ROOT AND BRANCH: REVISING THE ETYMOLOGICAL COMPONENT OF THE *OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY*[1]

By Philip N. R. Durkin
Oxford English Dictionary
(Received 15 July 1998)

Abstract

This paper provides an overview, with examples, of the style and policy being employed in the preparation of the etymological and linguistic components of the third edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary*. Significant areas of policy are dealt with in numbered sections, although emphasis is placed throughout upon showing how these areas interact in practice. Comparison is made with the treatment of similar material in the first edition of the dictionary and its four-volume supplement (and hence in the integrated second edition of 1989).

As part of the revision of the full text of the *Oxford English Dictionary* currently in preparation, all etymological and linguistic material is being reconsidered and where appropriate revised or rewritten. In the present article the word 'etymology' will be taken to refer, very broadly and simply, to all material presented between square brackets at the head of an entry in the printed text. Sir James Murray, in the 'General Explanations' section of the introduction to the first *OED* fascicle, reproduced in the complete edition of 1933, in fact refers to this component of each entry as the 'morphology or form-history', and goes on to describe its constituent parts as follows:[2]

---

[2] *OED1* will in this article denote the complete edition of 1933 published under the title *Oxford English Dictionary*, comprising the original fascicles published (at first

> The **Morphology** or *Form-History* [within heavy square brackets] includes:- 1. the *Derivation*, or *Etymology*, showing the actual origin of the word, when ascertained. 2. The *Subsequent Form-history* in English, when this presents special features, as phonetic change, contraction, corruption, perversion by popular etymology or erroneous association. 3. *Miscellaneous facts* as to the history of the word, its age, obsolescence, revival, refashioning, change of pronunciation, confusion with other words.

In the 'General Explanations' section of the introduction to *OED2*, which largely reproduces the equivalent section from Murray's preface, the word 'morphology' in the passage quoted is changed to 'etymology', and the words 'derivation, or etymology' replaced with simply 'derivation'.

  Much of the descriptive terminology shown in this passage and elsewhere in the first edition will of course be changed in the course of work on the third edition. However, Murray's use of a different term as a general label for this part of each entry is perhaps a matter of more than passing interest. I will in this article use the word 'etymology' in this broader function in place of Murray's 'morphology' simply on the grounds that it is felt by *OED*'s present-day editors to be on balance probably more appropriate, and to the general reader less confusing, than Murray's term or any other readily available substitute. Its use certainly should not be taken as implying that the question of terminology, with the broader implications it carries with it, is taken to be unproblematic.

  In a recent overview of some problems of Middle English etymology (Hoad 1984), T. F. Hoad has drawn attention to some comments from W. W. Skeat's preface to his *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language* (the first edition of which was completed two years before the publication of the first fascicle of *OED*) where this category of information is pithily characterized:[3]

under the title *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, and hence often referred to as *NED*) from 1884 to 1928, plus a one-volume supplement issued in 1933; *OED2* denotes the integrated second edition of 1989, incorporating the first edition of 1933 plus the four-volume *Supplement* of 1972–1986, together with further additions and some very limited revisions.

  [3] Skeat (1882: v). The second edition of Skeat's dictionary appeared in 1884 (the

> I could find no single book containing the facts about a given word which it most concerns a student to know, whilst, at the same time, there exist numerous books containing information too important to be omitted.

While it is arguable to what extent information concerning the later history of a word within English is appropriate to a dictionary of English etymology such as Skeat's or the later *Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*,[4] such information is of much clearer relevance to a historical dictionary such as *OED* which attempts to record the full semantic and morphological history of each word within English and to set this information in an appropriate context. I will attempt to demonstrate as a main theme of what follows the extent to which such information is often inextricable from the presentation of a word's history prior to its earliest attestation in English, and the necessity therefore of treating such material together. In all areas of etymological work there is much to be done for *OED3*, both in updating and supplementing *OED2*'s documentation, and in exploring more fully some areas (such as the semantic as opposed to the morphological history of a word) the study of which was still in its infancy at the time of the preparation of *OED1* and which are thus somewhat under-represented in the dictionary. Murray's 'derivation, or etymology' obviously remains central as an invariable characteristic of each dictionary entry, and I will discuss here first those aspects of revision work which most directly concern this area, before considering somewhat more briefly some aspects of Murray's sections 2 and 3, drawing upon illustrative examples of work in progress wherever possible.

    At the outset, some words are essential on the general scope and intention of the revision of *OED* presently under way, in order to set issues relating specifically to the etymological component of the

---

same year as the first fascicle of *OED*), and the third and fourth editions in 1898 and 1910 respectively. On Skeat's view of the intended relationship between his work and *OED*, see the preface to his first edition (p. vi), and also Murray (1977: 152–53). The debt of *OED1*'s etymologies, both in content and in methodology, to Skeat's work is a subject which is worthy of close consideration.

    [4] Onions (1966): henceforth *ODEE*. For particular consideration of this question with reference to a dictionary expressly of English etymology, see Hoad (1983); for wider discussion see especially Malkiel (1976).

dictionary in their proper context. The text on which revision work is being carried out on a day-to-day basis is *OED2*, the integrated second edition of 1989: material subsequently published in the *Oxford English Dictionary Additions Series* (1993–1997) will also be fully integrated, together with a large number of further new entries and senses. In addition to a large number of further new entries and subsenses covering fairly recent developments in the lexis, there will also be a considerable number of new entries and subsenses documenting previously unnoted words and senses from earlier in the language's history: see also note 28 below.

While the material most urgently in need of review with regard to content is in most cases to be found among the material hitherto unchanged from *OED1* (which constitutes by far the largest component of *OED2*), material from all of these sources will be reviewed closely, especially with regard to matters of style, terminology, or manner of presentation. The revision process will thus constitute a thorough-going re-examination of the complete dictionary text, involving close scrutiny of the existing text by a large editorial team, and incorporating the fruits of a very large amount of original research on both primary and secondary material undertaken by the project over the course of the last decade and longer. Based as it is upon a combination of reading of a vast amount of both primary and secondary material with consultation of a large number of expert consultants in linguistic and other specialized fields, the process is in many ways comparable to that which accompanied the preparation of *OED1* (on which see especially Murray (1977), Berg (1993), and a forthcoming volume of essays on the preparation of *OED* edited by Lynda Mugglestone). While scholarly work which has drawn attention to deficiencies or gaps in the documentation of the dictionary is of course greatly valued,[5] this only constitutes a very small proportion of the material being acted upon during the preparation of *OED3*. The project is also perforce working to firm deadlines, and while it is both generously funded and provided with a large editorial staff, there are always in practical lexicographical

[5] Demanding especial notice are the contributions of Schäfer (1980, 1989) and Bailey (1978: see also note 28 below) and the many pieces drawing attention to supplementary documentation which have appeared in the pages of the journal *Notes and Queries*.

work on a project of this scale clear limits to how much can be done within the constraints of deadlines and budgets, and I will attempt to set out here where for etymological and linguistic material these limits are being fixed for *OED3*.

In all areas this complete revision makes possible the first top-to-bottom review of policy and procedures since Murray's early fascicles and his preface of 1884, a time at which many key areas of policy and procedure were necessarily being determined on a case by case basis as editing proceeded. Although many small, and some larger, changes in scale, procedure, terminology and style were made as work progressed, Murray and his co-editors were necessarily constrained to keep fairly closely to the style and approach of material already published. The same is true to an even greater extent of the four-volume Supplement of 1972–1986 and of the approximately 5000 new entries or parts of entries added to the second edition of 1989, as this material all had to be accommodated within the existing structure of *OED*. For *OED3* these constraints are far fewer, and it has been possible to act upon many of the suggestions made during extensive consultation with expert consultants,[6] as well as to develop and refine more detailed points of style and procedure during the course of editorial work.

Editorial revision work for *OED3* began on material in the letter M, from among which most of the examples in this article will be drawn; the corresponding fascicles of *OED1* which provide the bulk of the material being revised thus date from the first decade of the present century.[7] (All examples of revised material presented here

---

[6] In the planning stages for *OED3* local experts, especially the *OED* Advisory Committee consisting of distinguished academics working in relevant areas, and in the area of etymological work also Mr. Terry Hoad of St. Peter's College, Oxford, were consulted extensively on many points of style and procedure, although inevitably at times *OED* editorial staff have had to make compromises and take a slightly different direction from that suggested, and final responsiblity is of course our own. (It is not within the scope of the present paper to enter into any account of the decision-making process which shaped the policy matters described here, nor to detail alternative styles or procedures which may have been proposed, although both subjects are clearly of some interest and perhaps worthy of being recorded at a future date.)

[7] The first M fascicle was published in October 1904, and the last in 1908, while the relevant portion of the *Supplement* was published in 1976. The editor responsible for this letter in the first edition was Henry Bradley, who comments in his preface to the

are taken from revised entries at a draft stage, and are intended to illustrate general points of style and procedure.)

1. THE DERIVATION OR TRANSMISSION, AND DISCUSSION OF FOREIGN-LANGUAGE COGNATES

1.1. Style and Terminology

As already noted, there are areas of style, terminology, and manner of presentation that are in need of close attention. Firstly, there are inconsistencies, inevitable in a dictionary compiled over such a long period and under the guidance of so many editors, which can now be addressed, especially with the aid of computational tools, to ensure that both terminology and abbreviations are employed consistently throughout. For instance, such groups as 'abbrev. of', 'abbreviated form of', and 'abbreviated from'; 'compar.' and 'comparative'; 'dim.', 'dimin.', and 'diminutive'; or 'echoic', 'imit.', and 'imitative' can each be standardized on a single term, reducing possible confusion for the reader and increasing the functionality of the database for electronic searches.

Another area badly in need of attention is the labelling of foreign language forms. Firstly, for a computer database to realize its full potential there must be complete consistency in the abbreviations used for each language and dialect, something which is seldom found in *OED2*. For instance, *OED*'s use of 'Fl.', 'Flem.', and 'Flemish' interchangeably clearly needs to be rationalized. (The preference, except for extremely common language names, will usually be for fuller and thus more easily comprehensible forms.) Secondly, the language and dialect names themselves need to be made fully consistent and brought up to date with current practice. Taking the same example again, *OED3* will normally use 'Belgian Dutch' except where referring strictly to the dialects of Flanders, and *OED1*'s practice of labelling as Flemish early modern Dutch forms from Kiliaan's sixteenth-century *Dictionarium Teutonico-Latinum* will be corrected. Thirdly, periodization within languages

---

letter, 'Etymologically considered, the words beginning with M form a typical portion of the English vocabulary, every one of the main sources of our vocabulary being represented, while none is overwhelmingly predominant.'

needs to be made more consistent, for example by ensuring that OFr., MFr., and Fr. refer consistently to clearly defined periods in the history of the French language – a task made much more possible by work of recent decades in French lexicography (see further section 1.4 below). Similarly, in the case of Greek, the sporadic and inconsistent labelling of forms in *OED2* will be replaced by a clear and consistent periodization of ancient, Hellenistic, Byzantine, medieval, and modern Greek. The orthography and lemmatization of cited foreign-language forms will also be reviewed and regularized, for instance by the adoption of the macron rather than the circumflex in marking length in forms from the earlier stages of the Germanic languages, or by making consistent the manner of presentation of the nominative and oblique stems in Latin and Greek nouns and adjectives when both are needed.

In some areas the terminology employed by *OED2* will be simplified and the number of contrasts reduced. A notable example is the derivational formulae employed by *OED2*. Murray's preface describes these as follows (pp. xx–xxi):

> An English word is (1) the extant formal representative, or direct phonetic descendant, of an earlier word; that is to say, it is the earlier word itself, in a later or more recent form . . . This *phonetic descent* is symbolized by (:-) . . . If not the extant formal representative of an original Germanic word, an English word has been (2) *adopted* (a.), or (3) *adapted* (ad.), from some foreign language; i.e. it is a word once foreign, but now, without or with intentional change of form, used as English; or it has been (4) *formed* on or from (f.) native or foreign elements.

