Mariusz Kamiński

A History of the Chambers Dictionary

LEXICOGRAPHICA
Series Maior

Supplementary Volumes to the International Annual for Lexicography
Suppléments à la Revue Internationale de Lexicographie
Supplementbände zum Internationalen Jahrbuch für Lexikographie

Edited by
Rufus Hjalmar Gouws, Ulrich Heid, Thomas Herbst,
Oskar Reichmann, Stefan Schierholz,
Wolfgang Schweickard and Herbert Ernst Wiegand

Volume 143

Mariusz Kamiński

A History of the Chambers Dictionary

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-031250-8
e-ISBN 978-3-11-031273-7
ISSN 0175-9264

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.dnb.de abrufbar.

© 2013 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston
Druck: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
♾ Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier
Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my profound gratitude to Professor Tadeusz Piotrowski for suggesting the topic for my PhD thesis, on which the current book is based, as well as supervising the work, and sharing with me his deep knowledge of lexicographic theory and practice. Special thanks are due to the reviewers of the original manuscript, Professor Arleta Adamska-Sałaciak and Professor Rafał Molencki, for their insightful critical remarks and valuable comments which laid the foundations for the revision of the work.

Contents

Editions of *Chambers*, in chronological order

Ch-A Donald, James (ed.) (1867): *Chambers's Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*. – Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers.

Ch-B Donald, James (ed.) (1872a): *Chambers's English Dictionary*. – Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers.

Ch-C Davidson, Thomas (ed.) (1898): *Chambers's English Dictionary*. – Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers.

Ch-1 Davidson, Thomas (ed.) (1901): *Chambers's Twentieth Century Dictionary of the English Language*. – Edinburgh: W & R. Chambers.

Ch-2 Geddie, William (ed.) (1952): *Chambers's Twentieth Century Dictionary*. – Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers.

Ch-3 Geddie, William (ed.) (1959): *Chambers's Twentieth Century Dictionary*. Revised Edition with Supplement. – Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers.

Ch-4 Macdonald, Agnes. M. (ed.) (1972): *Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary*. – Edinburgh: W & R Chambers.

Ch-5 Macdonald, Agnes. M. (ed.) (1977): *Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary*. (with Supplement). – Edinburgh: W & R Chambers.

Ch-6 Kirkpatrick, Betty (ed.) (1983): *Chambers 20th Century Dictionary*. – Edinburgh: W & R Chambers.

Ch-7 Schwarz, Catherine et al. (eds.) (1988): *Chambers English Dictionary*. (7th edition). – Edinburgh: W & R Chambers.

Ch-8 Schwarz, Catherine et al. (eds.) (1993): *The Chambers Dictionary*. – Edinburgh: Chambers Harrap Publishers.

Ch-9 Schwarz, Catherine et al. (eds.) (1998): *The Chambers Dictionary*. – Edinburgh: Chambers Harrap Publishers.

Ch-9new Brookes, Ian et al. (eds.) (2003): *The Chambers Dictionary*. (new 9th edition). – Edinburgh: Chambers Harrap Publishers.

Ch-10 Brookes, Ian et al. (eds.) (2006): *The Chambers Dictionary*. (10th edition). – Edinburgh: Chambers Harrap Publishers.

Ch-11 Marr, Vivian. et al. (eds.) (2008): The Chambers Dictionary. (11th edition). – Edinburgh: Chambers Harrap Publishers.

Ch-12 Marr, Vivian. et al. (eds.) (2011): *The Chambers Dictionary*. (12th edition). – Edinburgh: Chambers Harrap Publishers.

List of tables

List of figures

Introduction

The object of the study

In the mid-nineteenth century two Scottish brothers William and Robert Chambers started a publishing firm in Edinburgh. Having found a niche in the market, they began to bring out dictionaries and other educational works, making a name for themselves as "publishers for the people" (McArthur 1986: 134). In 1867 they published *Chambers's Etymological Dictionary* (henceforth *Ch-A*), which was edited by James Donald. Five years later, in 1872, a larger version of the dictionary appeared under the title *Chambers's English Dictionary* (henceforth *Ch-B*). For nearly 140 years, the *Chambers Dictionary* was revised and expanded, with subsequent editions building on the success of the preceding ones. The 1901 edition, titled *Chambers's Twentieth Century Dictionary* (henceforth *Ch-1*), became widely acclaimed by its users and "over the decades grew into the flagship of the Chambers fleet" (McArthur 1988: vii). The latest edition came out in 2011.

It is worthwhile to trace the history of the *Chambers* dictionary for several reasons. The history spans the long period of an undoubtedly successful tradition of native lexicography of English, which numerous editions and reprints testify to. This popular dictionary has gone through twelve editions, though this number would be higher, had the count included three nineteenth-century dictionaries that belong to the tradition of the *Chambers* dictionary[1]. A systematic comparison of *Chambers* editions may give us insights into the work of the lexicographers, and reveal the strengths and weaknesses of each edition. This study, it is believed, will also throw light on the development of British lexicography in general, especially in the period of the latter half of the nineteenth century, that is before the emergence of Murray's *New English Dictionary*, the period which is considered as "largely unexplored by lexicographical historians" (Simpson 1990: 1958).

The aim of the present book is to trace how the *Chambers* dictionary has developed over the years, with regard to the following aspects of the structure: the arrangement of entries, the selection of morphological forms, the selection of vocabulary, definitions, the order and discrimination of senses, etymology, usage labels, syntagmatic and paradigmatic information, pronunciation, and outside matter. These aspects will be analysed on the basis of the samples taken from the micro- and macrostructure of each edition.

---

1 The nineteenth-century dictionaries were published in 1867, 1872, and 1898. In the current study the author includes them in the count of the Chambers editions, using the following abbreviations: *Ch-A*, *Ch-B*, *Ch-C*, respectively. If these dictionaries had been treated as Chambers editions by the publisher, the most recent edition would have been the fifteenth.

