sight, leading to a mutilation, to *Hansa*, *Hanse*, which was applied to other mercantile corporations, and was supposed to signify an association. Fr. *Hanse*, a company, society or corporation of merchants (for so it signifies in the book of the ordonnances of Paris, and in some other old books); also an association with, or the freedom of the Hanse, also the fee or fine which is paid for that freedom. *Hanser*, to make free of a civil company or corporation—Cotgr. G. *hänseln*, to hansel, to initiate a novice—Küttner. Here it will be observed we apparently get back to the original form of the word, but in reality the second syllable of the German verb is the usual frequentative termination instead of the element signifying delivery in the O. N. *handsal* or E. *hansel.*

VI.—ON THE EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN WORDS FROM A DICTIONARY. By Herbert Coleridge, Esq.

Before I reach the proper subject of this paper, I wish to say a few preliminary words as to the nature of the communication I am about to make. Several evenings of discussion in the earlier part of the present year have resulted in the production of a series of Rules and Canons, by means of which a definite shape and outline has been given to our work, and the Editor's functions brought within what seemed to some too narrow limits. However notwithstanding the supposed stringency of the fetters thus imposed, it must have been obvious to every one that numerous minor difficulties would necessarily from time to time present themselves to the mind of a man engaged in so complicated a task, and that for these difficulties a solution must be found somehow; but the Canons did not attempt to indicate any source of information or advice which would meet all the exigencies of the case. Under these circumstances I feel that I cannot do better than assume for myself in Chancery phrase 'liberty to apply', and request the Society, if not

to decide, at any rate to ventilate the questions I may have from time to time occasion to submit to them by discussion; philological matter, unlike physical, usually becomes clearer by shaking.

The difficulty which forms my present subject may be stated briefly to be concerned with 'the exclusion of words'. Are we to include every word, which can anyhow claim a place on any pretext within the wide precincts of our Canons, or are there any circumstances or conditions which may so affect a particular word as to render it inadmissible, notwithstanding it has passed without what I shall take leave to term 'canonical' objection. And here I would just remind those who may have forgotten it that, supposing such power of exclusion to be conceded, we do not expose ourselves to any charge of inconsistency or desertion of principle, inasmuch as in our Prospectus (p. 3) there is reserved a discretion, to be cautiously used no doubt, but still real and exerciseable in this very thing.

Now in answer to my own query I maintain that instances of such words do occur, and that it will be in the proper decision of these ambiguities that the Editor's judgment will be most severely taxed. I have found it difficult, indeed impossible, to reduce the various examples I have met with to a single class, but those I shall give will sufficiently illustrate my meaning even in the absence of a logical definition.

I. In the first place then come a number of words, which are not exactly *slang*, because they are free from any contortion either of form or meaning; nor pedantic coinages of an affected author, such as 'palmiferous', 'medioxumous', &c., but yet seem to acknowledge a kind of relationship to both the foregoing classes. Perhaps the phrase 'Vocabular Parodies' would come nearer, as a short definition, than any other, but here is an example. The phrase 'Your Lordship' is of course perfectly familiar to us as the proper mode of addressing any nobleman under the rank of Duke. Nash however in his tract called "Pierce Penniless", having thought fit to commence with a solemn invocation of Satan,

addresses him throughout as 'Your Devilship'. Is such a word as 'Devilship' to be admitted? Consider its claims a little, and see what there is against them, remembering always that in such a scheme as ours, every word is prima facie to be looked upon as admissible, till its inadmissibility be satisfactorily established. That it is a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον,* is nothing against it—such is the Shaksperian 'gallow', so is Burton's 'diverb' in the sense of 'proverb'; not to mention this, that the fact of a word's being a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον may* be due to a mere accident. That it is an ugly, uncouth, or absurd word, is not necessarily against it; for the same may be said with equal justice of 'septemfluous' and the numerous pedanticisms collected in pp. 6, 7 of the Dean of Westminster's Essay, 2[d] ed. Wherein then does the special objection to 'Devilship' lie? In this, I answer, that it never was intended even by its author for general circulation or adoption,—he uses it for the purpose of creating what might be termed an acoustic effect, a sort of surprise on the reader, which is perceptible enough when the word is read with its peculiar context, but which would be lost utterly or to a considerable degree by transplantation. Now, when H. More called the Nile a 'septemfluous' river, he meant to imitate the terseness of a Latin epithet, which, he was aware, could not be done in English but by the adoption of the expedient of naturalizing the Latin word itself, and he would no doubt have been glad enough to have seen this and many of his other attempts received into public favour. With him indeed these experiments were seldom fortunate—but Bentley succeeded in anglicizing several useful classicisms (*idiom* for instance), which had to encounter a far more trying hostility from the Christ Church wits than was ever directed against the bantlings of the philosopher. Nash however, as I have said, evidently used the word 'devilship' with a view of imparting a quaint comicality to a particular piece of special extravagance, in which he was then allowing his pen to run riot. Both 'devilship' and 'septemfluous' are of course in one sense coinages, but Nash's only bears a private trade-mark, and is therefore