This methodology has, for reasons outlined above, perforce been retained in all of the material making up *OED2*, although not without some difficulty (especially in distinguishing consistently between 'adoptions' and 'adaptations'), and with occasional inconsistencies (again particularly as regards Murray's second and third categories). Revision of the complete text of *OED2* now makes possible a reconsideration of this four-fold distinction, and at a fresh inspection some objections present themselves. For instance, (1) is designated 'phonetic descent', implying that it is the (inferred or

reconstructed) spoken realization of the word that is in question, yet inspection of instances where this formula is in fact applied show it to be used chiefly where dramatic if predictable changes in both the spoken and the written form have occurred, most commonly in indicating the relationship between a classical Latin word and its Romance reflexes. Similarly, it is unclear whether standard, paradigmatic representation of a foreign-language grapheme by an English one, with or without any corresponding change in pronunciation, represents 'adaptation' (2), 'without or with intentional change of form', or whether this represents the combination of a foreign morpheme with a native suffix and thus possibly falls under category (4). Essentially, *OED*'s existing categorization of etymological types is ill-suited to reflect the modern general recognition in linguistic and philological work of the importance of a distinction between phonemic and graphemic contrasts. For *OED3* all four of Murray's etymological types will be reduced to a single formula,[8] although with some modification in particular circumstances (such as the use of the term 'ultimately' qualifying many of those instances falling under Murray's first category where several steps are effectively omitted in a complex but largely predictable transmission which has no bearing upon the distinctive history of the word within English). In the examples which follow the sign < appears in this function, although it should be noted that the underlying representation in the database is a code for which any symbol could easily be substituted in the published text, enabling us to perhaps select a more distinctive symbol to flag clearly to the reader the wide variety of derivational types thus denoted.

1.2. *Number of cognates cited, and use of reconstructed forms*

An area where matters of presentation overlap with larger matters of editorial policy is that of the number of cognates cited in each

---

[8] This procedure may already be seen applied, albeit on a rather smaller scale, in etymologies in the *New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*. Similar practice has been frequent in work on English historical linguistics since the 1960's: several notable examples among dictionaries are *A Dictionary of Canadianisms on Historical Principles* (1967), *A Dictionary of Jamaican English* (ed. 1, 1967), and *A Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage* (1996).

entry. *OED*'s approach in this area is not entirely consistent, and has attracted some comment, most notably in connection with the very large number of sometimes very remote cognates listed in the etymologies of many words of common Germanic descent.[9] For such words, the general principle of number of cognates within Germanic cited will be little changed from *OED1*. The explanation given of this in an unpublished letter[10] of Henry Bradley's of April 11th 1896 to Lyttelton Gell, then Secretary to the Delegates of Oxford University Press, on the subject of restrictions to the length and content of *OED*'s etymologies being proposed by the delegates of the press, still holds true, with certain modifications, in the opinion of present-day editors:

> From the beginning of the Dictionary, it has been the rule to quote all the parallel forms in the other Teutonic dialects for every primary word of native origin. It is now proposed that some of these should be omitted . . . It is proposed that the modern German form should be omitted; but this is often the only interesting thing that the non-philological reader finds in the etymological note. That the extra-Teutonic affinites of Teutonic words should be more sparingly treated than heretofore is a rule which I am quite willing to adopt.

There will of course be changes in small matters of style and presentation, as illustrated by the relevant portion of the draft revised etymology for MORE a. (n.) and adv.:

> [< the Gmc. base of OFris. *māra* (also *mār*, *mēr* adv.), MDu. *mēre* (also *meer* adv.; Du. has the double compar. *meerder*), OS. *mēro* (also *mēr* adv.; MLG. *mēr*), OHG. *mēra*, *mēro* (MHG. *mēre*, Ger. *mehr*; cf. the double compar. forms OHG. *mērōro*, *mēriro*, MHG. *mērer*, *mērre* greater, more, Ger. *mehrere* pl., several), ONorse *meiri*, Sw. *mera*, Da. *mere* (the Sw. and Da.

---

[9] For comment, and a rather different suggested approach suitable for a specialist etymological dictionary making reference more explicitly to the existing scholarly literature, see Hoad (1983).

[10] Held in the archives of Oxford University Press, *OED* Additional 11 April 1896, and quoted by kind permission of the Secretary to the Delegates of the Press.

forms are the neut. adj. used adv.), Gothic *maiza*. For further
etymology see discussion of corresponding Gmc. adv. forms
from the same base s.v. MO *adv*.]

The ordering of forms is here changed from that usual in *OED*, with
Middle Dutch and modern Dutch no longer presented erroneously
as though descended directly from Old Saxon (there being no Old
Dutch, or Old Low Franconian, form attested to cite here as the
antecedent of the later Dutch forms), and similarly the Swedish and
Danish forms are not presented as though directly descended from
the attested, chiefly West Norse, Old Norse forms; Old English
forms are represented only in the English quotation evidence and in
the analysis of English form history, and not as in *OED1* for a
second time among the Germanic cognates; on a purely stylistic
level, the use of the macron in place of older use of the circumflex
may be observed here.

The remoter etymologies of Germanic items will be treated in
OED3 just like those of items from other branches of Indo-Euro-
pean. Any particularly closely related forms from other branches of
Indo-European will be cited, plus forms which have yielded another
English loan (and where a cross-reference to another *OED* entry
may thus be supplied) or which are of particular significance in
showing the geographical and linguistic spread of an item (in the
latter case with greater consistency being shown in the choice of the
representative language from which forms should be cited for a
given branch of Indo-European). In the process a good many of
OED's lists of cognates will be simplified, while others will be
supplemented.

Reconstructed forms, especially reconstructed proto-forms pos-
ited for stages earlier than the earliest documentary evidence for the
language or language family in question, will wherever possible be
avoided, and where discussion of a reconstructed proto-form is
needed this will normally be done by description of the relevant
characteristics of the assumed form, rather than as traditionally by
the presentation of a starred reconstructed form.[11] With the avail-

---

[11] In the case of items of Germanic origin, there is certainly a very strong case for a
detailed and comprehensive etymological dictionary of Old English to supersede
Holthausen (1934, 1963): for further discussion see Bammesberger (1985) and, for a

ability of vastly improved lexicographical coverage in many of the most important areas, it is possible for *OED3* to draw a much clearer distinction than was possible for *OED1* between documented and hypothetical forms, and it is our intention to take advantage of this by making most prominent in our presentation those documented forms on which our etymologies are based, and to leave by and large to specialist works of comparative linguistics the detailed reconstruction of proto-forms.

1.3. *Use of cross-references*

A policy of wherever possible tracing any Indo-European morpheme to its earliest documented form and there listing its most significant cognates clearly makes considerable logistical demands. A major factor in making this burden more manageable is the systematic use of cross-references. A consistent and systematic application of cross-referencing is widely accepted to be essential for any major modern etymological dictionary. *OED3* etymologies will cross-refer whenever a fuller etymology of a given lemma is found elsewhere in the dictionary. This policy involves making systematic a practice which is already widespread in *OED1*, and will ensure that the reader is always directed efficiently and economically to a single location or 'node' where an important

---

practical example of a more detailed treatment of a limited number of words, Bammesberger (1979). However, *OED3* is hardly the place for such an undertaking, not least because of its restriction in coverage of Old English items broadly to those which survived past 1150, with full coverage of the Old English lexis being the province of the *Dictionary of Old English* in preparation in Toronto; further, while *DOE*'s coverage of etymological questions is very limited, it would seem appropriate that any wholesale reconsideration of Old English etymology should await the completion of that project and the vast amount of essential documentation and detailed analysis that will thus be made available to the scholar. In some cases, *OED3* will have to consider in some detail questions of Old English etymology, on occasion perhaps even in rather greater detail than would a period-specific etymological dictionary (the cases of *OED*'s MESH n. and MASK n. provide an example where *OED3* must consider a number of very poorly or even unattested Old English forms and their proposed etymologies in rather more detail than might be deemed necessary in a work dealing specifically with Old English), but a comprehensive examination of the whole of the common Germanic lexis as represented in English of all periods (thus, embracing Old English and those items unattested before Middle English or even later) is outside the scope of *OED3*.

etymology can be treated in depth.[12] Such nodes will usually be located at the entry for the English word which is closest in form to the etymon in question, although some exceptions may be made in cases where a word which diverges slightly more in form is of overriding importance in the history of the morpheme in question within English. In the case of words attested in more than one branch of Indo-European, the full comparative account of cognate forms will usually by preference be placed under the entry for an English word of Common Germanic descent if such a word exists, although in such cases a subsidiary node may be found under, for example, a Romance cognate describing in more detail peculiarly Romance developments in cases where this Romance item itself has a number of important reflexes in English. Thus a significant base is not entirely submerged among the cognates of a Germanic word, and the reader is spared what may be a somewhat confusing leap directly from the etymology of a derivative of a non-Germanic word to a subsidiary treatment of the parent word buried deep within the detailed discussion of an Indo-European base with numerous reflexes both inside and outside Germanic. To take an example, it seems sensible that the important family of words all ultimately derived from classical Latin *medius* and the not insignificant number of chiefly scientific and technical formations showing ancient Greek μέσος should each refer to a convenient 'staging-post', most probably MEDIUM n. and a. and MESO- respectively, rather than in every instance referring directly to the discussion of more distant cognates at MID a. (Further illustration of the cross-referencing method employed will be found in examples presented elsewhere in this article.)

With rare exceptions, *OED3* cross-references will be uni-directional, from a reflex, derivative, or loan-word to its etymon. 'Downstream' cross-references – that is to say, those which move in the same direction as the transmission, rather than against the current towards an etymon, though undeniably informative, are not an essential part of the structure of an etymological dictionary, and cannot be provided exhaustively in any large dictionary without

---

[12] For an explanation of this method contemporary with *OED1*, see Skeat (1882) p. vi.

resulting in etymological text which is hopelessly overcrowded with cross-references. A selective approach immediately reveals its own subjective basis in the tastes and prejudices of the compiler, and can tend only too easily to eclecticism. Thankfully, for readers using the dictionary in electronic form, such 'downstream' cross-references are unnecessary: so long as the method of cross-referring is thoroughly consistent (which that of *OED3* will be, with the minor inconsistencies of previous editions corrected), it is a small matter for the user to extract all cross-references to a given location contained in etymology text, and then either browse or consider in detail the resultant set of matches. As in so many other areas, the responsibility of the lexicographer in the computer age is here not to provide for the user every single conceivable comparison and pointer (a task impossible to achieve with any degree of consistency or objectivity for so vast a work as *OED*), but to ensure that the electronic database is so structured that the reader can easily extract the required information.

The implications of making systematic the method of cross-referring that is already implicit in *OED2* will have significant implications for the uses that readers and scholars will be able to make of the database so constructed. Connections, containing no matter how many individual 'links', will exist in the database between any given dictionary headword and all other headwords known by the lexicographer to be ultimately cognate with it; connections which it will be possible for the user of the database to trace by easy steps. Furthermore, the user of the dictionary in electronic form, whether the dedicated researcher or the interested amateur, will be able through a few simple searches to trace word-families across the entire database, identifying and investigating patterns of relationship and development perhaps unnoticed by the lexicographer but the tracing of which has been made possible by the careful and consistent placing of cross-references at each individual link in the chain.