The structure of the book

This book consists of fifteen chapters. Chapter 1 introduces the theoretical and methodological basis of the research. It explains the method of taking the samples, and fundamental tenets to be followed in the lexicographic analysis. Chapter 2 briefly presents the founders of the Chambers publishers, William and Robert Chambers. The origin of the dictionary is dealt with in Chapter 3 by outlining the sociohistorical factors that stimulated the growth of educational publishing in Victorian Britain. This chapter also addresses the issue of sources of the dictionary, and presents intellectual ideas that might have influenced the structure of the original edition of *Chambers*. Chapter 4 provides a biographical account of the editors. The design of the first edition (*Ch-A*) is discussed in detail in Chapter 5. This chapter is entirely devoted to the analysis of *Ch-A*, within the framework presented in Chapter 1. This original edition is given special attention as it serves as a point of departure for the discussion of subsequent editions. The evolution of the dictionary is the subject of the remaining chapters, 6-15, each of which analysing how a particular aspect of the dictionary structure has changed over the years. The thematic approach adopted in these chapters will ensure a proper perspective on the changing dictionary. Chapters 5-15 are largely based on a systematic analysis of the samples, though references are also made to parts of the dictionary that fall outside the sample range. Each chapter is followed by a summary of the main points. Tables are usually given at the end of the relevant chapters. Complete lists of tables and figures are provided at the beginning of the book. Chapter 15 is followed by Conclusions.

At the back of the book, in the Appendices, there are pages selected from the early editions published from 1867 to 1901. They are followed by Sample 1 and 2, which contain excerpts from all editions of *Chambers*. The former sample represents the macrostructure and comprises six sections of the word-list, while the latter represents the microstructure and covers a selection of full entries. The samples were analysed in detail for statistical purposes. The method of sampling is explained in detail in Chapter 1. Throughout the analysis cross-references pointing to particular entries in sample 2 are used. The cross-references are given in an abbreviated form (e.g. A-3; B-22; 1-4, etc.), in which the first letter (or number) indicates the edition from which the entry is taken, and the following number indicates the number of the entry in the sample. This formula is further explained in Chapter 1. The list of all editions of *Chambers*, with their abbreviations as used in the present book, is given both at the beginning and at the end of the work.

1 Methodological and theoretical foundations of the analysis

This chapter provides a framework for the analysis of the *Chambers* dictionary. It explains the method of taking the samples and the major theoretical points according to which successive editions were analysed. Each point will be discussed in the context of the original edition, in Chapter 5, and of the subsequent editions, in Chapters 6—15. The framework of the analysis has in part been inspired by Hausmann and Wiegand (1989: 328-359) and their followers, for example Frączek (1999). One of the recurring themes in this scheme of analysis is the major tenet of the theory of lexicographical functions, according to which dictionaries are considered as objects of use produced for a specific group of users in mind (Tarp 2008; Wiegand 1987).

1.1 Numbering of editions

Not all editions of the dictionary were numbered. Of all editions only five appeared with a number, either on the imprint or on the title page: the 7th (published in 1988), "the new 9th"(2003), the 10th (2006), the 11th (2008), and the 12th (2011). The 1901 edition did not appear with a number, but it was referred to as the first one on the imprint page of some other editions, for example in the 1959 edition, where it was mentioned in the following note: "first published as *Chambers's Twentieth Century Dictionary* in 1901". What is more, the nineteenth-century editions were excluded from the count by the publisher, while the two editions with supplements (1959 and 1977) were counted as separate[2]. All in all, it is only recently that the publisher has begun numbering editions in any systematic way.

Since most editions were not numbered, the present author has marked them with abbreviations, trying not to interfere with the numbers assigned by the publisher. In this book, *Ch-A*, *Ch-B* and *Ch-C* represent the earliest, nineteenth-century editions, while *Ch-1* to *Ch-12* refer to subsequent editions. Thus, the numbers overlap with those assigned by the publisher, including the 2003 edition, which is referred to here as "*Ch-9new*". The table below shows all *Chambers* editions, with their corresponding numbers as given by the publisher (the middle column), and as used in the book (right-hand column).

2 This finding has been confirmed by Katie Brooks, the assistant editor of the 2006 edition (private correspondence).

Table 1. Numbering of *Chambers* editions.

Chambers editions, in chronological order	The number of the edition as given on the title or imprint page	The abbreviation used in this book
1867. James Donald. *Chambers's Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*	-	*Ch-A*
1872. James Donald. *Chambers's English Dictionary*	-	*Ch-B*
1898. Thomas Davidson. *Chambers's English Dictionary*	-	*Ch-C*
1901. Thomas Davidson. *Chambers's Twentieth Century Dictionary of the English Language*	1*	*Ch-1*
1952. William Geddie. *Chambers's Twentieth Century Dictionary*	-	*Ch-2*
1959. William Geddie. *Chambers's Twentieth Century Dictionary*. (Edition with the Supplement).	-	*Ch-3*
1972. Agnes M. Macdonald. *Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary*	-	*Ch-4*
1977. Agnes M. Macdonald. *Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary*. (Edition with the Supplement)	-	*Ch-5*
1983. Betty Kirkpatrick. *Chambers 20th Century Dictionary*	-	*Ch-6*
1988. Catherine Schwarz. *Chambers English Dictionary*	7	*Ch-7*
1993. Catherine Schwarz. *The Chambers Dictionary*	-	*Ch-8*
1998. Catherine Schwarz. *The Chambers Dictionary*	-	*Ch-9*
2003. Ian Brookes. *The Chambers Dictionary*	new 9	*Ch-9new*
2006. Ian Brookes. *The Chambers Dictionary*	10	*Ch-10*
2008. Vivian Marr. *The Chambers Dictionary*.	11	*Ch-11*
2011. Vivian Marr. *The Chambers Dictionary*.	12	*Ch-12*

* Mentioned for the first time on the imprint page of *Ch-2*.

