greek, and conferring upon it a very specific and complicated meaning for the purposes of modern scientific discourse. More typically, however, ISV words are compounds or derivatives, made up of constituents that can be found entered in their own alphabetical position with their own ulterior etymology, again generally involving Latin or Greek. In either case an ISV etymology as given in the present work incorporates the word into the system of Indo-European etymology as well as if the immediate source language were known and stated. At the same time, use of ISV avoids the often untenable implication that the word in question was coined in English, and recognizes that the word as such is a product of the modern world and gets only its raw materials, so to speak, from antiquity."

In the Explanatory Notes on etymology prefaced to the dictionary the use of the ISV label is depicted as follows: "7.6 A considerable part of the technical vocabulary of the sciences and other specialized studies consists of words or word elements that are current in two or more languages with only such slight modifications as are necessary to adapt them to the structure of the individual language in each case. Many words and word elements of this kind have become sufficiently a part of the general vocabulary of English to require entry in a general dictionary of our language. On account of the vast extent of the relevant published material in many languages and in many scientific and other specialized fields, it is impracticable to ascertain the language of origin of every such term, yet it would not be accurate to formulate a statement about the origin of any such term in a way that could be interpreted as implying that it was coined in English. Accordingly, whenever a term that is entered in this dictionary belongs recognizably to this class of internationally current terms, and no positive evidence is at hand to show that it was coined in English, the etymology recognizes its international status and the possibility that it originated elsewhere than in English by the use of the label ISV (for International Scientific Vocabulary). In some instances a statement as to probable language of origin is added after a semicolon. Examples:

**end·oral** ... *adj* [ISV *end-* + *oral*]

**en·do·scope** ... *n* [ISV *end-* + *scope*; prob. orig. formed in F]

**hap·loid** ... *adj* [ISV, fr. Gk *haploidēs* single ...] **1**: having the gametic number of chromosomes or half the number characteristic of the somatic cells

**-ene** ... *n suffix* ... [ISV, fr. Gk *ēnē* (fem. patronymic suffix) **1**: unsaturated carbon compound

7.6.1 Occasionally the label ISV is used, not to indicate that the entire entry form belongs to the International Scientific Vocabulary, but to identify as internationally current (though non-Latin) one of the constituents of a compound word formed in New Latin:

**cho·les·ter·ol·emia** also **cho·les·ter·ol·ae·mia** ... *n* ... [NL, fr. ISV *cholesterol* + NL *-emia*, *-aemia*]."

Gove traces the development of the NL and ISV labels in successive Webster editions and gives further details on its use in: Philip B. Gove: The International Scientific Vocabulary in *Webster's Third*. In: *Journal of English Linguistics* 2, 1 (1968), pp. 1–11. For some background information see Morton 1994, pp. 111–113 and p. 301. Robert Burchfield, editor of the four-volume OED Supplement, praised the introduction of the label in a review of W<sup>3</sup> in *The Review of English Studies. A Quarterly Journal of English Literature and English Language* 14 / 55 (August 1963), pp. 319–323, here 322–323: "The etymological treatment in general follows traditional lines and from the samples I have examined the reassessment of the main etymological works published since O.E.D.