1.4. Documentation of foreign-language cited forms

All foreign-language word-forms cited in *OED* etymologies are being checked rigorously in the best available dictionaries. For

many languages the state of lexicographical work is vastly different from what it was at the time of the preparation of *OED1*. Taking as an example probably the most important proximate source of English loan-words, French, *OED1* editors had available to them, for parts of the alphabet at least, the impressive historical dictionary of Littré (1863–1872; 1881) and the dictionary of contemporary French by Hatzfeld, Darmesteter, and Thomas (1890–1900), together with Godefroy's dictionary of Old and Middle French, and the studies of comparative Romance etymology of Diez (1853) and, for the final fascicles of the dictionary, Meyer-Lübke (1911–1920). Compared with the very limited lexicographical resources available for many languages at that time, this was a very fair basis for *OED*'s etymological work. However, these works when taken collectively left very considerable gaps in the documentation. For instance, for early modern evidence it is striking how often *OED* was obliged to fall back on the evidence of Cotgrave's French-English dictionary of 1611.[13] For *OED3* the situation is radically different, the lexicographical resources being so rich that only the most significant can be enumerated here. In particular, the immense scholarship and monumental collection and synthesis of evidence of regional variation in Walther von Wartburg *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (*FEW*) has transformed French lexicography, and its data provides much fruitful material for the re-examination of English etymologies.[14] For contemporary French vocabulary, synthesis and some updating of material from early fascicles of *FEW* is provided by A. Rey *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française* and by the *Trésor de la langue française*. The latter source, when taken in conjunction with the more detailed supplementary documentation on numerous items provided by successive volumes of *Datations et documents lexicographiques* and the huge number of dated rarer vocabulary items contained in the Robert *Dictionnaire alphabétique et ana-*

---

[13] For an example, compare the revised etymology for MARMALADE n. given below with that in *OED1*.

[14] For a valuable recent study of the history and methodology of *FEW* see Büchi (1996). For more general assessment of *FEW*'s role and impact within a broader context, see Malkiel (1976) and, from the perspective of an account of the history of the field, Malkiel (1993).

logique de la langue française, makes available a vast quantity of data on modern French, enabling close comparisons to be made between dates of first attestation and subsequent sense developments of French and English words. For Old French, the ongoing *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch* is a resource of great value,[15] and for Middle French the first of the series of subject-specific dictionaries being produced by the Institut National de la langue Française represent a significant improvement in resources,[16] while the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* has quite revolutionized a huge number of *OED* etymologies. *OED1* etymologies have been criticized, perhaps somewhat unfairly in view of the resources then available, for their very sporadic distinction between Anglo-Norman and Old French forms. The *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* makes available to the English etymologist a mine of information on the distinctive characteristics of Anglo-Norman, enabling *OED3* at last to substantiate Professor Rothwell's valuable observations on the deep influence which developments unique to this variety of French have had upon the English language (see especially Rothwell 1991, 1992), and to identify both morphological and semantic characteristics in which English lexis follows insular rather than Central Old French models. When the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* is taken in conjunction with the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (or for parts of the alphabet which it does not yet cover, its precursor the *Revised Medieval Latin Wordlist*),[17] and of course the greatly supplemented documentation of Middle English words and senses provided by the *Middle English Dictionary* (*MED*), the documentation available to us for the Middle English period will be seen to be particularly rich.

  In cases like that of French where the documentation is now so

----

[15] One awaits eagerly also the point at which *OED3* revision work will reach parts of the alphabet for which the *Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français* (1974–) is available.

[16] To date, Lalande (1995), Kunstmann (1996), Dubuis (1996), Jacquart (1997); for the sixteenth century Huguet (1925–1967) remains of great value.

[17] Those parts of the parallel dictionaries of medieval Latin from sources of other European national origins already published will also be used extensively, as will such dictionaries as those of Hoven (1994) and Niermeyer (1976), to supplement *OED1*'s evidence based chiefly upon Du Cange's remarkable dictionary and its various revisions.

rich, the *OED3* etymologist is able to do much more than was possible for *OED1*. A relatively simple example of the more sophisticated analysis made available by vastly improved lexicographical coverage of both Anglo-Norman and Old French and by *MED*'s Middle English documentation is provided by a draft note from the etymology of MARBLE n. and by the etymology of its derivative MARBLER n. (in the latter entry the three senses referred to in the etymology are, briefly, 'a person who carves in marble', 'a person who quarries marble', and 'a person who marbles paper' respectively):

> MARBLE n. and a., subsidiary etymological note on development of forms:
> [The change of *marbre*, *marber* to *marbel* appears to be a ME. development. The form *marbele* occurring as a gloss on L. *marmor* in a 13th- or 14th-cent. manuscript could be Eng. or Anglo-Norman, and Anglo-Norman evidence for such forms is otherwise late 14th- or 15th-cent.: the possibilities of the influence of the ME. form on later Anglo-Norman, or simply of parallel development, cannot be excluded. No evidence of such a change in the dialects of Fr. is presented in *F.E.W.*, although cf. the OFr. form *malbre* with dissimilation.][18]

> MARBLER n., draft revised etymology:
> [< MARBLE *n.* + -ER[1], perh. after Anglo-Norman *marbrier*, OFr. *marbrier* (in senses 1 and 2). In sense 3, < MARBLE v. + -ER[1]; cf. Fr. *marbreur* (1680).
> Numerous examples of the word as a surname survive from the ME. period, as *M.E.D.* shows, the earliest being quot. (1230) below. It is uncertain whether any forms spelt with -*r*- can be confidently regarded as evidence for the word's adoption into Eng., but forms with -*l*- (which appears to be a characteristically Eng. development: see etym. note s.v. MARBLE *n.*) may be treated as such. It is also uncertain to which of senses 1 or 2 some examples should be assigned, but a marbler resident in

---

London may be presumed to have been a carver, as in quot. 1307–8 in sense 2.
(1230) in *Publ. Pipe Rolls Soc.* (1927) IV. 153 Reg. le Marbrer.]

In other cases, such as MOREL n.[4] or MARMOT n., *OED*'s etymology must either be rejected entirely in favour of that supported by the fuller data and fresh analysis of *FEW* and other dictionaries, or the balance of probabilities be reassessed (in both of these cases with a Germanic etymology suggested by *OED* now appearing much less attractive than a Romance one). To take the example of MOREL n.[4] (much the less complex of the two), a revised etymology along the following lines results:

MOREL n.[4], draft revised etymology.
[< MFr. *morille* (16th cent.), prob. < an unattested post-class. L. dim. formation from *morus, maurus* (see MOOR *n.*[2]) in *-icula* (see -CULA), on account of the dark colour of the fungus.
The relationship with OHG. *morhila* (MHG. *morchel, morhel*, Ger. *Morchel* > scientific L. (as genus name) *Morchella*) < *morha* MORE *n.*[1] + *-ila* -EL[2] is unclear and disputed. In OHG. the dim., like the primary word, occurs only denoting the carrot or the parsnip; in MHG. both were applied also to the fungus; Ger. *Morchel* occurs only in this sense: it is thus poss. that in MHG. the dim. was conflated with a post-class. L. word of similar sound, and subsequently became distinguished in this meaning from the primary word. The contrary development is prob. shown by post-class. L. *morella* carrot or parsnip (15th cent. in German glossarial sources), in sense at least prob. after MHG.]

In such cases rather fuller documentation than that provided by *OED1* is required in order to give the reader wanting to use *OED* without recourse to other dictionaries a reasonable summary of the reasons for the revised etymology, and to provide enough of the most important of the data in order to allow the reader to assess the argument advanced.

In other instances, a fuller account of an etymology may be provided for no other reason than to satisfy the curiosity of a reader who is unable or unwilling to consult more specialist, non-English-

language, resources. Such a need is recognized by Murray in his Presidential Address to the Philological Society for 1884 (Murray 1884: 13):

> In *arsenal*, *artichoke*, *article*, *artillery*, for instance, would it be satisfactory simply to refer the word to the Italian or French antecedent, without any account of how the latter came into being, or acquired its special sense? I venture to think that it would not be satisfactory; that the English scholar is entitled to find in the Dictionary the fact of the Arabic origin of the two former words, with the general changes, whether of form or sense, to which they have been subjected in the Romance, before reaching English, as well as those they may have undergone in English itself.

The more detailed question touched upon here of the interrelation between developments prior to a word's first appearance in English and developments occurring within English will be examined more closely in following paragraphs. However, here one may perhaps usefully advance a revised etymology where it is proposed to offer to the reader more information on the word's history prior to its earliest occurrence in English simply in order to make available to the non-specialist reader (especially one with no Italian) information which may be of great interest but which would otherwise remain more or less inaccessible (in the present instance, also making available a very recent suggestion from the article literature):

> MAFIOSO n., draft revised etymology:
> [< It. *mafioso*, re-formed (as if < *mafia* MAFIA *n.* + -*oso* -OUS) < *mafiuso* (1862 in G. Rizzotto *I mafiusi della Vicaria*) < Sicilian *mafiusu*, further etymology uncertain and disputed: poss. blend of *marfusu* scoundrel (It. *malfusso* rascal; 15th cent.) and *marfiuni*, *marpiuni* cheat (It. *marpione*; ult. < Fr. *morpion* MORPION *n.*); Sicilian *marfusu* is < Sp. *marfuz* renegade, traitor, prob. < Arab. *marfūḏ*, pass. pple. of *rafaḏa* abandon, reject.]

To take another example very similar to Murray's own example of *article*, at MORGUE n.[2] we are now able to provide a concise explanatory account (clearly dependent on work in French lexico-

graphy) of the sense developments in French prior to the borrowing into English, and incidentally also to identify an interesting instance of apparent cross-fertilization back from the loanword to its French etymon:

> MORGUE n.[2], draft revised etymology:
> [< Fr. *morgue*, spec. sense development of MFr. *morgue* MORGUE *n.*[1]. The sense development in Fr. proceeds from the sense 'place in a prison where the guards examine new prisoners before locking them up' (1611, prob. with reference to the haughty expression of the jailers), to the sense 'place where unidentified bodies are displayed' (1674), and subsequently, prob. after Eng. (in Fr. only from 1942), 'hospital mortuary'.]

Murray's comments, as well as the existing entries for the words he lists, indicate that providing such supplementary documentation is clearly not in excess of what he and his fellow editors would have done had suitable and sufficient documentation been available to them; I believe this to be even more the case with the slightly more complex examples to follow, where *OED* is able to make use of documentation of this sort to draw original conclusions concerning the circumstances of the borrowing of words into English and their subsequent development within English.

The accurate dating of foreign language lemmas, although fraught with difficulties,[19] is of immense value to the *OED* etymologist, allowing existing etymologies, often based for want of fuller documentation upon (frequently inspired) conjecture, to be re-evaluated in the light of hard evidence. To take a fairly simple example, use of a variety of lexicographical resources enables the lexicographer to review the transmission for MARMALADE n. offered by *OED*, to note that the earliest English evidence available to us (1480) is earlier even than the earliest attestations of its Portuguese etymon, and to provide in a note a suggestion as to

---

[19] *OED3* is to pursue a policy for earlier material, not yet universally applied in the lexicography of other languages, of using wherever possible the dates of the documentation of the surviving written records, rather than the putative dates of composition of their contents. The *OED* etymologist, and no less the reader, must therefore always be alert to the fact that one is not necessarily comparing like with like.

why the word is recorded so very early in English in comparison with other major European languages:

> MARMALADE *n*., subsidiary etymological note:
> [Close medieval trading relations between England and Portugal may account for the very early borrowing of the Port. word in Eng.: cf. MFr. *marmeline* (1541), Sp. *mermelada* (1570), It. *marmellata* (1573), MFr. and Fr. *mermelade*, *marmelade* (1573), Sw. *marmelad* (1578), post-class. L. *marmelatum* (1588, from a French text), Ger. *Marmelade* (1597, perh. < Fr.), Du. *marmelade* (1599).]

In other cases an explicit note may be offered where the existing transmission is to be retained but where the dating of the lemmas implies a discrepancy:

> MARABOU *n*.[1], draft revised etymology:
> [< Fr. *marabout* kind of wading bird (1820), feather of this bird (1821), spec. application of MARABOUT *n*.; the naming of the bird after the hermit orig. occurred in Arab. dial. (e.g. Moroccan Arab. *mrābiṭ*, and cf. MARABOUT *n*. 1, quot. 1759). The Eng. word is attested in the sense 'feather of the marabou stork' a year before the first attestation of the Fr. word as a bird name; this is prob. due to the tendency for foreign animal products to be known (through commerce) before the animals themselves, and there is no doubt that Fr. was the intermediary by which the word entered English. The adoption of a spelling without the final -*t* of the Fr. perh. reflects borrowing that was primarily in the spoken context rather than through books.]