rather of the nature of a medal than a coin: More's is a bona fide attempt to imitate with his own mint the literary currency then in use. And on this ground of speciality alone I contend that 'devilship' ought not to be received into any Dictionary, however wide its scope may be. Other examples are 'neckweed' in the phrase 'playster of neckweed', meaning a halter, and 'Knaveship' is a parallel to 'Devilship' in Pap with a Hatchet.

II. Here too may be mentioned the numerous quaint verbs and past participles formed by prefixing 'be-' to substantives and verbs, such as 'be-stockinged', 'be-hatted', 'be-hugged', 'be-backed', (a word I saw not very long ago in a bookseller's catalogue, and intended no doubt for 're-backed'); and many playful or 'hypocoristic' terms, as they have been called, formed with such suffixes as '-kin', '-let', '-ling' &c., most of which are referrible to this category.

I may in passing just mention another species of this word-genus, which employs an already formed and familiar word in an extraordinary and unexpected sense, which properly it could not bear according to the ordinary laws of the language. Thus Marprelate addresses the Primate as 'Your gracelessness of Canterbury', thereby creating a sort of imperfect pun. It is not however worth while to discuss the matter, because the word 'gracelessness', on which the author has operated, must come into the Dictionary in its own right, and when once there, it would be easy to note the quaintness, if sufficiently neat to deserve that distinction.

III. Words such as I have been hitherto describing meet us first in the writings of Skelton, but are not much resorted to till we come to the writers of the numberless pamphlets and broadsides, which were produced during the latter half of Elizabeth's reign and the whole of that of her successor. Few examples, comparatively speaking, occur from the reign of Charles II to that of George IV, but within the last 30 years the antipurist reaction which has set in, has stimulated the growth of these literary fungi with alarming rapidity. Southey's Doctor is an early instance of the kind

of writing in which they are found—witness such formations as 'cattery' for a collection of cats, 'cattophilist', 'philofelist', 'bonafidely', and 'sinequanonniness'; witness Sydney Smith's 'foolometer', Carlyle's 'whiskerage', 'Correggiosity', 'promenaderess', 'rainous', a vernacular rendering of the Revolution name for one of the months (Pluviose), and 'Youro Majesty', a parody on the German court form 'ihro', Thackeray's 'snobonomer', Dickens's 'have-his-carcase', and a host of others, of which the number in any given work is usually in inverse proportion to the literary rank and standing of the author.

IV. There is however another and quite distinct class of novelties imported by the writers of our own day, which perplex the Lexicographer even more than those I have hitherto been engaged with. I allude to a host of terms, chiefly derived from Greek or Latin, rivalling the worst of Henry More's in pedantry, very commonly malformations, owing to the utter ignorance of their authors of the laws of composition in the classical languages, and what is worst of all, introduced in cases where a word exactly expressing the sense required already exists in familiar use. Every one knows the meaning of the phrase 'visual organ' as a synonym for the eye, what then is gained by a modern writer's substitution of 'visive'? Why, when we possess 'psychologist', are we to be troubled with 'psychologer'? why is 'disembarrass' to be discarded for 'debarrass', 'tentative' for 'peirastic', 'monarchical' for 'monarchal' &c., or why should such terms be introduced at all into the language? I have no vague fear of new words, because they happen to be classical or foreign, if they supply a want, and are formed with such deference to the laws of composition which obtain in the language from which they are drawn, as to be intelligible at once and without hesitation to persons versed in that language—'orography' and 'uranography' are just as useful as 'topography', or 'hydrography', or 'geography'; but I do strongly protest against the reception of words, which not only are not wanted, but by virtue of their malformation either mean nothing at all, or

mean something totally different from that intended by the ingenious author. The attempt to justify this practice of altering words or coining new ones on the ground, that the rhythm of the particular sentence where they occur, happens to be improved and therefore requires such change, is an argument which to my mind simply proves the unskilfulness of the writer in the use of his materials. A great writer may pardonably enough take a license once now and then with his language, but if every one who writes a book is to consider himself at liberty to snip pieces out of words or to add syllables to them according to his or her notions of rhythm, every new publication will soon have to be accompanied with its glossary, just as it is now with its index or table of contents.

