PREFACE

1. Volume 4 (OEDS 4)

When Miss Marghanita Laski read the galley-proofs of the entry for off in Volume 3 of this Supplement she remarked, 'I am almost completely flummoxed by this, and must ask your indulgence on it'. Professor Audrey Duckett, another of our regular contributors, independently remarked, 'I'm glad I didn't have to write off for OED, but I'll never write OED off'. Off was a complex entry, or set of entries, both in the OED and in OEDS 3, and the same is necessarily true of a good many entries in this final volume—those for un- (prefix) and up (various parts of speech), for example. Our language is a complicated mechanism at the best of times, and sometimes almost frighteningly so when presented in its largest dimension as in the following pages.

But not all of the elements of the English language are complex. Many of the expressions that appear in this final volume merely illustrate the concepts, inventions, and movements of our generation—words of very recent origin (1984) like yumpie and yuppie, and somewhat older expressions like self-fulfilling prophecy, sputnik, and test-tube baby. We are all in an electronic environment, and the entries for such words as SNOBOL, transputer, and wyclifeyg draw attention both to the ingenuity of the world of the green screen and to the manner in which its practitioners embrace the techniques of present-day word-formation.

Every effort has been made to keep up with the language as it developed even while the final volume of the Supplement was being prepared. The Growing Pains of Adrian Mole (1984) is quoted under yoyo, for example, and there are numerous examples from 1985 sources in the later letters of the alphabet in this volume.

As in earlier volumes no effort has been spared to verify details of the coinage, meaning, or other aspects of each word entered in the Supplement. The Bodleian Library, the British Library, and the Library of Congress, in particular, have probably never experienced such a systematic combing of their resources as has been necessary for the preparation of the four volumes of OEDS. We owe an incalculable debt to the custodians of these libraries, and also to many other specialized libraries in Britain and abroad, for their cooperation. We are also deeply indebted to numerous scholars and men of letters who have over the years assisted us with the definition or the circumstances of origin of expressions they have coined themselves, e.g. acceptance world (Anthony Powell), drogulius (A. J. Ayer), dymaxion (Buckminster Fuller), hobbit (J. R. R. Tolkien), jsg 2 sense 3 (N. F. Mott), non-event (I. Gilmour MP), psephology (R. B. McCallum), quark (M. Gell-Mann), tracklement (D. Hartley), and tribology (C. G. Hardie). Part of the pleasure and the value of historical lexicography lies in the establishing of the circumstances of a coinage from the coiner himself.

* * *

Sadly the need arises once more to set down the names of people associated with the Supplement who have not survived to see the publication of this final volume: Professor A. J. Bliss, Professor S. Deas, Dr N. R. Ker, John Lyman, Professor Raven I. McDavid Jr., Professor Mitford M. Mathews, Peter Opie, Professor Dr László Országh (Hungary), Professor Dr. I. Poldauf (Czechoslovakia), Professor I. Willis Russell, and Peter Tamony.

Major contributors of quotations in the period 1982-5 included the following: G. Charters (Australia), G. Chowdhary-Bye, G. A. Coulson, F. D. Hayes, Miss M. Laski, Sir E. Playfair, and F. R. Shapiro. The product of their work is to be seen on virtually every page of this volume.
The outside proof-readers, who systematically scrutinized sets of galley-proofs and submitted their comments and criticisms during the preparation of Volume IV, were Professor A. R. Duckert, M. W. Grose, T. F. Hoad, Mrs D. D. Honoré, Miss M. Laski, Professor E. G. Stanley, and Mrs H. C. Wright. The volume would have been much the poorer without their expert attention.