Looking beyond the question of the immediate transmission of a loan-word, the dating of particular morphological, semantic, or syntactic developments in foreign languages opens an almost entirely new dimension for *OED* etymologies, making it possible in a great many cases to make for the first time detailed comparisons between the history and development of an English word and that of its cognates in other languages. *OED1* often lavishes great attention upon the history, and even the pre-history, of the form of a word, while showing comparative neglect of the possibility of making comparisons between a word's meaning or sense development in

English and those of its cognates in other languages. This is probably in part a reflection of the spirit and the interests of the age in which the shape and character of *OED1* were determined, and also a result of the lack both of a suitable conceptual framework and of suitable lexicographical tools for making such comparisons: Murray's comments quoted above, and the example of entries where suitable documentation was available to *OED1* editors via either published sources or private communications from scholars, suggests that the last of these factors may have provided the determining influence in many cases for *OED1*. MEMORY n. and MEMOIR n. provide a very good illustration of what can be done for *OED3* by making use of current lexicographical resources. At MEMORY n., supplementing *OED1*'s etymology which deals almost exclusively with the remoter affiliations of the base of Latin *memoria*, *OED3* can provide an analysis of the extent to which the sense structure in English reflects that already existing in classical Latin, while at MEMOIR n. better lexicographical coverage of French, as well as fuller documentation on the English form history of both MEMORY n. and MEMOIR n., permits the lexicographer (1) to document earlier sense developments in French prior to the English borrowing, (2) to examine the manner in which subsequent sense developments in English are paralleled earlier in French, and (3) to examine the possibility that the earliest sense in English may to some extent represent an independent offshoot of MEMORY n.:

MEMOIR *n.*, draft revised etymology:
[< MFr. *memoire* (masc.) written account, description (from *c*1190 in OFr.), document containing the facts in a case which is to be judged (1356), document containing instructions on a certain matter (1477) < *memoire* fem. MEMORY *n.* The main sense developments in Eng. reflect those in Fr.
The change of gender in Fr. is commonly accounted for by the supposition that the word in this use is elliptical for *écrit pour mémoire*; however, the gender of MFr. *memoire* fluctuated in all senses until the 16th cent., prob. influenced by masc. nouns in *-oir* (see -ORY[1]). Sp. *memoria*, Port. *memória*, and It. *memoria* are fem. in all senses.

In the early modern period in Eng. there is considerable overlap in forms between MEMOIR *n*. and the *β*-forms s.v. MEMORY *n*.; it is arguable that sense 1 may represent at least in part a native development from existing senses of MEMORY *n*. The spelling *memoir* prevalent in Eng. since the 18th cent. perh. results from awareness of the gender of the Fr. noun, although the regular spelling of both masc. and fem. *mémoire* in Fr. has long been with final -*e*.]

For some categories of rather more 'exotic' loanwords lexicographical resources are available for *OED3* which were perhaps scarcely even imagined, certainly not realistically hoped for, when *OED1* was compiled. For instance, in examining the particular circumstances of loans to English which have occurred outside the traditional mainstream of British or American English, *OED3* can draw upon the detailed analysis of such works as the *Dictionary of South African English*, the *Australian National Dictionary*, or the *Dictionary of Jamaican English*, to name but three from a rapidly expanding field. An interesting case is presented by the *Dictionary of South African English*'s entries for MIJNHEER n. and MENEER n., which vastly supplement the material in *OED1* and the *Supplement* for MYNHEER n. and for its foreign-language antecedents (and which will probably occasion in due course the splitting of *OED*'s material into at least two separate entries).

For some areas, most notably although not exclusively where loans directly or indirectly from non-Indo-European languages are concerned, *OED3* is unable to rely either upon printed discussions of the loans themselves or upon dictionaries of the donor languages, and in this area *OED* is very fortunate to be able to fall back upon the expertise of a large number of expert consultants and other contributors. In this area use may often be made also of such work already done for the *New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*. As has already been touched upon, a fact that is brought to one's attention often when reviewing *OED1* etymologies is the frequency with which leading continental scholars were consulted on matters concerning particular words, for want of suitable published work in a given field or to supplement discussions in print.[20] For *OED3* the material

---

[20] The present article is not the place for a full consideration of the editorial

falling under each of these headings may have changed, but in each category there remain areas where expert advice must be sought.

1.5. Discussion of rival etymological hypotheses

Cases often arise where the lexicographer is confronted by a number of rival theories concerning the etymology of a given word. Except where one of these rival explanations both appears to the lexicographer to be of greater intrinsic merit than others that have been advanced and has met with more general acceptance among the academic community at large, it is obviously unacceptable in a dictionary which is of the scale of *OED* and which does not aim to pursue any particular 'polemic' line, for just one among a group of rival theories to be advanced as though universally accepted, and for silence to be maintained concerning all others. Wherever there is genuine, current, disagreement among the scholarly community concerning an etymology, *OED3* will attempt to present each of the most important and most widely held theories, restricting the scope of possible 'polemic' to such nuanced comments as 'poss.', 'prob.', or 'perh.' In this area the question of bibliographical citation of rival arguments is also an obvious one, and the depth of such bibliographical references, as well as the extent of any comment offered upon such rival etymologies, are often among the chief distinguishing factors between particular etymological dictionaries.[21] This is an area where *OED3* will remain fairly close to the style of earlier editions, it being our opinion that a general historical dictionary, even a very large one, can only afford to give very occasional bibliographical references in this area; this being combined also with the very practical consideration that in very few instances can one adequately or fairly represent previous scholarly discussion of a particular issue with only one or two references, and consequently that if any movement were made towards making

procedures of *OED1* with regard to etymological material, an area of the history of the dictionary which is still largely unexplored, and which I hope to investigate more fully in the future.

[21] See Malkiel (1976: 58–61) for a detailed discussion, with examples, of different strategies pursued in this area. For comments specifically with regard to a dictionary of English etymology such as ODEE, see Hoad (1983: 87–88).

bibliographical references a regular feature of *OED* etymologies it would be very hard, and perhaps a little dishonest, to avoid a situation in which most etymologies were accompanied by a dense paragraph of bibliographical references better suited to an expressly specialist etymological work. (Even among the most respected specialist etymological works there of course occur great differences of approach in this area, as one may observe particularly clearly in the case of pairings such as that of the Greek etymological dictionaries of Frisk (1960–72) and Chantraine (1968–1980), the former dense with detailed exposition of rival theories and bibliographical references to the secondary literature, while the latter pursues the much sparer and more economical style of presentation pioneered by Ernout and Meillet (1932) in which a more selective account of the various established theories is accompanied by a bare minimum of references to secondary literature.) However, in spite of what may be seen by some as a restriction upon the scope of *OED3*'s etymologies, it will certainly be the case that the etymologies prepared for *OED3* will provide a far more suitable foundation for such an enterprise in the future than any existing etymological or historical dictionary of English.[22] It is also doubtful how far any English etymological dictionary which sought to provide even a reasonably full selective bibliography of previous etymological discussions could attempt to cover even remotely so extensive a wordlist as *OED*, or, equally significantly, to find space (or editorial time) to cover etymological or linguistic issues surrounding the history of a given word other than the direct etymological descent.

In practice, a number of strategies will be adopted in *OED3* in such cases according to circumstances. In some instances, reference to a single secondary work containing summaries of each of the rival hypotheses may be appropriate: this will most frequently be the case where the etymology of a word which appears in English straightforwardly as a loan is greatly disputed, but where the disagreement

[22] An interesting attempt to begin an English etymological dictionary characterized by a more or less exhaustive bibliography of previous scholarly and pre-scholarly discussions of each etymology included is currently being made by Anatoly Liberman of the University of Minnesota, the preparatory bibliographical volumes of which are in an advanced stage of preparation and promise to be of great value for future work on English etymology: see further Liberman (1998).

has little or no bearing upon the history and development of the word within English:

> MERINGUE n., draft revised etymology:
> [< Fr. *meringue* (1691), perh. related to MLG. *meringe*, post-class. L. *meringa* (in an undated document from Artois cited in Du Cange), and class. L. *merenda* (gerundive of *merēre*: see MERIT *n.*), all of which mean 'afternoon meal' (without, how-ever, any connotations of delicacy or luxury): for this and other theories see *T.L.F.* s.v. *meringue*. Forms in other langs. are later than, and prob. from, the Fr. word: cf. Ger. *Meringe* (1715), *Meringue* (1747), *Meringel* (1801), *Merin* (1811), Sp. *merengue* (1747), and MARRANGLE *n.*]

In other cases, a remote etymology, while having little or no bearing upon the history and development of the word within English, may have a bearing upon the relationship between several words which all ultimately have English reflexes, and thus a brief summary of the various proposed etymologies may be the simplest way of presenting these possible relationships:

> MYRRH n.[1], draft revised etymology:
> [< class. L. *murra, murrha, myrrha* (> OFr. *mirra* (*c*980), *mirre* (1080; Fr. *myrrhe*), It. *mirra* (12th-13th cent.), Sp. *mirra* (prob. 12th cent.)) < ancient Gk. μύρρα (also σμύρνα, ζμύρνα). The Gmc. langs. have also borrowed the class. L. word directly or indirectly, e.g. MDu. *myrre, mirre* (Du. *mirre*), OS. *myrra*, MLG. *mirre* (> ONorse *mirra*), OHG. *myrrā, mirrā, murrā* (MHG. *mirr, mirre*, Ger. *Myrrhe*).
> Ancient Gk. μύρρα is prob. of Semitic origin, poss. < Sumerian or Akkadian *murru* (cf. Arab. *murr*, Heb. *mōr*), which is cognate with MAROR *n*. It has also variously been proposed that the Gk. word (in form σμύρνα) is < or after the name of the town SMYRNA *n.*, or that (in forms σμύρνα or μύρρα) it is cognate with μύρον (see MYRONIC *a.*: the latter an ancient etymology which remains attractive). None of these etymologies can be asserted with confidence, and it is likely that confusion between several Gk. words (of which some may have been IE. in origin) affected both form and meaning.]

In other cases, an older view (in the case quoted here also the view favoured by, and the only one recorded in, *OED1*), must be balanced carefully against a more recent one which now generally commands greater, although not invariable, support:

> MARCH v.², draft revised etymology:
> [< MFr. *marcher* (15th cent. in sense 1) < OFr. *marchier, marchir* orig. to trample, hence to walk, to go (12th cent.). In the specific military application the word has been adopted not only in English but in other European langs., as Sp. *marchar*, Port. *marchar*, It. *marciare*, Ger. *marschieren*, Du. *marcheren*, Da. *marchere*, Sw. *marschera*.
> The etymology of Fr. *marcher* is obscure; it is perh. most likely < a Gmc. verb cognate with OE. *mearcian*, OHG. *marchōn* MARK *v*., possibly via an unrecorded post-class. L. verb; an older view was that the earliest recorded sense 'to trample' was developed from a sense 'to hammer', and that the word represents a Gaulish Latin verb < late class. L. *marcus* hammer.]

1.6. *Encylopedic information bearing either upon the etymology or the development of meaning within English*

Certain categories of encyclopedic information within etymologies have attracted considerable comment in the context of exclusively etymological dictionaries,[23] and such information may at first seem best suited for consideration in the second part of this piece, and there perhaps recommended as an area for rigorous pruning in the revision of an existing dictionary. However, for a general historical dictionary such as *OED*, the situation is often quite different. In some cases, the etymology is simply the most convenient place for an overview of shifts in usage and external factors determining them which cannot easily be accommodated within the structure of definitions of particular senses:

> MYCENAEAN *n*. and *a*., subsidiary etymological note:
> [Mycenean, and its cognates in other European languages,

---

[23] See in particular Hoad (1983: 81–82). It should be noted that the discussion there is in the quite different context of a proposed specialist etymological dictionary of English to supersede ODEE.

referred exclusively to inhabitants of or things associated with Mycenae until H. Schliemann's rich archaeological finds, starting in 1876, at the site of the city, after which the adj. came to be used to designate Bronze Age culture in Greece and the Aegean generally. The term was subsequently restricted in scholarly use to the late Bronze Age, and was applied as a noun to the language of the linear-B tablets after that was identified as a dialect of Greek.]