Gove entered very many terms from science, medicine and technology, more indeed than Murray or Whitney. All three lexicographers lemmatised latinate word-formation items as a matter of course alongside lexemes, an essential policy in this area. Like Murray, Gove introduced a compromise in respect of their etymological description in terms of origin or authorship. Both compromises were plausible, in my view, certainly for their time: they recognised problems and set standards. But what about the 21st century? Does authorship in a more precise sense matter? I think it does, certainly in an era when the sciences and medicine – perhaps the field where science and society interact most directly – have such a very marked impact on the wider community and when laypeople inevitably have difficulty understanding specialist terminology in particular or, more generally, technical terms that have moved from the periphery to or towards the centre of lexis. Explanation is needed, and I believe there is a case for particular lexicographical attention now being paid to the (scientific) periphery of vernacular lexis. This is, of course, at the same time a strong plea for encyclopedic dictionaries, encyclopedic in both the inclusion and the description of lexical items. If a dictionary includes etymologies, and in my view scholarly historical dictionaries must as a matter of course, then on principle the etymology of each and every lexical item entered matters equally, regardless of whether it is (originally) a scientific, medical, theological, philosophical, literary or other item. It may be a detail, but then dictionaries are by their nature composed of a myriad of such details, and a good scholarly dictionary gets as many details as possible right. The ubiquitous devil is in such detail, scholarship in lexicography is exorcism. It must be evident that the European latinate or (neo-)classical lexis of interest here raises questions not necessarily answered by an electronic text corpus of any one vernacular, however comprehensive or representative, nor indeed by lexicographers working on any one vernacular. The questions require other answers. One such might be found in the findings of non-lexicographical scholars, namely linguists, philologists, literary historians or historians of science and culture, working on original historical sources, often across languages. The current revision of the OED, for instance, not only stands in a lexicographical tradition very sensitive to the issue, but also benefits palpably from the contributions to the study of early modern English lexis made by Jürgen Schäfer<sup>71</sup> and Rod McConchie<sup>72</sup>, to name but two such scholars. The current revision of selected etymologies in the TLF likewise benefits from a very well established tradition in Romance and French etymology, in which German-speaking scholars have played and play a notable role. Both projects are setting, in my view, high standards of etymological scholarship.<sup>73</sup> For its part the new edition of the DWB cannot fall back on such a tradition, at least not in dictionaries of language. Historical German-language encyclopedias, on the other hand, have much to offer in respect of the inclusion and description of (neo-)latinate items, including specialist technical terms, and the DWB does have at its disposal a wealth of secondary literature on

---

has been brilliantly conducted throughout the dictionary. [...] One may also admit that the rapid dissemination of internationalized technical and scientific terms justifies in its usefulness and acumen the introduction of the label 'ISV', standing for 'International Scientific Vocabulary'. It is aptly used, for example, in the etymological statement under *telecommunication*, which was coined at an international conference – at which the official language was French – at Madrid in 1932 and instantly rendered into English. But in those instances in which the form or pronunciation of the word in English has been partly governed by the language from which it was drawn, it seems a pity not to have made this clear, as for instance in such words as *metadyne* (French) and *schizophrenia* (German). Indeed sometimes this is done, for example, when *centromere* is stated in answer to G. Zentromer.<sup>74</sup> Burchfield – and likewise OED<sup>2</sup> – omits to mention that the French item was first coined in 1904 by Edouard Estaunié in his *Traité pratique de télécommunication électrique (télégraphie – téléphonie)*. It also seems strange that neither of Gove's two seminal articles is referenced in prominent modern works on etymology (in English) such as Malkiel 1993, Libermann 2009 or Durkin 2009.

<sup>71</sup> Schäfer 1980 and 1989.

<sup>72</sup> McConchie 1997.

<sup>73</sup> See further note 64 above.

words and word histories in addition to its basic textual material. The same must be true of similar lexicographical projects elsewhere. Another such answer might be found in institutionalised west- or pan-european cooperation between scholars, namely lexicographers and etymologists, specialising in the origin and history of (neo-)latinate vernacular lexis, both as an integral part of scholarly historical lexicography on the one hand and as a contribution such lexicography can legitimately make to the intellectual, cultural and scientific history of (western) Europe in the modern era on the other. The scholarly lexicography of both classical and medieval Latin is currently international in character and is supported by international advisory bodies. Something similar is advisable, in my view, for the lexicographical documentation and description both of Neolatin and of the (neo-)latinate heritage in european vernaculars. A (west-)european cooperative or association of vernacular etymologists, classicists and neolatinists, together with historians of science and medicine, working with consultants and working supranationally, be it in person or virtually, might perhaps be a fruitful way forward towards future standards of etymological description in scholarly historical lexicography?