1.2 Sampling method

In order to ensure a consistent comparison between editions, the same sections of the alphabet were examined. Basically, there were two samples: 1 and 2. The former represented the macrostructure, while the latter the microstructure. The former, which is shown in Table 7, covered six sections of the main word-list: *bourn – brandish, gestation – gin, Mab – magic, person – pestilent, sand – sarcenet, waist – warfare*. As seen, the headwords were selected from six letters dispersed through the alphabet, so as to represent different parts of the dictionary word-list: the beginning, the central, and the ending part. Given the fact that lexicographers rarely work in a systematic way, this method is preferable to a single-section sampling. The method reduces consequences of "alphabet fatigue", that is a situation when lexicographers are less thorough and systematic as they work on subsequent letters of the alphabet (Coleman and Ogilvie 2009: 4; Osselton 2007; Piotrowski 2001: 107). The above section boundaries were established in all editions of *Chambers*. They served as reference points against which the editions were compared. In *Ch-A*, the whole sample covered 300 headwords, with 50 headwords taken from each letter above. Sample 1 allowed for the analysis of changes in the macrostructure, showing in particular headwords that had been added to the word-list. These headwords were highlighted in Table 7.

Sample 2, which is shown in Table 8, represented the microstructure. It covered 42 full entries in *Ch-A*. The entries were selected on the basis of their position in sample 1 taken from *Ch-A*, where they appeared as successive entries: *boy*, *boyhood, boyish, brace, bracing, bracelet, bracket, gibbon, gibbose, gibbous, gibe, giblets, giddy, gier-eagle, mad, madcap, madhouse, madman, madwort, madden, madam, persuade, persuasible, persuasion, persuasive, pert, pertain, pertinent, sandwich, sandy, sane, sanable, sanative, sanatory, sanity, wand, wander, wane, want, wanting, wanton adj., wanton n.* Thus, each letter in the sample was represented by 7 entries.

In order to obtain more reliable results, certain aspects of the microstructure were analysed by looking into the microstructure of entries belonging to sample 1 rather than 2. In this case, the entries are referred to as sample 3. For lack of space, this sample is not included in the book. Sample 3 was used in the chapters on usage labels and on the growth of vocabulary.

The three samples served as a major source of information on the evolution of the dictionary. In addition, entries from other parts of the dictionary were sometimes taken into consideration, especially when a given feature, for example an idiosyncratic definition, did not appear in the sample. In order to illustrate changes in the order of senses more vividly, certain entries that fell outside the sample range were selected for further analysis. Moreover, the examination of changes in the outside matter required that parts of the dictionary outside the samples be studied. These included the front, the middle, and the back matter.

In the course of the book, the reader is often referred to entries from sample 2 by means of symbols. These are given in the form of numbers and sometimes letters, the latter being used to mark the nineteenth-century editions. The first number (or letter) indicates the number of the edition, and the second number refers to the number of the entry in the sample. For example, the notation *A-1*, which marks the entry *boy*, means that the entry is from *Ch-A* and is given as the first entry in sample 2. The entry for *boy* in *Ch-B* is coded with *B-1*, the one in *Ch-C* with *C-1*, the one in *Ch-1* with *1-1*, etc.

The remaining sections of this chapter will outline major theoretical points relevant to the analysis of the structure of the *Chambers* dictionary.

1.3 The arrangement of entries

The discussion of the arrangement of entries basically involves the description of the macrostructure, i.e. the word-list, which provides initial access to information. However, since many dictionaries place lexical items in the microstructure, i.e. the internal structure of the article, it is also necessary to examine this structure in order to identify the principle whereby the items are ordered. In Chapter 6 and in the section "Etymological groups" in Chapter 5, we will identify the type of entry arrangement, and consider the consequences it could have for the dictionary use. We will also see how the entry arrangement related to the purpose of the dictionary.

The organisation of entries depends on the orientation of semantic information. Two types of the presentation of information can be distinguished: semasiological and onomasiological. In the former, the linguistic form, as expressed by spelling, is the starting point for the lexicographic description of the meaning of the form. For the user engaged in decoding, it is also the initial point of departure for the search of an unfamiliar meaning of the word encountered in the text being read. By contrast, in onomasiologically-organised dictionaries, the orientation of information is reversed, that is, it goes from concept to form, for example in a thesaurus, where a concept provides an access point to various word forms expressing that concept. One may expect to find such organisation in dictionaries that are designed to serve productive needs of their users. While the division of dictionaries according to the orientation of semantic information seems to be absolute, in practical lexicography one type of approach does not exclude the other. For example, in semasiologically-oriented dictionaries, the relations of synonymy, antonymy, and hyponymy, which are typical of onomasiologically-oriented books, can be made explicit on the microstructural level (Louw 2000: 121; Wiegand 1999: 103). The decision as to which approach to take depends on the function of the dictionary, and involves considerations of, among other things, the situation in which the dictionary is to be consulted (Wiegand 1999; Tarp 2008). Thus, reception and production may be regarded as the two main types of language situations that determine the organisation of entries.

Traditionally, semasiological dictionaries arrange entries in strict alphabetical order. The obvious advantage of this order is that it enables the user to locate an entry easily, according to the position of letters in the alphabet, but it does not do justice to the morphological and semantic relations between words. This problem, however, can be remedied by the so-called nesting of entries, in which items that are morphologically, and sometimes semantically, related are clustered under a shared root or a constituent element, for example *handled*, *handler*, *handling* which may be given under *handle*. Nested items, which are referred to as subheads, are usually followed by independent explanatory information and other relevant data. Nesting can be revealing as to which items are derived from the same etymological root. It has another advantage, that of saving space, which in any print dictionary is at a premium. On the other hand, the nested type of structure is obtained at the expense of the broken alphabetisation. This is not the case in niching, in which subheads are clustered or listed following the alphabetical order. Nevertheless, clustering of entries, whether by nesting or niching, under a morphologically simpler form may be a hindrance to an inexperienced user, who has to peruse long entries in order to find a given lexical item. Thus, the lexicographer's decision as to which type of arrangement of entries to use has significant implications for the process of look-up.

The alphabetisation of headwords and subheads may be letter-by-letter or word-by-word. In the former type, boundaries between words or constituent free morphemes are ignored, for example: *bow, ..., bowsprit, bow-window*; *sand, ..., sandal, ..., sand-eel*; *wall, wallflower, wall-fruit* (*Ch-A*). In the word-by-word alphabetisation, in which word boundaries are respected, the lexical items just mentioned would be arranged in the following order: *bow, bow-window, bowsprit,; sand, sand-eel, sandal; wall, wall-fruit, wallflower*. All these points will be taken into consideration in the analysis.

