

Alan Kirkness

THE ETYMOLOGY OF EUROPEANISMS,

OR: LEXICOGRAPHERS' DIFFICULTIES WITH 'LEXICOGRAPHER'

For the purposes of this paper, 'Europeanisms' may be defined as words, or at least word forms, common to two or more European languages. The forms may vary from one language to another, especially in spoken usage, but the words remain easily recognizable. Examples are lexicography, lexicology, linguistics and philology, found also in German, French, Italian, Spanish and Russian, and not only there. I shall confine my remarks to West European languages, specifically to German, with comparative reference to English and to a lesser extent also to French.

A comparative approach is essential to the study of Europeanisms, but I have to restrict its scope in this paper. I shall further restrict myself to Europeanisms ultimately derived from Graecolatin or Neolatin and label these Classicisms or Neo-classicisms. (Neo-)Classicisms are a constitutive lexical feature of general educated written usage. The further one proceeds from the central common core of the vocabulary to the periphery of academic, scientific writing, which is for the most part avowedly European or international in character, the more prevalent they become. Classicisms offer unique opportunities, e.g. for facilitating international communication in the sciences, for teaching LSP to foreign students, for international standardization of terminologies, and so on. But there are also pitfalls, both intra- and interlingual. The major intralingual problem is the language bar between academics and non-academics, experts and laymen, the latter having often at most only a passive command of 'hard words', 'mots savants', or 'Fremdwörter'. The most obvious interlingual problem is one too well-known to foreign language teachers or translators and even to lexicologists to require more than passing mention, that of deceptive cognates or 'faux amis'. (Neo-) Classical Europeanisms also pose, in my view, considerable problems for general and historical lexicography, and these are my sole concern.

I shall restrict myself, firstly, to problems of etymology. Etymology may be defined for present purposes as the description of the origin and history of both form and content of a lexical item with regard to related items (i.e. to word families and semantic fields) and to equivalent or cognate items in related languages. I shall restrict myself, secondly, to the origin of word forms, leaving aside semantic questions (cf. Migliorini 1956, 1962, 1971). Even within this circumscribed area I can but raise rather than resolve issues.

That the etymology of Europeanisms, in the restricted sense just outlined, poses problems for general and historical lexicography can be demonstrated by reference to the current state of the art, as a comparative study of some standard dictionaries will reveal. To give the discussion a sharper focus, I shall

look closely at lexicographer and its immediate 'relatives' lexicography and lexicographical and rather glance at other examples as I go.

First a word on the selection of dictionaries. I begin with German, the language with which I am primarily concerned. To land even a small catch I had to cast my net far and wide. The standard work of German historical lexicography, Grimm's DEUTSCHES WÖRTERBUCH, has no entry on our words; nor have the leading etymological dictionaries by Kluge/Mitzka and Duden, nor the major general dictionaries of the 19th and 20th centuries, by such compilers as Adelung, Campe, Heyse, Heyne, Trübner, Paul etc. Two partial exceptions are the dictionaries by Sanders and Weigand/Hirt, but only the latter has etymological information. This negative balance is all too symptomatic of the treatment of Classicisms in the mainstream of German linguistic lexicography, which must be labelled woefully inadequate. Some are recorded, but there is little etymological information, now mostly out of date. As foreignisms ('Fremdwörter'), the Classicisms were seen as not belonging to German vocabulary, and hence largely banned either to special dictionaries of foreignisms to be glossed with native substitutes or to encyclopaedic lexicography, where the tradition was not puristic.

Only recently have there been signs of an overdue change in policy. The larger dictionaries of German, such as the WÖRTERBUCH DER DEUTSCHEN GEGENWARTSSPRACHE (Klappenbach and Steinitz), the DUDEN and BROCKHAUS-WAHRIG, now at least record Classicisms, including our test words, even if they cannot agree on their etymology. Due allowance must be made for the fact that none of them is essentially historical or based on a file of historical references, that they have no lexicographical tradition in German to fall back on and that they are all designed to meet the practical needs of the present-day general reader rather than the demands of academic historical lexicography. Even so, the picture is unsatisfactory. We are left with the sole lexicographical work on the origin and history of foreignisms to have scholarly pretensions, the DEUTSCHES FREMDWÖRTERBUCH by Schulz and Basler. This work is indispensable, but uneven in quality. In short, German lexicography leaves a great deal to be desired as regards the etymology of Europeanisms.