### Select bibliography<sup>74</sup>

Ammon, Ulrich: *Ist Deutsch noch internationale Wissenschaftssprache? Englisch auch für die Lehre an den deutschsprachigen Hochschulen*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter 1998.

Ammon, Ulrich (Ed.): *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science. Effects on the Non-English Languages and Language Communities (= Contributions to the Sociology of Language 84)*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter 2001.

Ammon, Ulrich / Grant McConnell: *English as an Academic Language in Europe. A survey of its Use in Teaching (= Duisburger Arbeiten zur Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft 48)*. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang 2002.

*Anglizismen-Wörterbuch. Der Einfluß des Englischen auf den deutschen Wortschatz nach 1945 begründet von Broder Carstensen, fortgeführt von Ulrich Busse. Vol. 1–3*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter 1993–1996.

Arens, Gerhard: *Naturwissenschaftliches und medizinisches Latein*. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie 1973.

Ayers, Donald M.: *English words from Latin and Greek elements*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press 1965; 2nd ed. by Thomas D. Worthen and R. L. Cherry 1986 (with accompanying workbook by Helena Dettmer & Marcia Lindgren and instructor's manual by R. L. Cherry, both 1986).

---

<sup>72</sup> The bibliography contains mainly books referred to in abbreviated form, especially in the footnotes, which are designed to provide at least an introduction to the various topics touched on. The notes contain further literature, including articles in periodicals. In acknowledgement of the differing conventions in English and German, both the publishers and the place(s) of publication are given wherever possible.

Bandle, Oskar et al. (eds.): *The Nordic Languages. An International Handbook of the History of the North Germanic Languages*. Vol. 1–2. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter 2002, 2005.

Bartels, Klaus: *Wie Berenike auf die Vernissage kam. 77 Wortgeschichten*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1996.

Bauer, Laurie: *English Word-formation*. (= Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press 1983.

Benner, Margareta & Emin Tengström: *On the Interpretation of Learned Neo-Latin. An explorative study based on some texts from Sweden (1611–1716)*. (= *Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* 39). Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis 1977.

Bolgar, R. R.: *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press 1973; <sup>1</sup>1954.

Bots, Hans & Françoise Waquet: *La République des Lettres*. (= *Europe et Histoire*). Brussels, Paris: Belin-De Boeck 1997.

Bracke, Wouter & Herwig Deumens (eds.) *Medical Latin from the Late Middle Ages to the Eighteenth Century*. (= *Academia Regia Belgica Medicinae – Dissertationes Series Historica* 8). Brussels: Koninklijke Academie voor Geneeskunde van België 2000.

Braun, Peter (ed.): *Fremdwort-Diskussion*. (= *Uni-Taschenbücher* 797). München: Fink 1979.

Braun, Peter / Burkhard Schaeder / Johannes Volmert (eds.): *Internationalismen. Studien zur interlingualen Lexikologie und Lexikographie*. (= *Reihe Germanistische Linguistik* 102). Tübingen: Niemeyer 1990.

Braun, Peter / Burkhard Schaeder / Johannes Volmert (eds.). *Internationalismen II. Studien zur interlingualen Lexikologie und Lexikographie*. (= *Reihe Germanistische Linguistik* 246). Tübingen: Niemeyer 2003.

Corson, David: *The Lexical Bar*. Oxford, New York etc.: Pergamon 1985.

Corson, David: *Using English Words*. Dordrecht etc.: Kluwer 1995.

Cottez, Henri: *Dictionnaire des structures du vocabulaire savant. Éléments et modèles de formation*. (= *les usuels du Robert*). Paris: Le Robert 1978, <sup>2</sup>1982, <sup>3</sup>1984, <sup>4</sup>1988.

Crystal, David: *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1997, <sup>2</sup>2003.

Dixhoorn, Arjan van & Susie Speakmann Sutch (eds.): *The Reach of the Republic of Letters: Literary and Learned Societies in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Vol. 1–2. (= *Brill's studies in intellectual history* 168). Leiden: Brill 2008.