The outside consultants to whom we have turned for advice on particular words while the volume was being prepared were: Dr G. E. H. Abraham, Dr G. C. Ainsworth, Professor A. J. Aitken, A. D. Alderson, R. E. Allen, Dr P. W. Atkins, A. J. Augarde, Professor J. R. Baines, †Professor A. J. Bliss, Dr. S. Bradbury, Dr J. Branford, Dr W. H. Brock, Sir A. K. Cairncross, Dr B. G. Campbell, Professor F. G. Cassidy, Dr P. A. Charles, M. J. E. Coode, Dr J. Cortés, Professor G. N. C. Crawford, Mrs U. Dronek, †Professor S. Deas, Dr B. J. Freedman, R. B. Freeman, W. K. V. Gale, P. G. W. Glare, Dr I. Goddard, Dr G. H. Gonnet, P. S. Green, R. Hall, R. E. Hawkins, M. T. Heydeman, Dr D. M. Jackson, P. Jarrett, Dr Russell Jones, Dr D. Julier, Dr W. J. Kirwin, Professor K. Koike, Professor J. D. Latham, Professor J. Leech, Professor B. Lennox, Dr G. Lewis, R. P. W. Lewis, Dr A. Loveless, Dr D. J. Mabberley, Dr R. S. McGregor, Professor J. B. McMillan, Dr T. Magay, Dr L. V. Malakhovski, Dr F. H. C. Marriott, R. D. Meikle, Professor G. Milner, D. D. Murison, Mrs I. Opie, M. B. Parkes, Miss V. Richardson, Professor R. H. Robins, Dr H. M. Rosenberg, Professor J. M. Rosenberg, Professor N. G. Sabbagha, R. Scruton, A. J. Stevens, Dr I. N. Stewart, Dr J. B. Sykes, Associate Professor Tao Jie, Miss D. J. Thompson, Professor G. Treitel, G. W. Turner, J. O. Utzson, Professor T. G. Vallance, Professor R. I. Venezky, Dr M. Weitzman, the Revd Canon Professor M. F. Wiles, and Dr D. Zorc.

This fourth volume contains about 13,500 Main Words divided into some 25,000 senses. There are about 11,000 defined Combinations within the articles and a similar number of undefined Combinations. The illustrative quotations are estimated to number 150,000.

It is appropriate to mention here that the printing of this final volume marks the end of an era in the printing trade. I believe that it may be the last major book to be set up in type by the hot-metal process. The printing house concerned, Latimer Trend of Plymouth, nobly retained its hot-metal department until the entry for Zydian was safely in type.

I should like to take this last opportunity to thank various people: first and foremost, the Delegates of The Oxford University Press, and their senior officers, for allowing this ambitious and very costly project to take its course; all members of my staff since 1957 for their skilled and determined assistance as a seemingly endless procession of problems presented themselves for solution; Miss Marghanita Laski, surely one of the most prolific contributors of illustrative quotations—some 250,000—to any dictionary in history; Clarence L. Barnhart (and more recently his son Robert K. Barnhart) who opened his valuable quotation files to us from the beginning of the preparation of OEDS; and Professor E. G. Stanley, the Rawlinson and Bosworth Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Oxford, a personal friend for nearly forty years, who was among the first to help me build up a team of source-readers for the Supplement and who has subsequently given close critical attention to sets of galley-proofs in every letter of the alphabet.

2. A Supplement to the OED (OEDS)

It is natural when a task of some magnitude has been completed to give some account, however inadequate, of the manner in which the project evolved.†

In 1957, when I began, I was both encouraged and worried by the first sentence in the General Explanations of the OED: 'The vocabulary of a widely-diffused and highly-cultivated

† A fuller account of the evolution of OEDS is given in my article 'The End of an Innings but not the End of the Game', Threlford Memorial Lecture, The Incorporated Linguist Volume 23, Number 3, Summer 1984, pp. 114–119.
living language is not a fixed quantity circumscribed by definite limits.' I was also much taken by Dr Murray's employment of the phrase *Lexicon totius Anglicitatis*. 'Limits' and 'totality' plainly suggested that boundaries would need to be set at many stages along the journey.

At the outset I was invited by the Delegates of the Oxford University Press to prepare a new *Supplement to the OED* in a single volume of about 1,275 pages, and to aim at completion within seven years. Both figures seemed reasonable at the time, as far as I can recall. The only significant model before me was that of the *OED* itself. James Murray had been instructed by the Delegates to complete the Dictionary within ten years. But the ten years, I reasoned, had turned into forty-four partly because Murray was a pioneer in the field of historical lexicography,¹ and partly because he and his co-editors had to deal with the language from the time of the first records (eighth century) of English till the late nineteenth century. I had rather less than a century's worth of language to consider.

In the event OEDS has taken nearly twenty-nine years to complete, and one volume has turned into four. By 1957 the language had proliferated at a much greater rate since the beginning of the century than I had at first judged. This dramatic increase was underlined by the publication in 1961 (i.e. not long after I had established my editorial policy and at a point when I thought the main collecting of evidence had been completed) of *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*. The sheer quantity of words in this majestic and influential work made it obvious that I had underestimated the problems confronting me. The whole editorial process, and particularly the extension of the 'definite limits' of inclusion, had to be reconsidered. The mine-shafts into the seams of words needed to be dug much more deeply.