In other cases, however, a discussion of somewhat encyclopedic matters is inextricable from an account of the sense development prior to borrowing into English sufficient for the purposes of a major historical dictionary such as *OED*:[24]

MARE n.[4], draft revised etymology:
[< post-class. L. *mare* (Kepler, *Dissertatio cum Nuncio Siderio* (1610) in *Opera Omnia* (1859) II. 497) < class. L. *mare* sea (see MERE *n.*[1]).
The idea that the dark parts of the moon's surface might be seas goes back at least to Plutarch, *Moralia* 921 B, who used the words θάλασσα sea and πέλαγος high sea. Galileo introduced the concept in modern times in his *Siderius Nuncius* (1610; Kepler's *Dissertatio* (see above) was a reply to this) but without using the word *mare*. Michael Florent Van Langren's broadside map of the moon (1645) labelled seven areas with specific names beginning with *Mare*, e.g. *Mare Astronomorum* (now *Mare Frigoris*), but the scientific nomenclature still used comes from Giambattista Riccioli's map in his *Almagestum Novum* (1651). Cf. also SEA *n.* 2c (earlier in Eng. than *mare*).]

In many cases, developments both before and after the primary borrowing of the term into English will be closely related, and require to be treated together, sometimes as here by reference to appropriate secondary literature:

---

[24] We are particularly grateful for the expert comments of Professor Owen Gingerich of Harvard University on a draft of this etymology; (any errors, however, as with all material on which expert advice is sought, remaining our own).

MICROSCOPE n., draft revised etymology and definition of first sense:

[< MICRO- + -SCOPE, after It. *microscopio* (coined by J. Faber 1625: see *Let*. 13 Apr. in Galileo *Opere* (1903) **13** 264; also as post-class. L. *microscopium* 1628), < *micro-* MICRO- + -*scopio* (in *telescopio* TELESCOPE *n*.). Cf. Fr. *microscope* (1656), Ger. *Mikroskop* (17th cent.), Sp. *microscopio* (1709).]

 I. A device used to produce a magnified image. **1. a.** An optical instrument for producing a magnified image of a small object placed close to it in its field of view, so as to reveal details invisible to the naked eye, and consisting of a lens or arrangement of lenses (or, rarely, mirrors). Also called *light microscope*, *optical microscope*.

A single lens or fixed combination of lenses is more usually known as a *magnifier* or *magnifying glass*.

comparison, *compound*, *phase contrast*, *polarization microscope*, etc.: see the first element.

For an account of the history and development of the microscope, see e.g. G. L'E. Turner *Micrographia Historica* (1972); S. Bradbury *Evol. Microscope* (1967).

Somewhat more rarely, negative information may also be recorded, as in the following example, where the sole quotation tantalizingly suggests that further information may be found in the surrounding context, and where a brief note may spare the interested reader duplicating the lexicographer's efforts:

MORGAN n.[1], draft revised entry:

†'**morgan**, *n*.[1] *Obs*. [Prob. < the surname *Morgan* (see quot.: the context of the quotation does not shed further light on the origin of the term).]

A counterfeit 20–shilling coin in circulation in the mid 17th cent. (see quot.).

1659 T. Fuller *Appeal Injured Innoc*. I. 65 There were lately false twenty Shilling pieces, (commonly called Morgans) coyned by a cunning and cheating Chymist.

1.7. Word-formation, derivational formulae, and combining forms

Derivational formulae will in *OED3* always be given explicitly and in full, and with all derivational affixes clearly cross-referred to parent entries where the origin and history of the affix is discussed in detail and its main word-forming patterns illustrated.

One area in which the approach of *OED1* and the Supplement has been widely acknowledged to have been innovatory is in the treatment of initial elements ultimately of Latin or Greek origin in forming modern, chiefly scientific, formations, mostly in combination with terminal elements also of Latin or Greek origin. The description of such word-forming elements as 'combining forms' has won some scholarly recognition, and has made possible some quite sophisticated analyses of the history of such word-forming patterns in English using *OED*'s information as its basis. The criticisms of *OED*'s use of 'combining form' raised by Marchand (1969: 131–133), relating mainly to inconsistency in the application of this term, will be addressed by adopting a policy broadly in line with that outlined by Bauer (1983: 213 ff.); hence, for *OED3*'s purposes, 'combining form' will denote those word-forming elements, usually ultimately of Latin or Greek origin or formed expressly upon the model of Latin or Greek morphemes, which can be combined either, like other affixes, with independent words, or, uniquely, with other bound word-forming elements. However, in two principal areas what could be achieved by *OED1* in documenting combining forms was very limited: firstly, in providing adequate documentation on terminal combining forms in English, and secondly in making comparisons with similar word-forming elements in other languages.

Work in the first of these areas was obviously hampered by the nature of the available data, alphabetically arranged by initial letter, making the compilation of data on even quite large groups of words sharing the same terminal element very difficult, and in the case of small groups of words, perhaps consisting of as few as five or six English formations which share the same terminal element in more or less analogous uses, a near impossible task: comparison of entries in *OED1* for even very common suffixes with those for equally common prefixes will demonstrate the difficulties presented by the

alphabetical arrangement of the data. Computerization of the database and of working procedures has made the collection of information on even the smallest groups a much more easily achievable objective, and entries for a good many terminal elements are being drafted for *OED3* parallel to existing entries for initial combining forms.

The second area, systematic comparison of the history of particular English combining forms with their cognates in other modern vernaculars, and even with the use of such elements in the classical languages, is one where the work of the revisers of *OED* is obviously constrained, just as that of *OED*'s original editors was, by the extent of the progress that has been made in both the lexicography of the other modern European vernaculars and in the study of Latin and Greek as languages of science in all periods from the ancient to the modern. Much here remains to be done;[25] however, over past decades much progress has been made, and *OED3* is able to derive much benefit from this. Perhaps the area of most notable progress is again in the lexicographical study of such formational elements in French. The provision of combining form entries analogous to *OED*'s in the *Trésor de la langue française*, combined with the detailed information on first dates of attestation and, where appropriate, coinage information, made available for individual lemmas by the *Datations et documents léxicographiques* volumes and by the Robert *Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française* make possible a great deal of close comparison, as does the pioneering work of Cottez (1985) in making tentative comparisons between the histories of French combining elements and those of their cognates elsewhere. Such a relatively simple advance as the availability of a computer-searchable text of the ninth edition of Liddell and Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*[26] makes it possible to obtain an overview of the use of a terminal element in the Greek of earlier periods, and online databases such as the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* corpus, and for Latin Chadwyck-Healey's electronic version of the Patrologia Latina database, often make it possible to supplement existing lexicographical coverage.

[25] See Munske and Kirkness (1996) for a review of the current situation.
[26] Liddell-Scott-Jones (1961), available via the Perseus website maintained by Tufts University.

(These resources are also often of importance in helping to provide documentation for forms which have previously been the subject of speculation: cf. Malkiel (1987: 192–193).)

These and similar resources, while still not presenting by any means the materials necessary for a full account of the history of such formations in the modern vernaculars, do present many more possibilities to the editors of *OED3* than were available to the editors of *OED1* or of the *Supplement*. A fuller picture can often be presented both of the stock of classical or post-classical Latin or Greek formations on the analogy of which early scientific uses were modelled, as well as of the development of a series of related terms in the vocabulary of science across the modern vernaculars. In the latter area a good deal of new information will also result from research commissioned by *OED* editors into the history and coinage of items of modern scientific vocabulary.[27] To take an example of what can be done in the case of an initial combining form of fairly limited productivity (with further modern vernacular parallels being noted, where information is available, under the lemmas in question):

MYELO-, draft revised etymology:
[< ancient Gk. μυελο-, comb. form of μυελός marrow. μυελός does not seem to be cognate with its synonyms in other IE. languages (see e.g. MARROW *n.*, MEDULLA *n.*), and may have been formed in Gk., perh. < μῦς muscle, mouse (see MUSCLE *n.*). Attested in Gk. compounds, as ancient Gk. μυελόεις full of marrow, μυελώδης like marrow, Hellenistic or Byzantine Gk. μυελοτρεφής breeding marrow, Byzantine Gk. μυελοποιός (see MYELOPOIESIS *n.*). The earliest modern scientific formation is Fr.

---

[27] The need for a good deal of such research in order to fully explain the etymologies of modern scientific items is well reflected in the documentation describing the stages by which the editors of *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* arrived at the very different decision to label such items where the details of original coinage were unknown as International Scientific Vocabulary or ISV: see Gove (1966), (1968) and the interview with Charles Sleeth quoted in Morton (1994: 112), and for slightly more critical comment, drawing particular attention to the central issue of the huge amount of research required if scientific coinages are to be traced in detail, personal communication from John Algeo quoted in Morton (1994) 255–6.

myélite, borrowed into English as MYELITIS *n.* Native forma-
tions are attested from the mid 19th cent., e.g. *myeloid*,
myeloma, *myelocyte*, *myelogenous*.
Combined with elements ultimately of Gk. origin.]

2. DISCUSSION OF INTERNAL DEVELOPMENTS; ASSOCIATED LINGUISTIC INFORMATION

2.1. *Orthographical and morphological history*

Turning to the second of Murray's areas, 'Subsequent Form-
History', comprehensive documentation of form and spelling his-
tory within English is a major objective of *OED3*, both on its own
merits and as an essential tool in investigating many uncertain or
disputed areas of English etymology. The case for integrating the
collection and analysis of data on form history closely with the
preparation of etymological material is again well made in Murray's
Presidential Address for 1884 to the Philological Society (Murray
1884: 11):

> In one sense an investigation of the etymology is a preliminary
> to the historical treatment of a word within the language; we
> must know its previous history in order to have a known point
> from which to start in the development of the forms and senses;
> in another sense the complete exhibition of the etymology is
> only possible after we know the history within the language, the
> decision between two or more *à priori* possible etymologies
> depending upon the historical forms and senses of the word
> itself.