Just how much, can be seen from a comparison with English, to which I now turn briefly. The treatment of (Neo-)Classicisms in English lexicography has a very different tradition, with 'hard words' long occupying the centre of the stage and the language of science (or 'international scientific vocabulary' as WEBSTER'S THIRD (W3) puts it) now receiving due attention. The OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY (OED), the SOED and W3 suffice for our purposes. The differences between them suggest, however, that there are still open questions. So do the slight inconsistencies of terminology and classification in the OED and some etymological discrepancies between the OED and the SOED (e.g. under incubator, muscular, osculant, potentiometer). These make it regrettable that apparently the chance was not taken in the OED Supplements systematically to revise the etymologies in the light of new research. But these are pinpricks that cannot detract from the Oxford achievement. Whether it be with regard to the

treatment of affixes and combining forms or to the consideration of Modern or Neolatin, to name but two areas vital to the historical study of Europeanisms, the OED must be regarded as the present model for future work in this field.

I shall not comment here on French lexicography or on Classical dictionaries. The reason for their inclusion will become clear as we proceed.

A comparative study of the dictionary entries on our test words reveals that there are discrepancies not only between the national lexicographies, which is not surprising, but also within the national lexicographies, which seems more surprising. Indeed, different works published by the same lexicographical enterprise may even be at variance with one another (cf. the entry lexicographe in LE ROBERT and in PETIT ROBERT), which is most surprising. The entries quoted provide us with a whole range of answers to the question of where the word forms lexicographe etc. come from, which indicates that the etymology of lexicographe etc. poses problems for lexicographers. Even so, the gamut of possible etymologies is not exhausted, as we shall see. It is these possibilities that I now want to discuss.

In general terms, a (Neo-)Classical word form may be either taken over from a foreign language (borrowing) or coined within the domestic tradition, mainly by composition or derivation (formation). Among the former, we may distinguish between borrowings from the Classical languages, Greek and Latin, and borrowings from modern European languages. Among the latter, we may distinguish between formations coined from constituents of Greek and/or Latin origin new to the domestic tradition and formations coined from borrowed constituents already available or even productive in the domestic tradition. The constituents may be free or bound forms, the latter including prefixes, suffixes and so-called combining forms, and they may be borrowed directly from Greek or Latin or indirectly via a modern European language. Combinations of these possibilities are possible. So, too, are combinations with native elements, although it is a moot point whether complex morphological items of this type should be classified as (Neo-)Classicisms.

Such a range of possibilities may make it difficult for the lexicographer to arrive at a plausible etymology of the word form in question. Incidentally, I use the qualifier 'plausible' advisedly. In many cases, it is impossible to be conclusive on the etymology of Europeanisms. Alternative interpretations are often possible, and it goes without saying that etymologies are subject to constant revision in the light of new knowledge. However, consideration of a number of factors can, I think, help the lexicographer find his way reasonably effectively through the etymological maze. These factors include the data, source and location of the first occurrence(s) of the word and of members of its immediate word family, comparison with the Classical and other European languages, general cultural and scientific developments and exchange patterns, and word formation. Let me now comment briefly on each of these factors.

I take it as axiomatic that comparison with Greek and Latin

and with the other modern European languages is essential. The historical lexicographer of Europeanisms in German, for instance, must obviously have at his disposal a collection of quotations from historical German texts as representative as possible and references to historical German dictionaries, but for the rest he is largely dependent on secondary sources. These include, firstly, historical dictionaries of the other European languages. The same is true of his English and French colleagues, and advances in this field are dependent inter alia on advances in the individual national lexicographies. (In this respect, the German scholar has at present a distinct advantage over his colleagues.) They include, secondly, dictionaries of Greek and Latin, since an indispensable step in establishing the etymology of a Classicism is checking whether the word or form was attested in Greek and/or Latin, in which senses and at what stage of language development. Two points are important here.

The first is that it seems advisable to refer wherever possible to the large thesauri of Latin and/or Greek rather than to bilingual dictionaries. To take the case of lexicographer. According to the THESAURUS GRAECAE LINGVAE by Stephanus, there are two Greek forms, lexigráphos and lexikográphos, the latter being attested in late Greek in the ETYMOLOGICON MAGNUM (before 1150) as a plural noun. On the basis of this reference (?), Liddell/Scott's GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON records a singular noun lexikográphos = 'lexicographer', while Pape's GRIECHISCH-DEUTSCHES HANDWÖRTERBUCH records the noun lexigráphos and an adjective lexikographos = 'writing a dictionary'. This discrepancy marks, to use a neutral term, an interesting divergence between German and English lexicography. Of the German dictionaries, only Schulz/Basler refers to a noun in Greek, as do the English dictionaries, while Weigand/Hirt and the DUDEN (following Pape?) record an adjective.