1.4 The selection of morphological forms

There is a wide range of potential candidates for headwords. On the level of morphology, they can be classified as simple forms, derivatives, compounds, bound morphemes, combining forms, and abbreviations. In addition, the main entry status may be assigned to items whose classification goes beyond the morphological analysis and enters into the domain of the phraseology, for example free combinations of words. Again, the decision concerning the selection of morphological forms depends on the function of the dictionary. It requires the consideration of needs of potential users, and the identification of their linguistic problems that the dictionary is supposed to solve (Tarp 2008: 97).

The decision as to which forms should be included depends not only on the function of the dictionary but also the availability of space. In order to use space

efficiently, general dictionaries tend to be limited to the presentation of those language facts that are of irregular character. This is of course justified by the well-known division of functions: while the grammar describes regularities, the dictionary deals with irregularities. It follows that editors compiling general dictionaries for native speakers tend to exclude regularly inflected forms from the word-list. By the same token, derivatives showing transparent semantic structure are discarded from the word-list on the grounds that their meaning can be deduced from the meaning of constituent morphemes. Whether the *Chambers* editors limited themselves to the description of irregularities will be investigated in the relevant section in Chapter 5 as well as Chapter 7.

1.5 The selection and growth of vocabulary

Chapter 8 and the section on "The selection of vocabulary" in Chapter 5 are concerned with the range of vocabulary selected for lexicographical treatment. They also attempt to determine some aspects of the function of the dictionary, such as the purpose of the dictionary and the intended user's profile. In order to estimate the growth of vocabulary in successive editions, the editions were compared with regard to size.

Depending on the users' needs, dictionaries may be more or less selective in coverage of vocabulary. A specialised dictionary addressed to adult readers of English literature collects words and meanings that are typical of literature. It may also contain extremely rare words, including the so-called hapax legomena, that is items used only once in a corpus. To what extent such vocabulary should be included depends on various decisions regarding the profile of the target user, the scope of the dictionary, financial resources etc. Yet even if the decisions are made, the realisation of the lexicographical project may not be straightforward, and the lexicographers need to make individual judgements about which items to include. In general dictionaries, the problem of vocabulary selection seems to be even more difficult to solve, as the dictionary is to serve not one but many different groups of users. In such a case, it is very difficult to aim at all-inclusiveness. The print form constraints prevent dictionaries from being exhaustive. What seems to be more realistic is the coverage of various areas of lexis in a *more or less* extensive way. Selection decisions must have certainly been more difficult in the past, especially when lexicographers worked alone, with no access to a reliable corpus.

Dictionaries can be analysed in terms of the direction of use, that is whether they are designed to assist the user in decoding or encoding texts. In native speakers' general dictionaries, the latter function is rarely the focus of the lexicographers' attention, as it requires a great deal of space. Typically native speakers' dictionaries offer relatively little productively-useful information, such as collocations, notes on grammar, the specification of selectional restrictions of words, and related senses.

However, dictionaries vary in this regard, and certain dictionaries for native users are more useful in encoding than others.

The problem of vocabulary coverage is related to dictionary size. We may assume, with a good deal of simplification, that the larger dictionary is, the more vocabulary it contains. Thus, it may be worthwhile to examine the size of the *Chambers* dictionary in order to gain an idea of how the vocabulary coverage has changed over years.

One of possible methods of assessing the dictionary size is to count the total number of entries. Dictionary publishers usually quote numbers of entries to prove that their dictionaries are larger than competitors' but this method is unreliable, as dictionaries differ from each other in a variety of ways. For example, as Piotrowski remarks (2001: 125), dictionaries do not agree as to what counts as a headword. While some dictionaries assign the main entry status only to one-word lexical items, others may also include multiword lexical items. The decision as to which items should be lemmatised may also be based on whether the potential candidate for the main entry is semantically opaque, but consistency in this regard is hardly achieved as opaqueness, or non-compositionality, is a matter of degree.

Taking the above considerations into account, the size of the *Chambers* dictionary in this book was calculated by counting the total number of characters in the main body, a method which is by far more reliable than the one based on the entry count (ibid.). Nevertheless, for the purpose of illustrating how *Chambers* editions differed from each other with regard to the macrostructure, the present author also compared the editions in respect of the number of entries. The method of counting characters consisted in scanning ten pages from the main body and using the Statistics tab in the OpenOffice Writer document to obtain the number of characters. The number was divided by ten in order to obtain the number of characters on a page, which was then multiplied by the number of pages in the main body.

Chambers editions were also compared in terms of physical dimensions, as measured on the edges of the cover. Assuming that the dimensions of the cover roughly correspond to the dimensions of a page, the surface area of the page was calculated (see Tables 3-1 and 3-2). By dividing the number of characters that appeared on a page by its surface area, the density of the text was obtained. This value reflected the degree of textual condensation on a page. It can safely be assumed that lower values of the text density correspond to better clarity of presentation of information.

1.6 Defining meaning

The aim of the discussion below is to raise some points pertaining to the analysis of *Chambers* definitions, specifically to outline those definition types that typically appear in dictionaries for native users. Definitions can be divided into major classes.

Although this classification is not exhaustive by any means, it serves as a starting point for the quantitative analysis presented in Chapter 9 and the section "Defining meaning" in Chapter 5. In addition, the chapter/section will deal with such aspects as the definition style, the use of key-words, and the defining vocabulary. These will be briefly discussed below.

The definition is a traditional and widely used means of explaining meaning. Following Geeraerts (2003: 84-93), we distinguish several types of definitions, depending on the type of meaning, lexicographic approach, and the target user's profile. In what follows, major definition types will be presented, in particular those which typically appear in native speakers' dictionaries and which pertain to the current analysis.

In monolingual dictionaries, the most prevailing type of definition has a form of the analytical phrase, which explains the meaning of a word in terms of its *genus*, or hyperonym, and *differentia specifica*, that is a selection of differentiating features (e.g. *mouse* "a little rodent animal found in houses and in the fields" *Ch-1*). Although analytical definition is most common major definition type, it is criticised for being imprecise (Hanks 1987: 191), unnatural and incomplete (Piotrowski 1989: 95), and subjective or even unintelligible for certain groups of users. Some of these shortcomings are due to the traditional requirement that the definition be substitutable for the word defined. In order to meet this demand, lexicographers often omit complements and objects of verbs from definitions with the effect that the definitions are difficult to understand for less experienced users.