Drozd, Lubomir / Wilfried Seibicke: *Deutsche Fach- und Wissenschaftssprache. Bestandsaufnahme - Theorie - Geschichte*. Wiesbaden: Brandstetter 1973.

- Durkin, Philip: *The Oxford Guide to Etymology*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press 2009.
- Eisenberg, Peter: *Das Fremdwort im Deutschen*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter 2011.
- Ellegård, Alvar: *Internationellt Morfemlexikon. 450 latiniska och grekiska ordbaser och deras avläggare I de svenska, engelska, franska och tyska språken*. Malmö: Liber 1982.
- Ellegård, Alvar / Arne Olofsson: *De internationelle orden. Allmän språlkunskap för gymnasieskolan*. Malmö: Gleerups 1966.
- Fischer, Roswitha and Hanna Pułaczewska (eds.): *Anglicisms in Europe: Linguistic Diversity in a Global Context*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing 2008.
- Flood, W(alter) E(dgar): *Scientific Words. Their Structure and Meaning*. New York, Oldbourne: Duell, Sloan & Pearce 1960.
- Fuhrmann, Manfred: *Cäsar oder Erasmus? Die alten Sprachen jetzt und morgen. (= Promenade 3)*. Tübingen: Klöpfer & Meyer 1995.
- Görlach, Manfred (Ed.): *A Dictionary of European Anglicisms. A Usage Dictionary of Anglicisms in Sixteen European Languages*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press 2001.
- Görlach, Manfred (Ed.): *English in Europe*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press 2002.
- Grant, W. Leonhard: *European Vernacular Works in Latin Translation*. In: *Studies in the Renaissance 1* (1954), pp. 120–156.
- Green, Tamara M.: *The Greek and Latin Roots of English*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield 2003.
- Grove, Victor: *The Language Bar*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1949 (1950).
- Guiraud, Pierre: *Les mots étrangers. (= Que sais-je? 1166)*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France 1965.
- Guiraud, Pierre: *Les mots savants. (= Que sais-je? 1325)*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France 1968.
- Gunnarsson, Britt-Louise (ed.): *Languages of Science in the Eighteenth Century*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton 2011.
- Guthmüller, Bodo (ed.): *Latein und Nationalsprachen in der Renaissance. Vorträge des 37. Wolfenbütteler Symposions in der Herzog-August-Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel vom 25. bis 28. September 1995. (= Wolfenbütteler Abhandlungen zur Renaissanceforschung 17)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1998.
- Hansen, Klaus, Uwe Carls & Peter Lucko: *Die Differenzierung des Englischen in nationale Varianten. Eine Einführung*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt 1996.

Haß, Ulrike (ed.): Große Lexika and Wörterbücher Europas. Europäische Enzyklopädien und Wörterbücher in historischen Porträts. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter 2012.

Hatcher, Anna Granville: Modern English word-formation and Neo-Latin. A study of the origins of English (French, Italian, German) copulative compounds. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, Oxford University Press 1951.

Hemme, Adolf: Das lateinische Sprachmaterial im Wortschatze der deutschen, französischen und englischen Sprache. Nachdruck der Ausg. Leipzig: Avenarius 1904. Hildesheim, New York: Olms 1979.

Höfler, Manfred: Zur Integration der neulateinischen Kompositionsweise im Französischen, dargestellt an den Bildungen auf *-(o)manie*, *-(o)mane*. (= Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 131). Tübingen: Niemeyer 1972.

Höfler, Manfred: dictionnaire des anglicismes. Paris: Larousse 1982.

Hoppe, Gabriele, Alan Kirkness, Elisabeth Link, Isolde Nortmeyer, Wolfgang Retting, Günter Dietrich Schmidt: Deutsche Lehnwortbildung. Beiträge zur Erforschung der Wortbildung mit entlehnten WB-Einheiten im Deutschen. (= Forschungsberichte des Instituts für deutsche Sprache 64). Tübingen: Gunter Narr 1987.