Data is being compiled from a wide selection of sources: firstly, the
quotation evidence of the dictionary itself, both within the entry and
elsewhere in the dictionary text; secondly, databases of computer-
readable texts used as sources of supplementary quotation evidence
for *OED3*; thirdly, the extensive paper files which were prepared for
a proposed *Early Modern English Dictionary*;[28] fourthly, the quota-

---

[28] On *EMED,* a projected member of the family of period and regional dictionaries
which emerged from a series of projects initiated by Sir William A. Craigie (see
Craigie (1931)) making use of materials compiled for *OED1* and greatly supple-

tion and variant forms evidence of the major period and regional dictionaries of English (most significantly, the *Middle English Dictionary*, *Dictionary of the older Scottish tongue*, *Scottish National Dictionary*, *English Dialect Dictionary*, and *Dictionary of American English*); fifthly, *OED*'s own quotation files, read again for variant forms evidence; and finally, a separate file maintained by the *OED* project of significant information on morphological and orthographic variation excerpted from scholarly editions and secondary works on historical linguistics. From this huge aggregate of materials, amply representative for any survey of the spelling and form history of an English word, a comprehensive list of spelling variants, dated by period for the period pre-1500 and by century for the period post-1500, is prepared. In most cases this will be presented in full in the entry, subdivided where appropriate (as often already in *OED2*) according to major categories of variation. In cases where the amount of variation shown is so huge that any list would be simply unmanageable and indigestible for the reader, a representative sample of the most important variants will be given in full with dates, accompanied by a discursive note detailing the categories of variation which are found with date ranges for each category. The data assembled will thus provide the reader with a comprehensive survey of English diachronic and synchronic orthographic and

---

mented by independent programmes of reading, see Aitken (1987) and further references given there. *OED3* is very fortunate in having available to it not only the selection of materials from the *EMED* collection published in microfiche and electronic form as *Michigan Early Modern Materials*, but also, thanks to the generosity of Professor Bailey, the project's complete collection of paper quotation slips, comprising the corresponding chronological sequence of slips from *OED1*'s files plus the fruits of the Michigan project's own extensive reading programme. In addition to the evidence they provide for form history, these materials will also be used extensively for the supplementary quotation evidence they provide, and as furnishing evidence for previously unrecorded words or senses. While the exhaustive documentation of the English of this period (for an eloquent case for the desirability of which see Schäfer (1987)) will have to remain as an objective for future editions of *OED* or for a revived project along the lines of *EMED*, *OED3* will endeavour to make as full use of these materials as possible in supplementing documentation for existing entries and in identifying the most significant new items for addition, with particular attention being given to those items which cast significant new light on existing items in *OED* (such as earlier formations on the same etymon, significantly early derived forms or compounds, etc.). On the acknowledged importance of this material for work on English etymologies, see Hoad (1983: 89).

morphological variation, the need for which has long been felt, and which is an obvious desideratum for any review of *OED*'s etymologies. The interplay of such documentation both with the transmission proper and with an account of the semantic development within English is well illustrated by a case such as MARE n.[1]:

> MARE n.[1], forms list and draft revised etymology:
> **mare** /mɛə(r)/, *n.*[1] Forms: α. OE **mearh**, (*inflected*) **mear-**, ME **maare**, ME- **mare**. β. OE (*WS.*) **miere**, **mire**, **myre**, OE (*non-WS.*), ME-15 **mere**, ME **meer**, **meere**, **mer**, **mure**, 15–16 **meare**; Sc. -17 **mear**, **meir**, **meire**, **meyr**, 17–18 **mear**, 19 **meer**.
> [The α form (OE. *mearh*, inflected *mear-* (strong masc.), horse, whose surviving instances occur chiefly in poetry) is closely cognate with OFris. *mar*, OHG. *marach*, *marah* (MHG. *marc*, *march*, Ger. only in *Marschall* MARSHAL *n.*, *Marstall* stables), ONorse *marr*; < a Gmc. base that has cognates only in the Celtic languages (Gaulish μάρκαν acc. sing. (Pausanias 10.19), OIrish *marc*, Welsh *march* stallion, OCornish *march* (> Cornish *margh*), Breton *marc'h*). The β form (OE. *mere* (weak fem.), mare) is closely cognate with OFris. *merie*, MDu. *merie*, *merrie* (Du. *merrie*), MLG. *mere*, *merie*, OHG. *merha*, *meriha* (MHG. *meriche*, *merhe*, Ger., with altered sense, *Mähre* jade), ONorse *merr* str. fem., Sw. *märr*, Da. *mær* bitch (as a derogatory term); < a Gmc. fem. deriv. of the base of the α form. In ME., from at least the 13th cent., reflexes of the inflected stem of the former (the α type) occurred in the sense 'female horse', while reflexes of the latter (the β type) occurred in the sense '(male) horse'. The latter sense (irrespective of form) died out at the end of the ME. period; the α form became general in southern and central England in the sense 'female horse', while the β form continued in northern regional use (the *Survey of English Dialects* records forms of the type /mɪə/ from the six northern counties) and in Sc. Cf. MARSHAL n.]

Morphological developments common to a group of words can pose particular problems in an alphabetically arranged dictionary. T. F. Hoad has commented upon the difficulties such features can pose for an alphabetically arranged dictionary (Hoad 1984: 29):

The prevalent practice, not yet shown to need replacement by any other for most purposes, of arranging the entries in such dictionaries under a sequence of individual, alphabetically-ordered headwords, has the unfortunate effect for editor and reader alike of dispersing what at times needs to be considered as a whole, and of bringing together what in many cases has no significant coherence.

Onions' introduction to *ODEE* reveals in a number of examples the often unwieldy result of attempting to deal in an alphabetically arranged dictionary with developments which are common to a number of words (p.ix):

The account of individual words includes, where useful or necessary, pronunciation and spelling. Thus under DIE[1] the reader will find 'For the development of *die* from ME. *dēʒe*, cf. *dye*, *eye*, *high*, *nigh*, *thigh*', and under JOIST 'The development (of ME. *giste*) to *joist* is paralleled by *foist*, *hoist*'; s.v. JOLLY 'Final *f* was lost as in *hasty*, *tardy*'; s.v. HARBINGER, 'The intrusive *n* occurs xv; cf. *celandine*; *messenger*, *ostringer*, *passenger*, *porringer*, *scavenger*, *wharfinger*; *nightingale*; *popinjay*'.

The last example quoted here shows how unwieldy dealing in this way with a development even of fairly limited frequency can be. Furthermore, this method gives the somewhat misleading impression to the casual reader that the circumstances and date of the development are identical for every item. The sophisticated use of semicolons in Onions' list for *harbinger*-type words offers an extra layer of information for the more attentive reader, but still in order to get a full picture of the development the reader must look at the separate entries for each word listed. In *OED3* we will attempt to apply broadly the same principle outlined in section 1.3 above of dealing with such characteristics in one place only and cross-referring from elsewhere, and will attempt wherever possible in doing this to make use of *OED*'s existing system of entries for initial letters and also for certain common letter combinations. Thus, in the case of the *harbinger* group of words, the reader can be referred to the entry for the letter N, where a somewhat more detailed explanation of the development can be provided, with some analysis

of the dates of occurrence in specific words, and cross-references to the most significant instances. (A user of an electronic version of the dictionary should be able to construct a complete list if required by extracting from the database all of the cross-references to this location: again cf. section 1.3 above.)

A number of *OED1*'s entries for single letters and letter combinations already show rudimentary discussions of particular developments restricted to particular lexical items rather than common to the whole sound system. These will be greatly expanded for *OED3*, and a number of new letter combination entries added. As well as resulting in etymologies less cluttered with cross-references, this method enables the etymologist to provide a fuller and more coherent account of the development in question than would otherwise be possible, as well as, for instance, making it possible to draw attention without ambiguity to analogous cases where the development in question is not shown. For instance, in dealing with the phenomenon of *n* being attracted to the beginning of a word beginning with a vowel from a preceding indefinite article or possessive pronoun (as in NUNCLE, NAUNT, etc.), the reader will be referred in each instance from the etymology of the item in question to the relevant senses of the initial letter entry for N, where the documentation at the existing senses dealing with this phenomenon (3 a-c) will be built up with the information thus compiled by means of the comprehensive system of cross-references introduced from the individual entries to the initial letter entry.

2.2. *Pronunciation history*

The analysis of data on form history is necessarily closely interrelated with several other areas which Murray groups under 'Miscellaneous facts', most notably pronunciation history, and several of the examples discussed in the preceding section clearly involve aspects of historical pronunciation as well as simply orthographic history. To provide a comprehensive account of the pronunciation history of every English vocabulary item would be a massive task, well outside the scope of *OED* as primarily a dictionary of the written language. However, *OED3* will attempt

to document the most significant aspects of diachronic and regional variation, especially where these have a particular bearing upon the form history of a word.

An important diachronic aspect in the representation of pronunciation in *OED3* will result from a close re-assessment of the pronunciations given in *OED1*. *OED2*'s pronunciations will of course be re-examined for their suitability as accurate reflections of modern usage, and will be supplemented routinely with U.S. pronunciations, (invaluable in regard to both of these areas being the draft materials and phonological descriptions of standard British and American pronunciation prepared for the as yet unpublished *Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Pronunciation* being prepared by C. Upton, W.A. Kretzschmar, and R. Konopka). However, *OED1*'s pronunciations will also be reviewed in the light of the diachronic evidence they provide for linguistic change. Idiosyncrasies of Murray's transcription system and aspects of systematic change in the sound system will not normally be commented upon (except in the latter instance perhaps at the entries for individual letters or letter combinations), but important developments unique to a particular word or small group of words will be commented upon at the entry in question. In such cases further evidence will be sought in a broad cross-section of representative British and American nineteenth- and twentieth-century dictionaries, including specialist dictionaries of pronunciation.[29] For earlier centuries the evidence of the orthoepists and the secondary literature of scholarship must of course be relied upon, most notably for the early modern period Dobson (1968), supplemented by reading and excerpting relevant material from the secondary article literature, with the conclusions of scholars being weighed carefully against the written evidence, especially any new evidence provided by the variant forms lists compiled for *OED3*.

To take a relatively simple example, recent developments in pronunciation can often be dealt with by a brief succinct note:

---

[29] Subsequent editions of *Everyman's Dictionary of English Pronunciation* (see details given in list of references below) provide a particularly valuable source for tracing developments in the decades since the publication of *OED1*.

MARASCHINO n., pronunciation, variant forms, and etymo-
logy:

maraschino /*Brit.* ˌmarəˈskiːnəʊ, ˌmarəˈʃiːnəʊ, *U.S.*
ˌmɛrəˈʃiˌnoʊ, ˌmɛrəˈskiˌnoʊ/, *n.* Forms: 17 **mareschini**, **mar-
ischini**, 17–18 **marasquin**, **mareschino**, 18 **maresquino**, 18– **mar-
aschino**, 19– **maraschine**. [< It. *maraschino* (> Fr. *marasquin*
(1739), whence some of the Eng. forms, Sp. *marrasquino*)
< *marasca* MARASCA *n.* + *-ino* -INE[4].
The pronunc. with /-ʃ-/ seems to be first attested in the U.S. in
Webster (1961), and appears in British dictionaries during the
1970s.]

Turning again to MEMOIR n., analysis of a number of nineteenth-
and twentieth-century sources shows how what may at first sight
appear a somewhat idiosyncratic note in *OED1* may open the door
to a fascinating line of enquiry concerning the pronunciation history
of a particular lexical item:

MEMOIR n., subsidiary note on pronunciation:
On pronunciation *N.E.D.* (1906) comments: 'the quasi-Fr.
pronunciation, which is still most frequently heard, is
somewhat anomalous, as the word is fully naturalized in use,
and has been anglicized in spelling; its continued currency is
prob. due to the fact that *-oir* is unfamiliar as an ending of
English words'. *N.E.D.* records two pronuncs. as then current:
(memˈwòɹ) /ˈmɛmwɔː(r)/, and (meˈmoiəɹ) /ˈmɛmɔɪə(r)/. Of
these, the 'quasi-Fr.' /ˈmɛmwɔː(r)/ shows identification of the
vowel in the second syllable in Fr. with the regular rounded
development of ME. *a* when it occurs after /w/ and before /r/,
while /ˈmɛmɔɪə(r)/ shows identification of Fr. *oi* (presum. by
analogy with earlier loans) with the regular reflex of the ME.
diphthong *oi*. Other 19th-cent. dicts. record a huge amount of
variation in pronunciation. In addition to those recorded by
N.E.D., pronuncs. are recorded with the following character-
istics in varying combinations: stress on the second syllable
rather than the first; /iː/ in the first syllable; and varying
syllabification (with the second /m/ standing either at the end
of the first or the beginning of the second syllable). The
pronunciation /ˈmɛmwɑː/ (U.S. /ˈmɛmwɑr/) usu. heard today,

with pronunciation of the final syllable broadly after Fr. (in line with most other Eng. loans from Fr. in -*oir*), is recorded from the late 19th cent. The pronunc. /ˈmɛmɔɪə(r)/ does not appear to be recorded later than in *N.E.D.*, while /ˈmɛmwɔː(r)/ is still recorded as a less common variant in Brit. usage in the 15th ed. (1997) of D. Jones *Eng. Pronouncing Dict.*

Documentation on earlier developments in pronunciation can often be used in conjunction with evidence provided by the *English Dialect Dictionary* or more recently by the *Survey of English Dialects*:[30]

> MANURE n., draft revised etymology:
> [< MANURE *v.*
> Stress on the first syllable in standard English is evidenced by the metre of quot. 1784 below; many orthoepists between 1644 and 1700 liken *manure* to *manner* (see Dobson, *E.P.* §282). This stress-pattern survived in regional and Sc. English into the 20th cent.: cf. the variant *mannering* s.v. MANURING *vbl. n.* and the forms /manəkaːt/ manure-cart and /manəliːdɪn/ manure-leading, recorded from Lincolnshire in the *Survey of English Dialects*, and see *E.D.D.* s.v. *manner* n². A pronunc. of the first syllable with ME. *ā* and its later reflexes is implied by the early Mod. Eng. forms with *ea* and *ay* and survives in Sc. /ˈmenər/ (see *S.N.D.*). Stress on the second syllable, perh. after MATURE *a.*, is evidenced by metre as early as quot. 1697.]