The imperfections of analytical definition and the awareness of specific users' needs have given rise to the development of innovative defining styles involving the use of full sentences. In the sentential definition (Geeraerts 2003: 93), the item being defined is used in the definition itself. One obvious merit of such a definition is that it breaks away from the tradition of substitutability. However, the application of full-sentence definition in lexicography for native speakers is limited, its merits being rather appreciated more in lexicography for EFL learners.

Some analytical definitions are special in that they reveal a morphological structure of the item defined. The so-called morpho-semantic definition (Geeraerts 2003: 90) is often used in defining derivatives and compounds. The language of the definition typically includes morphemes or constituent elements of the item (e.g. *breakfast* "a break or breaking of a fast" *Ch-A*), but it may also include inflected forms or derivatives of the root of the item (e.g. *giddy* "that causes giddiness" *Ch-A*).

Another type of definition frequently used in monolingual dictionaries has a form of a single near-synonym or a string of items of similar meaning. For the lexicographer, such a definition is convenient because it is easy to construct, with no need to take the meaning apart. What is more, of all definition types, this one occupies the least space, which is an enormous advantage in a general dictionary aiming at exhaustiveness of word-stock. On the other hand, true synonymy hardly exists in language and a definition by near-synonym offers but a vague idea of the word

meaning. Yet in a typical situation of dictionary use, when the native user encounters an unfamiliar word in a text and then turns to the dictionary for help, a short instruction or a general hint by means of a near-synonym may suffice for the purpose of appropriate interpreting of the text (Piotrowski 2001: 44).

A characteristic feature of many analytical definitions is the coordination of words and phrases, using either the conjunction "or" or a comma. These devices are used to broaden the range of meaning, and are often supported by the abbreviation "etc.", which is an indicator of an open class of objects (Bańko 2001: 107). Irrespective of the practical utility of these devices, they are considered by Wierzbicka (1996: 266) as nothing more than a sign of the lexicographer's "defeat" and "resignation" in the attempt at the delineation of meaning. As Wierzbicka remarks (1996: 266), their use testifies to the lack of precision of definition. What is more, frequent use of the above devices results in a highly complex structure of definitions, which may hinder their reception by the user, especially when the coordinated items or phrases are semantically unrelated and their syntactic patterns differ (Bańko 2001: 104).

As opposed to analytical definition, which embodies the intensional approach to meaning, lexicographers may choose to define lexical items by extension, that is by enumerating particular objects or concepts denoted by the word rather than describing their semantic features (Geeraerts 2003: 90). In practice, however, as Geeraerts (ibid.) observes, a pure extensional definition is hardly ever used because it is often impossible to list all the members of the category being defined. In effect, lexicographers mention only those members which are typical of the category, using the words such as "especially", "such as", "e.g.", "usually", "typically". These key-words, which narrow the range of meaning, are not limited to extensional definition but are used in the analytical definition as well. Following Geeraerts (2003: 91), definitions in which such key-words appear will be referred to as prototypical, as they provide tangible evidence for the protypical organisation of lexical items, emphasising the central part of the category and implying the existence of boundary cases (ibid.).

Definitions in dictionaries for native speakers often include a fair amount of encyclopaedic information. The encyclopaedic component may appear in a variety of forms: the inclusion of Latin taxonomic terms in definitions of plants and animals, the inclusion of biographical data, the description of a historical event or a geographical place, the detailed description of objects, processes etc. All such information refers to the extra-linguistic world rather than the language, though in practice it is difficult to establish a clear line between the two (Hartmann and James 1998: 49). The use of encyclopaedic definitions is open to criticism by certain scholars who emphasise that a definition should reflect a conceptual rather than a scientific view of the world (Wierzbicka 1985; Apresjan 1980: 81). This opinion is strengthened by the fact that the scientific view is best described in the encyclopaedia, which is where one should expect to find the information about the world (Piotrowski 1988: 58).

The process of constructing definitions involves making decisions as to which words to use as part of definitions. Neglecting this problem may result in the ignotum per ignotius type of definition. It is obvious that the employment of rare and technical words may hinder comprehension of definitions and discourage novices from using the dictionary. The problem has been successfully addressed in EFL lexicography by the use of a restricted defining vocabulary. However, in native speakers lexicography, the same model cannot be adopted uncritically for a number of reasons. Firstly, definitions constructed within restricted vocabulary take much more space than traditional ones, which affects the volume and the cost of the work. Secondly, the use of specialist vocabulary is unavoidable in certain definitions (Landau 2001: 166), especially of scientific and technical terms, which constitute a relatively large proportion of entries in native speakers' dictionaries. Thirdly, lexicographers may be tempted to use a specific word rather than its more general, or psychologically salient, hyperonym because only the former adds to the precision of the definition. However, the above arguments are not sufficient to discourage lexicographers from experimenting with innovative methods of defining, especially when understanding definitions is at stake.

1.7 The order and discrimination of senses

The analysis of changes in the arrangement of senses will be carried out in Chapter 10 and in the section on "Secondary meanings" in Chapter 5. Special attention will be paid to graphic ways of discriminating senses.

At the outset, it should be clarified that the word *sense* is used here in the strictly lexicographic sense as a term for a unit of division of word meaning within the microstructure (Piotrowski 1994: 21). This unit roughly corresponds to a definition. The clear-cut lexicographic division of meaning into numbered senses does not necessarily do justice to the polysemous structure of lexical items as postulated by linguists (Adamska-Sałaciak 2007: 186; Lew 2009: 237; Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2007: 155-156). The reason behind specific treatment of meaning in dictionaries is strictly to do with their purpose, target users, and specific language situations they are designed for (Lew 2009: 237). In principle, these conditions also determine the order of senses.

Kipfer (1984: 101) distinguishes three major ways of sense ordering: by arranging them according to frequency or usage, by distinguishing groups of senses clustered around the core one, and by arranging senses in chronological order. Each of them will be briefly discussed below.