Hoven, René: Lexique de la Prose Latine de la Renaissance. Leiden New York Köln: E. J. Brill 1994.

Hoven, René: Lexique de la prose latine de la Renaissance. Dictionary of Renaissance Latin from prose sources. Deuxième édition revue et considérablement augmentée / Second, revised, and significantly expanded edition. Avec la collaboration de / Assisted by Laurent Grailet. Traduction anglaise par / English translation by Coen Maas. Revue par / Revised by Karin Renard-Jadoul. Leiden, Boston: Brill 2006.

IJsewijn, Jozef: Companion to Neo-Latin Studies. Amsterdam etc: North Holland Publishing Company 1977.

IJsewijn, Jozef: Companion to Neo-Latin Studies. Part I: History and Diffusion of Neo-Latin Literature. (= Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia V). Leuven-Louvain: Peeters Press, Leuven University Press 1990.

IJsewijn, Jozef with Dirk Sacré: Companion to Neo-Latin Studies. Part II: Literary, Linguistic, Philological and Editorial Questions. (= Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia XIV). Leuven/Louvain: Leuven University Press 1998.

Janson, Tore: Latin: kulturen, historien, språket. Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand 2003;

A Natural History of Latin: Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press 2004; Latijn: cultur, geschiedenis en taal. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press 2004; Latein. Die Erfolgsgeschichte einer Sprache. Hamburg: Buske 2006.

Jensen, Minna Skafte (ed.): A History of Nordic Neo-Latin Literature. (= Odense University Studies in Scandinavian Languages and Literatures 32). Odense: Odense University Press 1995.

Klein, Horst G. und Tilbert G. Stegmann: EuroComRom – Die sieben Siebe. Romanische Sprachen sofort lesen können. (= Editiones EuroCom 1). Aachen: Shaker <sup>3</sup>2001.

Kocourek, Rostislav: La langue française de la technique et de la science. Wiesbaden: Brandstetter 1982.

Koppenburg, Rudolf: Konvergenzen in einigen europäischen Kultursprachen. Ein deutsch-englisch-französisch-italienisch-spanisch-russischer Übersetzungsvergleich. DPhil Dissertation. Tübingen 1976.

Krill, Richard M.: Greek and Latin in English Today. Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci <sup>3</sup>1993.

Kytzler, Bernhard & Lutz Redemund: Unser tägliches Latein. Lexikon des lateinischen Spracherbes. (= Kulturgeschichte der antiken Welt 52). Main: Philipp von Zabern 1992, <sup>6</sup>2002.

Kytzler, Bernhard, Lutz Redemund, Nikolaus Eberl unter Mitarbeit von Elke Steinmeyer: Unser tägliches Griechisch. Lexikon des griechischen Spracherbes (= Kulturgeschichte der antiken Welt 88). Mainz: Philipp von Zabern 2002.

Leisi, Ernst & Christian Mair: Das heutige Englisch: Wesenszüge und Probleme. Achte, Neubearb. Aufl. Heidelberg: C. Winter 1999.

Leonhardt, Jürgen: Latein. Geschichte einer Weltsprache. München: C. H. Beck 2009.

Liberman, Anatoly: *Word Origins ... and How We Know Them*. Etymology for Everyone. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press 2009.

Lindberg, Bo: Europa och latinet (= Vitterhetsakademiens skriftserie om Europa). Stockholm 1993.

Maier, Friedrich: Warum Latein? Zehn gute Gründe. (= Reclams Universal-Bibliothek 18565). Stuttgart 2008.

Malkiel, Yakov: *Etymology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1993.

Mantello, F(rank) A(nthony) C(arl) & A(rthur) G(eorge) Rigg (eds.): *Medieval Latin. An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press 1996.

Marchand, Hans: *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation. A Synchronic-Diachronic Approach*. (= Handbücher für das Studium der Anglistik). München: C. H. Beck 1960, <sup>2</sup>1969.