2.3. Regional variation, and etymological evidence from dialect sources

General implications of dialect data for morphological and pronunciation history have already been touched upon in the preceding section. Dialect documentation can often also have a direct bearing upon the reconsideration of the etymologies of existing *OED* headwords. Although the relevant portions of the *English Dialect Dictionary* were available before publication of those portions of *OED1* so far revised, and are frequently cited in *OED1*, the

---

[30] The *Survey of English Dialects* materials being most easily accessible for lexicographical work via Upton *et al.* (1994).

implications of dialect material for the etymologies of items belonging to the standard literary language seem often to have been only very tentatively investigated by *OED1*, perhaps reflecting the relatively recent emergence at that time of dialect studies as a major area of philological investigation. Making use of material from the *Survey of English Dialects* and also from many minor publications on local or regional varieties (and also, where appropriate, the lavish documentation of published volumes of the *Dictionary of American Regional English*), and also in many instances simply by taking a closer look at the documentation in *EDD*, many existing etymologies can be greatly improved.

For example, at MUZZY a. (with senses, as defined in *OED2*, 'Of persons, their actions, manner, etc.: Dull, stupid, spiritless; also mentally hazy' from 1728–9, 'Of places, times, etc.: Dull, gloomy' 1727–8 from the same source, 'Blurred, indistinct in form, etc.' 1832, and 'Stupid with excess of liquor' 1775), *OED* notes a certain semantic similarity with MOSSY a., summarizes several of the senses given in *EDD* for the adjective *mosey* (although without directly referring to the latter work), and then cross-refers to *OED*'s own entry for MOSY a. in the sense 'downy'. Closer examination of *EDD*'s entry reveals a good deal of documentation for several senses, which can be further supplemented from more recent dialect glossaries and from quotation evidence in *OED*'s files. Thus the existing sense 'downy' can be supplemented with two postdatings from dialect glossaries, while a new branch of 'senses relating to a decayed or imperfect condition' can be created, with senses 'Of fruit, vegetables: decayed; overripe; tough' (using evidence from *EDD* supplemented with evidence from more recent dialect glossaries), 'Confused, bewildered; out of sorts; fuddled through drinking alcohol; foolish, stupid' (again using *EDD*'s evidence and postdatings from more recent dialect glossaries, plus an example from James Joyce's *Ulysses* drawn from *OED*'s quotation files), and 'Of the weather: close, muggy; hazy, foggy; Of the moon: concealed by haze, indistinct' (with evidence from *EDD* and more recent glossaries complemented by an example of contextual use from our files from L. Luard *All Hands* (1933)); finally, use as a noun in the sense 'Idiot, fool' may be illustrated from *EDD*, later glossarial sources, and a further example from *Ulysses*. In addition

to in itself filling out *OED*'s coverage of a significant area of English lexis, this documentation, together with supplementary evidence drawn from *EDD* on the pronunciation and spelling history of this word, clearly provides a much sounder basis from which to approach the etymology of MUZZY a. and related words, in terms of both semantic analysis and probable phonetic development:

> MUZZY a., illustration of forms and draft revised etymology:
> **muzzy** /ˈmʌzɪ/, *a. colloq.* and *Brit. regional.* Forms: 17–18
> **mussy**, 17– **muzzy**, 18– (*Brit. regional*) **muzy**.
> [Etymology obscure.
> The group of words MUZZY *a.*, MUZZ *v.*, MUZZ *n.*, and MUZZLE
> *v*². are very similar in meaning, and are all first attested in the
> 18th cent. MUZZY *a.* is attested earliest, in the earliest two
> quotations (quots. 1727–8, in form *mussy*, and 1728–9 below,
> both from the same source) being clearly a term of deprecia-
> tion, although the precise meaning is less clear. In later use
> indistinctness and (esp. mental) confusion are key elements of
> most of the senses of each word (see further note s.v. MUZZ *v.*).
> It seems likely that these words are in origin closely related also
> to MOSY *a.* (cf. esp. senses 3 and 4 s.v.); it is possible that the
> present group of words show shortening of forms of MOSY *a.*
> with a raised long vowel (cf. pronunc. /muːzi/ and further
> discussion s.v.).]

2.4. Documenting grammatical developments within English

Rather fuller space will be found in *OED3* than in *OED1* for explanation of grammatical developments within English, most frequently accommodated either within main entry etymologies or in subsidiary etymological notes within the body of the entry. In some instances this will simply be a matter of explaining the development of a syntactic or grammatical pattern illustrated by a particular quotation paragraph, providing a synthesis of the most important observations of secondary works on the subject. For instance, in summarizing the development of the modern use of MORE adv. with adjectives or adverbs to form the comparative:

MORE adv. sense 1b, draft note:

[Traces of periphrastic comparison are found in OE. in the use of *ma*, *bet*, and *swiþor* (and for the superlative *betst* or *swiþost*, but not *mæst*) with participles and occas. with adjs. Periphrastic comparison of adjs. and advs. with *more* (and for the superlative *most*: see MOST *adv*. 1b) is found from early ME., although only sporadically before the 14th cent. Unlike modern usage, in ME. periphrastic comparison is commoner with monosyllabic or disyllabic adjs. than with adjs. of three or more syllables, although it is less common than comparison with -*er* for adjs. of any length in ME.; the development of the modern distribution is illustrated by the frequency with which formation of comparison of adjs. with three or more syllables with -*er* rather than with *more* is criticized in 18th-cent. and later normative grammars. It is uncertain to what extent the emergence of periphrastic comparison in Eng. was influenced by Fr. comparison in *plus* (or *le plus*) or L. comparison in *magis* (or *maxime*); confusion between and subsequent identity of form of MOST *adv*. and superlatives in -MOST (see note s.v.) may also have aided the process.]

To the specialist in the field the debt to standard reference works in such a note is obvious (here primarily drawing upon Mitchell 1985 and Mustanoja 1960, and also demonstrating the very significant value for the historical lexicographer of Sundby *et al.* 1991), but here *OED* provides a service for the more general reader in bringing this information together in very concise form in a single place. In other instances, information of this sort will be less easily extricable from the documentation on historical morphology and sense structure at the core of the entry, and even from the discussion of foreign-language cognates. Modal verbs constitute a significant word class, unfortunately too complex to be conveniently exemplified in detail here, where *OED3* editors are able to make use both of documentation (including again the *Michigan Early Modern English Materials* (see above, section 2.1) and the pioneering work of Visser 1963–73) and of a descriptive and analytical framework unavailable for *OED1* (for review of the literature see Denison 1993).

2.5. Semantic relationships within English

Cross-references will be provided in etymologies to earlier parallel derivative formations formed on the same word (such as MAR-MOREAL a. and MARMOREOUS a. paralleled by the earlier MARMOREAN a. and all formed ultimately on classical Latin *marmoreus*) or to earlier words of identical or similar meaning and application which are ultimately cognate (see MORDANT a. example quoted below). Such cross-references will also be used, selectively, in establishing semantic as opposed to etymological relationships, such as where non-predictable relationships of synonymy or antonymy exist (as between words formed with MICRO- and corresponding terms formed with either MACRO-, MEGA-, or MEGALO-). In some cases, by careful attention to dates of first attestation and consideration of questions of relative frequency,[31] interesting conclusions may be drawn concerning groups of ultimately cognate words (the sense referred to in the last sentence of this note is 'Pungent, biting, sharp; painful; of pain: acute, burning'):

> MORDANT *a.*, draft etymology note:
> Cf. the range of meanings in Eng. of the ultimately cognate MORDACIOUS *a.*, and similarly of the corresponding abstract ns. MORDANCY *n.* and MORDACITY *n.* While MORDANT *a.* is attested earlier in Eng. than MORDACIOUS *a.* and is of more frequent occurrence in most senses, the situation is different with regard to the corresponding ns., MORDANCY *n.* being both later than MORDACITY *n.* and much rarer before the late 19th cent., after which it largely supersedes the earlier word. In sense 3 cf. also the earlier MORDICANT *a.*, MORDICATIVE *a.*

In other instances, comparison of the range of meanings and application of a loanword with those of its parent may identify specialization in usage in English of one among a group of broadly synonymous and ultimately cognate terms:

---

[31] Detailed frequency information is not a realistic proposition for *OED3* given available resources, although in some instances observations based upon the evidence of our own quotation files and supported by available electronic databases of complete texts may be drawn upon.

MORISCO *a.* and *n.*, draft etymology note:
The main Eng. sense developments are paralleled in Sp., and are shown also by Fr. *mauresque* (earlier *moresque*, *morisque*: see MORESQUE *a.* and MORISK *a.*) and It. *moresco* (see MORESCO *a.*): the Eng. words MORISCO *a.* and (now much rarer) MORESCO *a.* are also broadly synonymous and have prob. been used by most writers without any strong sense of any etymological or semantic distinction between the two words. MORESQUE *a.* is, however, (unlike its Fr. etymon) largely restricted in reference to the decorative arts.

3. CONCLUSION

I have attempted to illustrate here a number of areas which either represent new departures for *OED3*, or where *OED3* is able to vastly improve upon the documentation and level of analysis possible for *OED1*. However, I have also noted at various points comments by various of *OED1*'s editors pointing towards a desire to investigate many of these very areas, and I hope that the overall impression will be of a project taking advantage of new opportunities, rather than of one recklessly discarding the practices of its predecessors. Murray's comments immediately following the passage quoted at section 2.1 above in fact capture the spirit of much of what I have attempted to illustrate here (Murray 1884: 11):

> The writing of the Morphology, and of the Sematology, must go hand in hand; no satisfactory Etymological Dictionary can be produced without full knowledge of the later phonology and sematology; no history of the forms and senses within the language can be exhibited which does not start from an accurate account of the form, sense, and conditions under which the word entered the language.

While in a major historical dictionary such as *OED* the etymological component is never subsidiary to the structure of definition text and quotation evidence, it is, in the best sense, complementary, and I hope to have shown how many of the most promising and rewarding aspects of the revision of *OED*'s etymologies arise precisely from the interaction between these two areas. I hope to have illustrated in

small measure both the value of etymology for the historical dictionary, and the considerable potential of the historical dictionary for etymological work.

The Oxford English Dictionary
Great Clarendon Street
Oxford OX2 6DP
E-mail: pdurkin@oup.co.uk

REFERENCES

AITKEN, A. J., 1987. 'The Period Dictionaries' in Robert W. Burchfield, *Studies in Lexicography*, 94–116, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

The Anglo-Norman Dictionary, 1977–1992, LOUISE W. STONE, T. B. W. REID, and WILLIAM ROTHWELL (eds), London: The Modern Humanities Research Association.

Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch, 1925– (to vonjement 1995), ADOLF TOBLER, ERHARD LOMMATZSCH, and HANS H. CHRISTMAN (eds), Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

The Australian National Dictionary a Dictionary of Australianisms on Historical Principles, 1988, WILLIAM S. RANSOM (ed.), Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

BAILEY, RICHARD W., 1978. *Early Modern English: Additions and Antedatings to the Record of English Vocabulary 1475–1700*, Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

BAMMESBERGER, ALFRED, 1979. *Beiträge zu einem etymologischen Wörterbuch des Altenglischen. Berichtigungen und Nachträge zum altenglischen Wörterbuch von Ferdinand Holthausen*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

BAMMESBERGER, ALFRED (ed.), 1985. *Problems of Old English Lexicography: Studies in memory of Angus Cameron*, Regensburg: Pustet.

BAUER, LAURIE, 1983. *English Word-Formation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BERG, DONNA LEE, 1993. *A Guide to the Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BÜCHI, EVA, 1996. *Les Structures du 'Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch': recherches métalexicographiques et métalexicologiques*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

CHANTRAINE, PIERRE, 1968–1980. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*, new ed. 1983–1984, Paris: Klincksieck.

COTGRAVE, RANDLE, 1611. *A Dictionarie of the French and English tongues*, London: Adam Islip.

COTTEZ, HENRI, 1985. *Dictionnaire des structures du vocabulaire savant*, 1st ed. 1978, 4th ed. 1985, Paris: Robert.

CRAIGIE, SIR WILLIAM A., 1931. 'New Dictionary Schemes Presented to the Philological Society, 4th April 1919' in *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1925–30 (1931) 6–11.

Datations et documents lexicographiques: Matériaux pour l'histoire du vocabulaire français, BERNARD QUEMADA and P. RÉZEAU (eds), 1959–1965, 2nd series 1970–, Paris: Klincksieck.

DENISON, DAVID, 1993. *English Historical Syntax*, London: Longman.

The Dictionary of American English, 1938–44, WILLIAM A. CRAIGIE and JAMES R. HULBERT (eds), 4 vols., Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

A Dictionary of Americanisms on Historical Principles, 1951, MITFORD M. MATHEWS (ed.), 2 vols., Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

The Dictionary of American Regional English, 1985– (vol. III I-O 1996), FREDERIC G. CASSIDY and JOAN H. HALL (eds), Cambridge Mass.: Belknap Press.

A Dictionary of Canadianisms on Historical Principles, 1967, WALTER S. AVIS (ed.), Toronto: W. J. Gage.

A Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage, 1996, RICHARD ALLSOPP (ed.), with a French and Spanish supplement edited by JEANNETTE ALLSOPP, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

A Dictionary of Jamaican English, 1967, FREDERIC G. CASSIDY and ROBERT B. LE PAGE (eds), 2nd ed. 1980, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

A Dictionary of medieval Latin from British sources, 1975– (fascicle 5 L 1997), RONALD E. LATHAM and DAVID R. HOWLETT (eds), London: Oxford University Press, for the British Academy.

A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles, 1996, PENNY SILVA (ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press, in association with the Dictionary Unit for South African English.

A Dictionary of the older Scottish tongue, 1937– (part XLIV S(c)hake to S(c)hot 1996), SIR WILLIAM A. CRAIGIE et al. (eds), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française: Les mots et les associations d'idées, 2nd. ed., ALAIN REY (ed.), 9 vols., 1985, Paris: Robert.

Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français, 1971– (beginning at G, published to hardïement 1997), KURT BALDINGER and FRANKWALT MÖHREN (eds), Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Dictionnaire historique de la langue française, 1992, ALAIN REY (ed.), 2nd. ed. 1995, Paris: Robert.

DIEZ, FRIEDRICH, 1853. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der romanischen Sprachen*, 5th ed. 1887, Bonn: Adolph Marcus.

DOBSON, ERIC J., 1968. *English Historical Pronunciation 1500–1700*, 2 vols., 1957, 2nd ed. 1968. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

DUBUIS, ROGER, 1996. *Lexique des cent nouvelles nouvelles*, *Matériaux pour le dictionnaire du moyen français 4*, Paris: Klincksieck.

DU CANGE, CHARLES DU FRESNE, SIEUR, 1678; 1883–1887. *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, 5th ed., Léopold Favre, Niort: Favre.

The English Dialect Dictionary, 1898–1905, JOSEPH WRIGHT (ed.), 6 vols., London: Henry Frowde.

ERNOUT, ALFRED, and MEILLET, ANTOINE, 1932. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots*, 4th ed. 1959–60, Paris: Klincksieck.

Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch: Eine Darstellung des galloromanischen Sprachschatzes, founding editor WALTHER VON WARTBURG, 25 vols., 1922–1978; 2nd. ed. in course of publication, Basel: Zbinden.

FRISK, HJALMAR, 1960–72. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

GODEFROY, FRÉDÉRIC, 1881–1902. *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*, 10 vols., Paris: Vieweg.

GOVE, PHILIP, 1966. 'Etymology in Webster's Third New International Dictionary', *Word* 22, 7–82.

GOVE, PHILIP, 1968. 'The International Scientific Vocabulary in Webster's Third', *Journal of English Linguistics* 2, 1–11.

HATZFELD, A., DARMESTETER, A., and THOMAS, A., 1890–1900. *Dictionnaire général*, 2 vols., Paris: Delagrave.

HOAD, TERRY F., 1983. 'An etymological dictionary of English: Some practical considerations' in A. BAMMESBERGER (ed.) *Das etymologische Wörterbuch. Fragen der Konzeption und Gestaltung,* Regensburg: Pustet, 79–91.

HOAD, TERRY F., 1984. 'English Etymology: Some Problematic Areas in the Vocabulary of the Middle English Period', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 82, 27–57

HOLTHAUSEN, FERDINAND, 1934. *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2nd edition ed. H. C. Matthes 1963, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

HOVEN, RENÉ, 1994. *Lexique de la prose latine de la Renaissance*, Leiden: Brill.

HUGUET, EDMOND, 1925–1973. *Dictionnaire de la langue française du XVIᵉ siècle*, 7 vols., Paris: Didier.

JACQUART, DANIÈLE, THOMASSET, CLAUDE, et al. (eds), 1997. *Lexique de la langue scientifique*, *Matériaux pour le dictionnaire du moyen français 4*, Paris: Klincksieck

JONES, DANIEL, 1917. *English Pronouncing Dictionary*, 2nd–14th eds. 1924–1977 (additional editors A. C. GIMSON, SUSAN RAMSARAN), London: Dent; 15th ed. (editors PETER ROACH, JAMES HARTMAN) 1997, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KILIAAN, C., 1574. *Dictionarium Teutonico-Latinum*, Antwerp; further editions 1588, 1599, 1599–1607.

KUNSTMANN, PIERRE, 1996. *Lexique des Miracles Nostre Dame par personnages*, *Matériaux pour le dictionnaire du moyen français 2*, Paris: Klincksieck.

LALANDE, DENIS, 1995. *Lexique des chroniqueurs français (XIVᵉ siècle, début du XVᵉ siècle)*, *Matériaux pour le dictionnaire du moyen français 1*, Paris: Klincksieck.

LIBERMAN, ANATOLY, 1998. 'What Can We Expect from a New Dictionary of English Etymology?', in T. FONTANELLE, P. HILIGSMANN, A. MICHIELS, A. MOULIN, and S. THEISSEN (eds) *EURALEX '98: Papers Submitted to the Eighth EURALEX International Congress on Lexicography*, Liège: University of Liège.

LIDDELL, H. G., SCOTT, R., and JONES, H. S., 1961, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed., revised supplement ed. P. G. W. GLARE and A. A. THOMPSON, 1996, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

LITTRÉ, ÉMILE, *Dictionnaire de la langue française*, 30 fascicles, 1863–1872; 5 vols. 1881, Paris: Hachette.

MALKIEL, YAKOV, 1976. *Etymological Dictionaries: A Tentative Typology*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

MALKIEL, YAKOV, 1987. 'How English Dictionaries Present the Etymology of Words of Romance Origin', in Burchfield, Robert W., *Studies in Lexicography*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 178–195.

MALKIEL, YAKOV, 1993. *Etymology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MARCHAND, HANS, 1969. *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation*, 1st ed. 1960, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz; 2nd ed. completely revised and enlarged 1969, Munich: C. H. Beck.

MEYER-LÜBKE, WILHELM, 1911–1920. *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3rd ed. 1935, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Michigan Early Modern Materials, 1975, RICHARD W. BAILEY, J. W. DAWNER, et al. (eds), Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

MICHAELIS, HERMANN, and JONES, DANIEL, 1913. *A Phonetic Dictionary of the English Language*, Berlin: Gustav Meyer.

The Middle English Dictionary, 1952– (to unmightines(se 1998), HANS HURATH, SHERMAN KUHN, and ROBERT LEWIS (eds), Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

MITCHELL, BRUCE, 1985. *Old English Syntax*, 2 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press.

MORTON, HERBERT C., 1994. *The Story of Webster's Third: Philip Gove's Controversial Dictionary and Its Critics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MUNSKE, HORST H., and KIRKNESS, ALAN (eds), 1996. *Eurolatein: Das griechische und lateinische Erbe in den europäischen Sprachen*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

MURRAY, SIR JAMES A. H., 1884. 'Presidential Address', *Transactions of the Philological Society* (1884) 1–100.

MURRAY, K. M. ELIZABETH, 1977. *Caught in the Web of Words: James A. H. Murray and the Oxford English Dictionary*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

MUSTANOJA, TAUNO F., 1960. *A Middle English Syntax*, I, *Parts of Speech*, Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki, 43, Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.

NIERMEYER, JAN F., 1976. *Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus: lexique latin médiéval-français/anglais*, Leiden : Brill.

The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology (ODEE), 1966, edited by CHARLES T. ONIONS with the assistance of G. W. S. FRIEDRICHSEN and ROBERT W. BURCHFIELD, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

The Oxford English Dictionary (*OED*: see footnote 2 above), 1884–1933, SIR JAMES A. H. MURRAY, HENRY BRADLEY, SIR WILLIAM A. CRAIGIE, CHARLES T. ONIONS (eds); *Supplement*, 1972–1986, ROBERT W. BURCHFIELD (ed.); 2nd. edn., 1989, JOHN A. SIMPSON and EDMUND S. C. WEINER (eds), Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Oxford English Dictionary Additions Series, 1993, vols. I–II, JOHN A. SIMPSON and EDMUND S. C. WEINER (eds), 1997, vol. III, MICHAEL J. PROFFITT (ed.), general ed. JOHN A. SIMPSON, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources, 1965, RONALD E. LATHAM (ed.), London: Oxford University Press, for the British Academy.

ROTHWELL, WILLIAM, 1991. 'The Missing Link in English Etymology: Anglo-French', *Medium Ævum* 60, 173–196.

ROTHWELL, WILLIAM, 1992. 'Chaucer and Stratford atte Bowe', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 74, 3–28.

SCHÄFER, JÜRGEN, 1980. *Documentation in the O.E.D.: Shakespeare and Nashe as test cases*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

SCHÄFER, JÜRGEN, 1987. 'Early Modern English: *OED, New OED, EMED*' in RICHARD W. BAILEY, *Dictionaries of English: Prospects for the Record of Our Language*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 66–74.

SCHÄFER, JÜRGEN, 1989. *Early Modern English Lexicography* 2 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press.

The Scottish National Dictionary, 1939–76, WILLIAM GRANT et al. (eds), 10 vols., Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

SKEAT, WALTER W., 1882 (2nd. ed. 1884). *An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

SUNDBY, BERTIL, BJØRGE, ANNE K., and HAUGLAND, KARI E., 1991. *A Dictionary of English Normative Grammar 1700–1800*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Trésor de la langue française: Dictionnaire de la langue du XIXe et XXe siècle (1789–1960), 1971–1994, PAUL IMBS and BERNARD QUEMADA (eds), 16 vols., Paris: Gallimard.

UPTON, CLIVE, PARRY, DAVID, and WIDDOWSON, J. D. A., 1994. *Survey of English Dialects: The Dictionary and Grammar*, London: Routledge.

VISSER, F. T., 1963–73. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*, 4 vols., Leiden: Brill.