In the first method, a sense which is most frequent in the language is given first, and the other, less common senses follow. A systematic execution of the usage principle presupposes that the lexicographers have access to a reliable source of such information, otherwise they are at the mercy of their intuition, which is a rather

poor guide to sense ordering. It appears that such an arrangement of senses is of great benefit to learners of foreign languages, for whom mastering common word meanings should be a priority.

The second method is based on the lexicographer's logical inference rather than citation evidence. In this method, senses that are related in meaning are grouped together around a core sense without actual investigation of the order in which they occurred first in the language. As Kipfer (1984: 103) remarks, the method is justified in the case of gaps in the citation evidence, especially when one attempts to show how metaphorical meanings fit into the chronological tree of sense development. Obviously, this method cannot be used as a sole means of establishing the historical development of senses but should rather be combined with the historical principle as supplementary one to the latter (ibid.). Recent studies show that it is worthwhile to exercise logical inference in dictionaries for foreign learners, even when it is made at the expense of the violation of the usage principle. As Van der Meer (1999) demonstrates, the practice of citing a literal sense first, and then the metaphorical one, despite the former being less frequent than the latter in the language, not only shows explicitly the motivation for the extension of the figurative sense but also contributes to raising awareness of such relationships among learners. This finding appears to have implications for native speakers' lexicography as well.

In the last method, senses are ordered in the way that shows the chronological and semantic changes of the word (cf. Hartmann and James 1998: 125). The sense that is given first in the entry is presumed to be the one that appeared first in the language. However, establishing the true path of meaning development is not always easy, even when the lexicographer has access to historical corpora. As mentioned earlier, the textual evidence may be patchy and incomplete. In such a case, it is reasonable to support the historical principle by the logical one (Kipfer 1984: 104), though in the periods with insufficient textual record the inferred order may not necessarily overlap with the actual one. Readers of old classical texts seem to benefit most from historically arranged senses. From this discussion it follows that lexicographers use different criteria for establishing the primary sense, that is the one that should come first in the entry.

1.8 Etymology

Chapter 11 and the section "Etymology" in Chapter 5 will consider the contents of the etymological part of the entry and the way etymological information was presented from the user's point of view.

In the context of the study of language, the purpose of etymology is to show changes in form and meaning that a word has undergone over time, from its origin, as far as it can be established or reconstructed from the textual evidence, down to the present day (Durkin 2006: 261). The account of a word history may be of great

interest for historical linguists and other experts in the field. It may be beneficial for learners of foreign or second languages by raising their awareness of relations between words (Szczepaniak and Lew 2011: 329). However, it is not the type of information that native speakers turn to their dictionaries for most frequently (Béjoint 2000: 144). Thus, it should come as no surprise that general dictionaries for a native audience tend to provide a limited account of etymology. In addition, space constraints are at play too, allowing only for sketchy treatment of the subject, often with a brief statement of the immediate source language and form. Sometimes dictionaries may attempt to outline in more detail the path of the word through the history, indicating intermediate stages of the form and meaning, major cognates in related languages, language periods, and the ultimate form and language, whether known from a corpus or reconstructed (Drysdale 1989: 527).

1.9 Usage labels

The relevant section in Chapter 5 and then Chapter 12 will trace how the system of usage labels developed with regard to the type and number of labels. Special attention will be paid to the problem of transparency and clarity of presentation of labels. The analysis will be carried out on the basis of sample 3, which is large enough to illustrate the changes. The data are presented in Figure 4 and 5, and Table 6, at the end of the chapter. We will take into consideration major types of usage labels, excluding the grammatical type, such as v(erb), n(noun), pl(ural), etc.

The system of usage labels provides information on the limitations on the usage of a word or a sense by means of special markers, known as labels (Hartmann and James 1998: 40). According to Hartmann and James (1998: 151), labels can be classified according to various dimensions of usage such as currency, emotionality, frequency of occurrence, assimilation, mediality, normativity, formality, style, technicality, textuality, and regionality. Atkins and Rundell (2008: 227-230) distinguish the following types of labels: domain, register (which includes subsets of slang and jargon, and of offensive terms), style, time, attitude, and meaning. Yet these classifications are not exhaustive: in practical lexicography one may find instances of labels that go beyond the pre-established categories or fall into more than one. In this work, we will use a combination of the two classifications above, with the following types of markedness being distinguished: time (e.g. *archaic, obsolete*), frequency (e.g. *rare*), attitude (e.g. *jocularly, ironically, contemptuously*), register and style (e.g. *formal*, *informal*, *slang*, *colloquial, poetical*), assimilation (e.g. *German, French*), field (e.g. *banking*, *chemistry, medicine, photography*), region (e.g. *American*, *dialectal*). In addition, for the purpose of our study, we will add two groups of labels: semantic type (e.g. *literal*, *figurative*), and source type. The latter indicates the source text in which the labelled word has appeared in a given sense. Such a

label appears either as the name of the source (e.g. *Bible*) or the writer's name (e.g. *Shakespeare*).

The use of a developed system of marking may testify to the professionalism of the editor and his or her lexicographic skills (Walczak 1991: 32). The lexicographer specifies restrictions on the usage, on the basis of their awareness of the language. Although the choice of a label is often a matter of subjective judgement, the more dimensions of usage is specified in the dictionary, the more valuable the information is (ibid.).

1.10 Syntagmatic and paradigmatic information

Chapter 13 and the relevant section in Chapter 5 are concerned with the identification of syntagmatic and paradigmatic information in the dictionary. Syntagmatic relations hold between words in the same sequence or construction (Matthews 1997: 368). Being analysed on the basis of sequential order, they may appear in a variety of forms such as collocations, syntactic phrases, set expressions, and sentences (Hartmann and James 1998: 109). They are distinguished from paradigmatic relations, which hold between words that can replace each other in a given sequence. Examples of paradigmatic relations are antonymy, hyponymy, synonymy, paronymy. Paronyms are items which are similar in form or meaning; hence the alternative name is confusable items (Hartmann and James 1998: 106).

The provision of syntagmatic and paradigmatic information is related to the function of the dictionary. In many native speakers' dictionaries, which are designed chiefly as an aid in reception, one is not likely to find many examples of this productively-useful information, unlike in dictionaries for EFL learners, which in principle are designed as an aid in production.