McArthur, Tom: *The English Languages*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press 1998.

McArthur, Tom: *The Oxford Guide to World English*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press 2002.

McCann, William J./Horst G. Klein / Tilbert D. Stegmann: EuroComRom – The seven sieves: How to read all the Romance languages right away. (= Editiones EuroCom 5). Aachen: Shaker <sup>2</sup>2003.

- McConchie, R(oderick) W.: *Lexicography and Physicke. The Record of Sixteenth-Century English Medical Terminology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1997.
- Meißner, Franz-Joseph / Claude Meissner / Horst G. Klein / Tilbert D. Stegmann: *EuroComRom: Les sept tamis: lire les langues romanes dès le départ; avec une esquisse de la didactique de l'eurocompréhension*. (= Editiones EuroCom 6). Aachen: Shaker 2003.
- Morton, Herbert C. *The Story of Webster's Third. Philip Gove's Controversial Dictionary and Its Critics*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press 1994.
- Müller, Peter O. (ed.): *Fremdwortbildung. Theorie und Praxis in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. (= Dokumentation Germanistischer Forschung 6). Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang 2005.
- Müller, Peter O. (ed.): *Studien zur Fremdwortbildung*. (= Germanistische Linguistik 197–198 2009). Hildesheim etc.: Olms 2009.
- Munske, Horst Haider & Alan Kirkness (eds.): *Eurolatein. Das griechische und lateinische Erbe in den europäischen Sprachen*. (= Reihe Germanistische Linguistik 169). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer 1996.
- Murray, K. W. Elisabeth: *Caught in the Web of Words. James A. H. Murray and the Oxford English Dictionary*. With a preface by R. W. Burchfield. Yale: Yale University Press 1977; paperback: Oxford, New York etc.: Oxford University Press 1979.
- Neues Lateinisches Lexikon. *Lexicon recentis latinitatis*. Über 15 000 Stichwörter der heutigen Alltagssprache in lateinischer Übersetzung. Von Astronaut *nauta sideratis* bis Zabaione *merum ovo infusum*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1998.
- Nybakken, Oscar E.: *Greek and Latin in Scientific Terminology*. Ames: Iowa State University Press 1959.
- Ostler, Nicholas: *Ad infinitum. A Biography of Latin*. New York: Walker & Co. 2007.
- Ostler, Nicholas: *The Last Lingua Franca. English until the Return of Babel*. New York: Walker & Co. 2010.
- Park, Katherine & Lorraine Daston: *Early Modern Science*. (= The Cambridge History of Science 3). Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press 2006.
- Polenz, Peter von: *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte vom Spätmittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*. Vol. 1: Einführung. Grundbegriffe. 14. bis 16. Jahrhundert. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter 2000; Vol. 2: 17. und 18. Jahrhundert. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter 1994; Vol. 3: 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Berlin, New York. Walter de Gruyter 1999.
- Pörksen, Uwe: *Deutsche Naturwissenschaftssprachen. Historische und kritische Studien*, (= Forum für Fachsprachen-Forschung 2). Tübingen: Narr 1986
- Porter, Roy (ed.): *Eighteenth-Century Science*. (= The Cambridge History of Science 4). Cambridge etc: Cambridge University Press 2003.
- Rettig, James (ed.): *Distinguished Classics of Reference Publishing*. Phoenix: Oryx 1992.

Rettig, Wolfgang: Sprachliche Motivation: Zeichenrelationen von Lautform und Bedeutung am Beispiel französischer Lexikoneinheiten. Frankfurt am Main etc: Peter Lang 1981.

Rey-Debove, Josette & Gilberte Gagnon: Dictionnaire des Anglicismes. les mots anglais et américains en français. (= les usuels du Robert). Paris: Le Robert <sup>3</sup>1984.

Schäfer, Jürgen: Documentation in the O.E.D.: Shakespeare and Nashe as Test Cases. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1980.