The second point is that Latin, in particular, must be subdivided chronologically into Classical, Late, Medieval and Modern or Neolatin. In the chain of the documentation of Latin, the missing link is Neolatin, dating from about 1500 on, once the lingua franca of European scholarship, then gradually superseded at different stages (and in different disciplines) by the respective vernaculars, but still used today, e.g. in the nomenclatures of anatomy and biological classification. To my knowledge, none of the national philologies or lexicographies has concerned itself with a systematic culling of Neolatin academic and scientific texts, with the exception of the Centre for the Study of the Intellectual Vocabulary of Europe in Rome in the field of philosophy. The few studies known to me show conclusively, however, that a consideration of Neolatin is a sine qua non in establishing the etymology of Europeanisms (cf. Hatcher 1951, Arveiller 1968, Höfler 1971). Unfortunately, I cannot expand on this theme here. Suffice to say that Neolatin is a European phenomenon of the past and present, but its documentation and evaluation, not least in the field of general and historical lexicography, is a European task of the future.

To return to our test words, we may note that only lexicographer could have been borrowed directly from Greek and that we have no lexicographical information on Latin or Neolatin influences or developments. Comparisons between the European

languages become illuminating when we consider the other factors mentioned.

The precise dating of the first recorded occurrence(s) of the word form together with its immediate family and details on author and title of the source of the first occurrences, including the text wherever possible, are important in establishing possible intra- and interlingual relationships. In our example, lexicographer is the oldest form in each language, followed by lexicography and then lexicographical, so that, as one theoretical possibility at least, the latter two could have been derived within the respective domestic tradition from a parent form lexicographer, but not vice versa. Further, the French form is the earliest, dating from 1578, followed by German in 1641 and English in 1658, so that the latter two could, theoretically at least, be borrowings from French. Independent borrowing direct from Greek in all three cases, i.e. polygenesis, is also a possibility, of course, quite apart from questions of word formation. Borrowing from Greek seems to me to be the most likely etymology for the French form, as the first user, H. Estienne (1578), is none other than the Stephanus who first produced (in 1572) the Greek THESAURUS mentioned above. As regards English, borrowing from the French seems to me at least a distinct possibility, since the first source is - as far as I can tell - a translation from the French, and in the second Stephanus is mentioned by name. W3 indicates direct borrowing from Greek, while the OED, if I interpret the entry correctly, plumps for a modern formation on late Greek lexikograph + os and refers the reader to the English agentive suffix -er. The German dictionaries offer less information: the full context of the first German occurrence, mentioned but not quoted in Schulz/Basler, reads "die Arbeit eines Lexicographi". This suggests Latin influence, but, given the present state of documentation, it is impossible to follow this Neolatin lead.

Dates and first sources thus provide helpful clues. Certain text types, such as translations and travel reports, hint at borrowing rather than domestic coining, and reference to geographical location - southern Germany as a gateway for Italian influence, northern Germany for Dutch and English, for instance - can help narrow down the range of possibilities, as can reference to the general field or subject area in which a source is located at a given time, e.g. the influence of Italian on German musical and banking vocabulary in the 16th century or the influence of English on aeronautical and computer terminology in German in the 20th.

Here we have moved on to a third factor, general cultural and scientific developments and exchange patterns. In this connection I can mention but one point, the links between the history of science, the naming of new techniques, substances, apparatus etc. by their inventor or discoverer, and the first occurrence of scientific terms or the first use of certain word formation elements. Scientific and linguistic paternity often coincide, and linguistic expressions are often borrowed along with scientific techniques etc. To quote some random examples from the OED Supplement, English antibiotic is a Gallicism (Vuillemin 1890), while bronchoscopy (Killian 1898) and autobasidiomycete (Brefeld 1889)

are Germanisms. A word of caution is necessary, as the nationality of the creator of a word is not necessarily always a clue to the language of origin. This is particularly true of Neolatin word forms, but not only. German Theodizee, for example, is, like English theodicy, a borrowing from French théodicée, coined in 1710 by the German Leibniz; isotherm and isothere were coined by the German Alexander von Humboldt in 1817 - in French, and borrowed from there into English and German. All the examples just mentioned are, regardless of their immediate language of origin, word formations combining Classical constituents. This brings us to the fourth factor I mentioned, word formation.

The relevance of word formation in establishing the etymology of Europeanisms is immediately clear from the dictionary entries on our test words. Some examples: For PETIT ROBERT lexicographe is a combination of Greek lexicon and the French suffix of Greek origin -graphie, while for LAROUSSE it is a combination of the French prefixal element lexico- and the French suffix -graphie, both borrowed from the Greek; for W3 lexicography is formed from lexicographer "after such pairs as E(nglish) geographer: geography", while for the OED it is a modern formation combining Greek lexiko- and Greek graphía. Here again, inter- and intralingual discrepancies point to open questions. As I see it, the major questions to be answered by historical-diachronic studies of word formation are the following:

When, in what areas of vocabulary and with what semantic range have prefixes, suffixes and combining forms of Graecolatin and Neolatin origin, such as lexico- and -graphy, become available for use and even productive within the domestic system of word formation?