1.11 Pronunciation

The problem of the presentation of pronunciation information involves taking several decisions as to which notation system to use, which accent to represent, how detailed the presentation should be, and which lexical items should be provided with the information. Before discussing the above points (in Chapter 5 and 14), it will be useful to make a brief overview of pronunciation systems used in dictionaries.

Respelling is a traditional way of representing pronunciation. It consists in retyping of the headword by means of letters and digraphs. In addition, the system can be supported by the use of different typefaces of the same letter in order to distinguish different phonemes. Furthermore, it can be combined with diacritics over vowel letters to indicate vowel quality, for example a macron, which usually stands

for a long vowel (e.g. “ā”), and others such as a breve (e.g. “ă”), a stroke (e.g. ó), and a double dot (e.g. ä). Diacritics may appear either on the respelled form of the headword, which is often the case, or on the headword itself. The latter used to be favoured by Oxford dictionaries (Fraser 1997: 184), notably *COD*, the editions from 1911 to 1982 (Kamińska 2010). Yet in this Oxford system, since headwords had to be printed according to the normal rules of spelling, with no change of letters being possible (unlike in respelling), the system necessitated expanding the inventory of diacritics so as to represent the whole set of phonemes. Rather than using diacritics, some early pronouncing dictionaries, such as Kenrick’s *New Dictionary of the English Language* (1773) used numbers above vowel letters in order to represent the vowel sound. This numerical system dominated most pronouncing dictionaries of the eighteenth century (Beal 2009: 160).

On the whole, respelling combined with the above symbols, whether diacritics, numbers or typographic distinction, has developed as a consequence of the fact that the number of letters of the alphabet was insufficient to represent all English phonemes (Fraser 1997: 184). The gap was filled by the use of aforementioned extra devices extending the inventory of symbols.

In respelling, the aim is usually to always represent each phoneme with the same letter or a combination of letters, the system being called phonemic (Fraser 1997: 184). In another version of respelling, which Fraser refers to as non-phonemic, a phoneme may be represented by more than one letter or combination of letters (ibid.). In this type of respelling, systematicity between phonemes and symbols is not the lexicographer’s goal (ibid.). Rather the system is based on “ordinary spelling conventions” that the reader is accustomed to.

A relatively recent notation system is based on the symbols of the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA). The IPA transcription has been widely adopted in EFL and bilingual lexicography (Piotrowski 1987: 40), and recently has even found its way to some British dictionaries for adult native speakers, for example *COED* (Kamińska 2010). Transcription is not dependent on conventional spelling in the way respelling is, though it uses letters of the alphabet. In addition to letters, it employs a number of symbols outside the alphabet. Yet the use of the non-alphabetic symbols causes that the reader has to learn the symbols by heart. On the other hand, an advantage of this system is that it is systematic, with symbol-to-sound and sound-to-symbol correspondences.

Other questions that need to be answered in the analysis of pronunciation concern the indication of suprasegmental features such as stress and syllable division. The problem involves the description of typographic symbols and the identification of the rules followed in syllabification. With regard to the latter, two principles of syllable division may be of help. The first one says that the syllable boundary falls between certain indivisible affixes and stems, for example “*mis.treat, un.able, free.dom, work.ing*” (Kreidler 1992: 84-85). The other says that the place of the syllable boundary depends on the vowel length in such a way that if a consonant letter

follows a short vowel letter, the consonant ends the syllable, as in "*rad.ic.al, sav.age*" (ibid.). On the other hand, if a consonant follows a long vowel letter, the vowel ends the syllable and the consonant starts the following syllable, as in "*ra.di.al, sa.vor*" (ibid.). It should be emphasised that the principles, which have been followed by convention in dictionaries since the eighteenth century, are totally arbitrary and text-bound, and do not overlap with the rules of speech (ibid.).

1.12 Outside matter

In Chapter 15 and in the section "Outside matter" in Chapter 5, we will look into changes in three parts of the outside matter: front, middle and back matters. Special attention will be paid to the type of information offered in each part. In what follows, we will briefly present the contents of each part of the outside matter.

Front matter is the lexicographic data that precedes the central word-list (Burkhanov 1998: 168). Apart from conventional components such as title page, imprint page, preface and table of contents, it provides information essential for the user, namely a list of abbreviations including labels, user's guide or explanatory information, and pronunciation symbols.

Middle matter may appear in the form of illustrations, diagrams, usage notes, and other types of information completing entries. It is strictly speaking not part of the word-list, but it is placed close to the relevant entries (Hartmann and James 1998: 94).

Back matter is the lexicographic data which follows the central entry-list (Burkhanov 1998: 168). It may include personal and place names, weights and measures, quotations and proverbs, list of abbreviations, prefixes and suffixes, and chemical elements (Hartmann and James 1998: 12). Back matter in a general dictionary usually contains a high component of encyclopaedic information.

2 The founders of W. & R. Chambers publishing house[3]

In this chapter we shall outline the biographies of William and Robert Chambers, throwing light on their efforts to establish the publishing house. The brothers were born in Peebles (Scottish Borders): Robert in 1800 and William in 1802. The former attended Peebles parish and grammar schools, and the latter received "a legendary Scottish education: dame-school for reading; burgh school for reading, writing, and arithmetic; and grammar school for Latin" (Cooney 2004: 1). Their father, James Chambers, cultivated in his children a high respect for education by encouraging them to read books (Hannay 2006: 1). In school Robert showed more enthusiasm for learning than William, who had "a more practical mind" (Scott 1997: 4). William admitted that his brother surpassed him in education: "Indisposed to indulge in the boisterous exercise of other boys – studious, docile in temperament, and excelling in mental qualifications – he shot ahead of me in all matters of education." (ibid.). Nevertheless, in later life William began to appreciate learning when he saw real benefits from study. On the other hand, William had qualities that predisposed him to succeed in business; the skills proved useful in his working life when he started the publishing firm.