Schäfer, Jürgen: Early Modern English Lexicography. Vol. 1. A Survey of Monolingual Printed Glossaries and Dictionaries 1475–1640; Vol. 2. Additions and Corrections to the OED. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1989.

Schleifer, Robert: Grow Your Vocabulary by Learning the Roots of English Words. New York: Random House 1995.

Sörensen, Ilse: Englisch im deutschen Wortschatz. Lehn- und Fremdwörter in der Umgangssprache. Berlin: Volk und Wissen 1995.

Stearn, William T.: Botanical Latin. Newton Abbey: David & Charles <sup>4</sup>1992; <sup>1</sup>1996, <sup>2</sup>1973, <sup>3</sup>1983.

Stefenelli, Arnulf: Das Schicksal des lateinischen Wortschatzes in den romanischen Sprachen. (= Passauer Schriften zur Sprache und Literatur 6). Passau: Richard Rothe 1992.

Stickel, Gerhard (ed.): Neues und Fremdes im deutschen Wortschatz. Aktueller lexikalischer Wandel. (= Institut für Deutsche Sprache. Jahrbuch 2000). Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter 2001.

Stotz, Peter: Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters. Erster Band: Einleitung, Lexikologische Praxis, Wörter und Sachen, Lehnwortgut. (= Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II. 5. 1). München: C.H. Beck 2002.

Strauß, Gerhard & Gisela Zifonun: Die Semantik schwerer Wörter im Deutschen. Teil 1: Lexikologie schwerer Wörter. Teil 2: Typologie und Lexikographie schwerer Wörter. (= Forschungsberichte des Instituts für deutsche Sprache 58). Tübingen: Gunter Narr 1985.

Stroh, Wilfried: Latein ist tot, es lebe Latein! Kleine Geschichte einer großen Sprache. Berlin: List <sup>6</sup>2007.

Taatvitsainen, Irma & Päivi Pahta (eds.): Medical and Scientific Writing in Late Medieval English. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press 2004.

Ullmann, Stephen: Semantics. An Introduction to the Science of Meaning. Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1962; paperback 1972.

van Roey, Jacques, Sylviane Granger, Helen Swallow: Dictionnaire des – Dictionary of faux amis. français – anglais. English – French. Bruxelles: Duculot <sup>2</sup>1993; <sup>1</sup>1988.

Vossen, Carl: Mutter Latein und ihre Kinder. Europas Sprachen und ihre Herkunft. Düsseldorf: Stern-Verlag Janssen & Co. <sup>13</sup>1992; = Latein. Muttersprache Europas. Düsseldorf: Hub. Hoch <sup>6</sup>1978.



Walter, Henriette & Gérard Walter: Dictionnaires des mots d'origine étrangère. Paris: Larousse-Bordas 1991, <sup>2</sup>1998.

Waquet, Françoise: Le latin ou l'empire d'un signe. XVI<sup>e</sup>-XX<sup>e</sup> siècle. Paris: Albin Michel 1998; Latin or the Empire of a Sign. From the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries. London, New York: Verso 2001; Latino. L'impero di un segno (XVI–XX secolo). (= Campi del sapere). Milan: Feltrinelli 2004.

Weeber, Karl-Wilhelm: Romdeutsch. Warum wir alle Lateinisch reden, ohne es zu wissen. (= Die andere Bibliothek). Frankfurt am Main: Eichborn <sup>3</sup>2006.

Werner, Fritz Cl.: Wortelemente lateinisch-griechischer Fachausdrücke in den biologischen Wissenschaften. (= suhrkamp taschenbuch 64). Berlin: Suhrkamp 1972; <sup>1</sup>1956, <sup>2</sup>1960, <sup>3</sup>1968.

Wittstock, Otto & Johannes Kauczor: Latein und Griechisch im deutschen Wortschatz. Lehn- und Fremdwörter altsprachlicher Herkunft. Berlin. Volk und Wissen 1979, <sup>3</sup>1982.