V. It would be easy to go further on this subject and discuss the kindred question as to the admissibility of all books as authorities, whether all three-volume novels, sermons, tracts, and newspapers are of right to claim admittance, or can in fact be cited for any useful purpose whatever. But the solution of the difficulty which has commended itself most to my mind, renders this unnecessary. All words belonging to the classes I have been describing in this article, I should propose to treat as probationers on trial; they should be carefully noted for the benefit of a second Edition of our work or of a future lexicographer, and even (if it was wished) printed in alphabetical order at the end of the Dictionary, as Forcellinus has done with his Antibarbarus, but not admitted into the columns of the Main Dictionary *at present.* And further it seems to me that words imperfectly naturalized, and which any particular author may have imported in their foreign garb, should be dealt with on the same principle—had I lived in King James the First's reign and been commissioned to compile a dictionary for his Majesty's guidance, I should certainly have placed 'dosis' and 'idioma' (familiar as they are now to us in their English dress) in my list of ambiguities, and left it to my successor to give them promotion; and I see no reason, why expressions like *νοῦς, οἱ πολλοί,* ne plus

ultra, or such as 'smorzando', 'crescendo', 'pizzicato', 'scherzo' &c., should not receive a similar treatment in the days of Queen Victoria.

As I have no intention of converting these communications into essays on Lexicography, I feel I had better leave the further discussion of the point I have raised to the collective wisdom of those from whom I am to receive an answer. I would just add that although I have indicated my own opinions on the matter clearly enough in what precedes, I am perfectly prepared to relinquish or modify them, if the general sense of the Society should be adverse to my views. I say this, because I should wish any discussion which may arise upon the reading of this paper, to be conducted without reference to any private inclinations which I may be supposed to have in relation to the matter in question.

The questions raised by Mr. Coleridge's Paper were discussed and decided by the Meeting of the Society, before whom the Paper was read, on Nov. 8. The Members present thought that the main question was decided by the previous determinations of the Society and its Dictionary-Rules-Committee, that, except in very special cases, *all* words should be admitted into the proposed Dictionary; and though they allowed that a discretion was reserved to the Editor to exclude some words, they desired that it should be exercised sparingly. I. All the members present voted for the inclusion of Mr. Coleridge's instance *devilship*, and its class. II. As to the forms '*be* + noun + *ed*' (*be-stocking-ed* &c.), ten voted for the inclusion of the whole class, three for the exclusion of the less common words of the class,—some members not voting at all. III. Of the 'literary fungi' mentioned by Mr. Coleridge, examples (since added in the Paper) were asked for; but it was decided that word-puns, such as *hepistle*, *shepistle*, should be excluded. IV. On this class of words (*visual* and *visive*, &c.) it was said that the business of the Dictionary-maker was to register the two equivalent forms, that others coming

after might sée which prevailed, or whether both continued to exist, becoming desynonymized or not. If an Editor did not like them, he might add some note of his dissent, but should not exclude them. Professor Key instanced Dr. Bentley in his Phalaris saying 'Why have you Oxford men introduced this new word '*signify*' when you already have a word which *means* the same thing'. Prof. Key also stated that at the first Meeting of this Society, in 1842, the members were about equally divided on the question, whether *philologer* (cf. astrologer, philosopher, astronomer, geographer &c.) or *philologist* was the right form. There was no doubt therefôre that both forms should be registered in the Dictionary. As to *disembarrass*, *debarrass; disembark*, *debark,* a French visitor said that the words were not equivalent in French, that 'to remove an *embarras*', and 'to clear things—from a table', say;—to disembark people only, and to debark people and goods &c., were different things, and that a Dictionary should notice whether the French distinctions had been kept, in the transfer to English use. V. The *Antibarbarus* plan was not approved, except as an interesting extract of words in the body of the Dictionary. And as to the Italian musical terms,—they were to be inserted; but it was suggested that they should be treated as other terms of science and art; that when you import racing and steamboats into France &c., you import *groom*, *stop-her* &c. with them, and these words should be in a French Dictionary; that *scherzo* was a term for which we have no equivalent in English, that *crescendo* has a metaphorical sense; and that as we must have in the Dictionary a *sine-qua-non*, a *quorum*, a *nisi-prius* argument &c., so certainly we ought to have *scherzo* &c.

F. J. FURNIVALL.