A second circumstance leading to delay was my acceptance of responsibility for the governance of the smaller Oxford dictionaries. In 1957 there were only four Oxford English dictionaries for native speakers apart from the *OED* itself: in chronological order of first publication, the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* (first published in 1911), the *Pocket Oxford Dictionary* (1924), the *Little Oxford Dictionary* (1930), and the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (1933). Now this small flotilla of scattered ships—scattered because in 1957 they had no base to operate from—has turned into an invincible fleet of more than twenty dictionaries and lexical guides, all flying the Oxford flag from their base at 37a St. Giles', Oxford. The editors of all these smaller works, and many of their editorial assistants, first cut their lexicographical teeth on OEDS.

* * *

When I look back at the work of Murray, I cannot but marvel at the permanent value of so much of his editorial policy, and even of his clerical procedures. Like Murray and his editorial colleagues we have worked by hand on dictionary slips, the only difference being that our slips are standardized in size (6 in. × 4 in.). They filed bundles of slips in wooden pigeon-holes after tying them with string or tape. We have placed our slips in an upright manner in strict alphabetical order in the trays of fire-proof cabinets. One procedure of Murray's has been abandoned: as often as not his readers cut up books, including many valuable ones from earlier centuries, in the process of collecting quotations. This would today be regarded as vandalism. We were able to hasten the process of preparing slips containing evidence from much-cited sources (e.g. the technical glossaries of the British Standards Institution), by mass-producing them with typed titles and with the help of a photo-copying and paper guillotine, rather than, as in Murray's day, by the use of hand-setting composition in a printing house. I am sure too that our standards of research and verification of the printed evidence have been consistently higher than those of our predecessors. Victorian standards were lower in such matters; ours is a more pedantic age. The

¹ The *OED* was not in fact the first historical dictionary. Jacob Grimm and Wilhelm Grimm started their *Deutsches Wörterbuch* at an earlier date, and their first volume (A–Bierwohle) was published in 1854.
resources of even the greatest libraries then were also much more limited than they are now. Many quotations in the OED were taken from secondary sources like, for example, C. Pettman's *Africanderisms* (1913) and J. Redding Ware’s *Passing English* of the Victorian Era (1909): we have tried always to verify such quotations in the original source. We have also tried always to verify quotations from poems and short stories in their first place of publication and not merely in collected editions.

In matters of editorial policy, except for the abandonment of the once obligatory initial capital in the headwords, we have endeavoured in OEDS to display the entries in the manner of the parent work, even to the extent of retaining Murray's old-fashioned (though very convenient) pronunciation system. If a word has developed new senses we have placed these in their logical place in the numerical sequences first devised nearly a century ago, sometimes needing to make use of strings of asterisks, as explained on p. xxi. We have given the same attention to every department of modern English vocabulary—etymologies, definitions, illustrative examples, combinations, proverbs, idiomatic phrases, and all the rest—as did the lexicographers who preceded us, except that the entries for words entering the language in the twentieth century are more generously illustrated by examples than was judged necessary in the past.

* * *

One unforeseeable circumstance that has had an intangible and yet curiously potent effect on present-day attitudes to historical lexicography is that the period of preparation of OEDS has coincided with the arrival of new linguistic (and especially structuralist) attitudes. What I have elsewhere called ‘linguistic burial parties’ have appeared, that is scholars with shovels intent on burying the linguistic past and most of the literary past and present. I refer to those who believe that synchronic means ‘theoretically sound’ and diachronic ‘theoretically suspect’. It is theoretically sound, the argument of the synchronists runs, to construct contrastive sentences or other laboratory-invented examples which draw attention to this or that element of grammar or lexis, and to do only that. I profoundly believe that such procedures, leading descriptive scholars never to quote from the written language of even our greatest modern writers, leave one looking at a language with one’s eyes partly blindfolded.