The family did fairly well at the time while the father earned a living as a commission agent for cotton weavers, but soon life turned hard. During the Napoleonic wars weaving became no longer profitable and the father, James Chambers, moved into the drapery trade. At that time many French prisoners-of-war stayed in Peebles. Being rather naive, James Chambers gave them cloth on credit, hoping that the Frenchmen would repay their debts as soon as they went home. However, when the French soldiers failed to do it, the Chambers family got into serious financial trouble and had to face poverty. Soon they decided to leave Peebles for Edinburgh. Only Robert remained in the home town to complete his school. Before long it turned out that living on the textile trade in Edinburgh was even more difficult than in Peebles. William, who was then 13, had to help support the family, working as an apprentice in a bookshop. He liked the job, particularly because he could borrow books for reading in the hope that "any knowledge he gained would help him to better himself and his family" (Hannay 2006: 2). The job gave him considerable experience in the book trade, which proved useful in his later life.

Robert, who had completed his education in Peebles, had hopes of going to university but the family could not afford it. For some time, he had no regular job,

---

3 This chapter is based chiefly on a biographical account of W. and R. Chambers that was kindly provided to me by Rosemary Hannay, the curator of the Tweeddale Museum of the Chambers Institute in Peebles.

which made him depressed. He decided to rent a shop in Leith Walk and started his own business as a second-hand book seller. First, he traded in books that he had at home, mostly from his father's collection. With the money earned, he bought more stock and soon he could support himself. Nevertheless, the life was still difficult for the family. The father lost his job due to his drinking and the mother had to maintain the family on her own. She opened a small tavern, doing most of the work herself. Shortly afterwards, William moved into Robert's shop and shared a room with him. The living conditions were rudimentary, as William wrote:

> so miserably was the place furnished, that at first we had no bed, but lay on the floor with a rug for covering and a bundle of books for pillow. Afterwards a bed stuffed with chaff made things a little easier, and rolled up during the day the bed with its rug made a convenient sofa. (Hannay 2006: 2)

Soon William opened a little shop and started to run his own business as a bookseller. He did not confine himself to selling books: he bought them unbound and bound them himself in order to reduce expenses (Hannay 2006: 3). When he had enough money, he purchased a second-hand printing press and taught himself how to typeset and print. Yet the printing machine was difficult to operate and the impression was of poor quality. The brothers' first attempt at printing was a pocket edition of the *Songs of Robert Burns,* which brought them financial success (Brookes 2001: 4). The next endeavour was a cheap satirical journal called *Kaleidoscope*. The price was low because the journal did not raise political matters; otherwise, a tax would be applicable. However, *Kaleidoscope* turned out to be rather unsuccessful and was ended after three months. In 1824 the brothers published *Traditions of Edinburgh*, a historical account of the old city of Edinburgh, its people and customs. It went into the third edition, bringing the brothers a financial success.

At that time, a number of cheap periodicals intended for a wide audience were available in Scotland. Yet not all of them had a large readership. The publishing business required skills, experience and, above all, knowledge of the market, which William had: "selling books, printing notices, and generally huckstering among the lower middle classes of Edinburgh had given him a nose for what would succeed" (Hannay 2006: 5). Having discovered what the competing papers lacked and what the public needed, William came up with the idea that a successful paper should offer its readers a means of social improvement:

> With no purpose but to furnish temporary amusement, they [i.e. the papers] were, as it appeared to me, the perversion of what, if rightly conducted, might become a powerful engine of social improvement. Pondering on this idea, I resolved to take advantage of the evidently growing taste for cheap literature, and lead it, as far as was in my power, in a proper direction (Scott 1997: 25).

In other words, William became aware of the growing need for social changes in Britain and the necessity of political reforms. He also realised that a good publica-

tion should not only be entertaining but also educational. In addition, it was necessary that the publication be sold at a moderate price and thus be available for the "humbler orders" (Cooney 2004: 1). William persuaded Robert to write for a new periodical, as the latter had already made his name as a writer: "His wide ranging interests in literature, philosophy, modern life and manners, arts and science were linked to a homely yet elegant and accessible style" (Hannay 2006: 5). The first issue of the journal brought in a great success which surpassed the brothers' expectations. *Chambers's Edinburgh Journal* first appeared in 1832 at a low price of three-halfpence (Cooney 2004: 1). The success of the journal was tremendous and the circulation rose rapidly, reaching 50 000 issues within a year. Robert was the main contributor and his articles particularly appealed to the working and middle classes of Edinburgh (Hannay 2006: 5). The journal provided texts on various subjects such as literature, science, arts, history, and politics. Although the periodical was supposed to avoid the problem of domestic affairs, some articles touched upon the problem of political reforms, which was a current issue in Britain at that time. The weekly brought the brothers big profits and secured their financial situation to a large extent. When the fifteenth issue of the journal appeared, the brothers founded the company of W. and R. Chambers.

In 1834 the Chambers brothers began to publish *Chambers's Instructions for the People*, a series of sheets dealing with various subjects, including science and literature. Continuing educational publishing, the following year they began work on a series of schoolbooks and short publications entitled *Chambers's Educational Course*. Between 1860 and 1868, they published parts of *Chambers's Encyclopedia: a Dictionary of Universal Knowledge* (Cooney 2004: 3). Among publications prepared by Robert himself there were *Life of Scott*, *Life of Burns*, and a *Cyclopaedia of English Literature* (Hannay 2006: 9). He was the author of a bestseller *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*, published anonymously in 1844. Robert's decision to remain unknown arose from his fear of destroying the reputation of the Chambers company by a storm of criticism that the book would trigger (Sedgwick and Tyler 1939: 427). Indeed, the book aroused a strong reaction from conservative critics and provoked a fierce debate about the origin of language. Inspired by astronomical, geological, and physiological evidence, Robert claimed that human speech developed from the rudimentary and primitive ability of animals to communicate, and that language consequently was not of divine origin (Chambers 1845; Aarsleff 1967: 223-224). However, the book lacked a scientific basis, which is why it was deplored in academic circles (Hannay 2006: 7). Nevertheless, no doubt it brought the evolution of species to the attention of a wider public, predating in this sense Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* by fifteen years (ibid.).

Robert died in 1871, a year before the publication of *Chambers's English Dictionary* (*Ch-B*), and William – twelve years later, in 1883. Then the head of the firm was taken over by Robert Chambers (1832-88), William's nephew.