When etc. have borrowed word formation patterns been introduced to and become productive in the domestic system?

Have, and if so when etc., such affixes and combining forms and word formation patterns been introduced to and become productive in the other modern European languages that could be considered possible sources for a borrowing?

What was the status of affixes and combining forms such as lexico- and -graphy in the word formation system of Greek, Latin and Neolatin?

I cannot go into detail here, so let me give but one example of how a consideration of such questions could throw light on etymology. I take lexicography in English as my example. The reasons for this choice are simple: English is comparatively well documented. The OED alone, for example, contains full articles on affixes and combining forms. From my observations, the OED has contributed more to specialist studies in English word formation than it has received from them and remains the principal source of historical-diachronic information on word formation (cf. Marchand 1969, Adams 1973, Bauer 1983). In German lexicography, on the other hand, the treatment of affixes and combining forms of foreign origin is rudimentary to non-existent, with the uneven exception of the DEUTSCHES FREMDWÖRTERBUCH by Schulz and Basler, so that at present answers to the above questions are at best

premature, the more so as word formation on a foreign basis of coining has been until very recently virtually ignored in German lexicology and grammar. New synchronic studies either deal primarily with standard usage or are designed as practical terminology courses for specialist areas, notably medicine; we lack diachronic studies (cf. Link 1983).

But back to English lexicography: W3's etymology seems to me to be more immediately plausible than the OED's. Geography and geographer both date from 1542, so could well have served as the model for an analogous formation, especially as -graphy and -grapher were well established as terminal elements (suffixes or combining forms?) in such pairs as ours in the 16th century. Further, lexico- was not used as a combining form in Greek, lexikographos being the only compound form attested, whereas the fact that -graphy and -grapher were already well established as terminal elements in English would make it quite feasible for the lexico- of antecedent lexicographer to be separated off and combined with -graphy on analogy with already extant pairs such as geographer: geography in English, without recourse to the Greek formation pattern suggested by the OED.

So much, then, for the difficulties of lexicographers with lexicographer etc. in particular and for the problems that the etymology of Europeanisms poses for general and historical lexicography in general. I have touched on a few aspects of the topic, but have had to ignore many more, especially in the complex area of academic and scientific word formation (cf. the DICTIONNAIRE by Cottez 1980, Sager/Dungworth/McDonald 1980, Kocourek 1982).

In conclusion, let me emphasize two points that have, I hope, emerged clearly from this paper: The study of Europeanisms must be seen in a European context and perspective, and the documentation and evaluation of Neolatin is a European task. Both transcend national philologies and lexicographies. Here, surely, is a fitting sphere of activity for the proposed European Association of Lexicography?

#### References

- Adams, V. (1973) An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation. London: Longman
- Arveiller, R. (1968) "De l'importance du latin scientifique des XVIIe-XVIIIe s. dans la création du vocabulaire technique français à la même époque" in Actas del XI. congreso internacional de lingüística y filología románicas. Madrid
- Bauer, L. (1983) English Word-formation. Cambridge: U.P.
- Hatcher, A.G. (1951) Modern English Word-Formation and Neo-Latin. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press
- Höfler, M. (1971) Zur Integration der neulateinischen Kompositionsweise im Französischen, dargestellt an den Bildungen auf -(o)manie, -(o)mane. Tübingen: Niemeyer
- Kocourek, R. (1982) La langue française de la technique et de la science. Wiesbaden: Brandstetter
- Link, E. (1983) "Fremdwörter - der Deutschen liebste schwere Wörter?" Deutsche Sprache 11, 1: 47-77

- Marchand, H. (1969) The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation. München: Beck
- Migliorini, B. (1956) "Latin and Greek as a resource for the vocabularies of modern languages" Annual Bulletin of the Modern Humanities Research Association 28: 16-26
- Migliorini, B. (1962) "I latinismi" Cultura e scuola 3: 5-10
- Migliorini, B. (1971) "Polysémie des latinismes dans le vocabulaire européen" in Interlinguistica. Sprachvergleich und Übersetzung. Festschrift M. Wandruszka ed. by K.-R. Bausch and H.M. Gauger. Tübingen: Niemeyer
- Sager, J. et al. (1980) English Special Languages. Wiesbaden: Brandstetter