I want to dwell on these matters a moment longer because the editorial policy adopted in the four volumes of OEDS was formed in all its essentials between 1957 and 1960, when the new linguistic attitudes were at an embryonic stage. A small measure of autobiography is necessary. Between 1951 and 1957 I had retyped the text of the late-twelfth-century set of versified homilies called the *Ormulum*. I had also compiled an *index verborum* to it, and had given lectures to Oxford undergraduates on the language of the *Ormulum* and on the language of other medieval works like the *Peterborough Chronicle*, the *Ancrern Wisse*, and the *Avenbite of Inwyrt*. For such work, indispensable prerequisites included a knowledge of the linguistic monuments of Old English, Old Norse, Gothic, and other Germanic languages, also of Old French, and a professional knowledge of all the elements of comparative Indo-European philology that had a bearing on the vocabulary and grammar of medieval English. I also conducted tutorials and seminars on the language of writers like Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Dickens, and many others. In that context the grammaticality of ‘Colourless green ideas sleep furiously’, and the contrast between *langue* and *parole*, had no relevance at all. Above all else it became clear to me that the entire vocabulary of all the main literary, philosophical, religious, etc., works that had survived from the period since 1100, as well as that part of pre-Conquest English that remained in the language after 1066, had been included in the OED. Any omissions were attributable to human frailty not to deliberate design. There were no exclusion zones, no censorings, no blindfoldings, except for the absence of two famous four-letter (sexual) words. Dr Murray, his colleagues,
and his contributors had dredged up the whole of the accessible vocabulary of English (the sexual words apart) and had done their best to record them systematically in the *OED*. I concluded that if the Dictionary had room for the word *thester* as adjective (‘dark’) and noun (‘darkness’), and Orm’s *peosterrlecg* ‘darkness’, it could, and must, admit the vocabulary of Edith Sitwell and Wystan Auden. Of course the structuralists and other scholars at one or more remove from the primary work of Ferdinand de Saussure could not see this, and they probably never will. It seems that they would prefer to bury Orm’s vocabulary along with that of the best writers of the present day. But *OEDS*, like its parent work, has been hospitable, almost from the beginning, to the special vocabulary, including the once-only uses, of writers like T. S. Eliot, Virginia Woolf, D. H. Lawrence, and others. It must be emphasized that in practice these uses form only a tiny fraction of the vocabulary presented here; in other words the balance of the volumes has not been disturbed by them nor has the publication of the dictionary been delayed by their presence.

Perhaps the main departure from the policy of Murray was my decision to try to locate and list the vocabulary of all English-speaking countries, and not merely that of the United Kingdom. For the most part Murray preferred to fend off overseas words until they had become firmly entrenched in British use. Words more or less restricted to North America, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the West Indies, and so on, were treated almost like illegal immigrants. All that has been changed and, as far as possible, equality of attention has been given to the sprawling vocabulary of all English-speaking countries. At a time when the English language seems to be breaking up into innumerable clearly distinguishable varieties, it seemed to me important to abandon Murray’s insular policy and go out and find what was happening to the language elsewhere.

As work on the Supplement proceeded, the number of scientific, technical, and specialized academic words and senses that needed to be included multiplied spectacularly. The astonishing growth in academic and scientific research and in industrial and technological achievements, especially since the 1939–45 war, is plainly reflected in the text of *OEDS*. The first sputnik was launched in 1957 just as work on *OEDS* was beginning. As we proceeded with the dictionary, visits to the moon by astronauts and the exploration of outer space by far-travelling rockets became routine features of our age. Nuclear power stations came into being along with quantities of nuclear weapons and other weapons of war, and all the attendant vocabulary. Nobel prize-winners, playwrights, philosophers, and writers of every kind wrote their books and articles. The *New York Times* and other newspapers increased hideously in size, as did the regular issues of learned journals in chemistry, medicine, and all the other academic subjects. New vocabulary reached our language from the wars and revolutions of the twentieth century, and from the considerable extension of leisure travel. A curious by-product of the scholarship of our age is that the metalanguages of linguists and philosophers have now reached a point where writers of monographs cannot even reach the starting line without regularly defining exactly what they mean by such ordinary (and certainly not new) expressions as *accent*, *sentence*, *utterance*, and *word*, not to go further afield. Some linguistic scholars can now express themselves only in a manner which is ‘as inviting as a tall wall bottle-spiked’ (to use Professor Ricks’s memorable phrase), others only in tree-diagrams, others again by ritual exercises like distinguishing ‘the cat sat on the mat’ from ‘the mat sat on the cat’. I cannot believe that historical lexicography will crumble or be damaged in any permanent way by these transient schools of thought, but the danger exists.

---

It has given me boundless pleasure to ‘ascertain the significance’ of so many modern English words, and ‘to perform all the parts of a faithful lexicographer’. The performance of the task has also taken me to lecture platforms and broadcasting houses in most major countries in the world. In this country I have had the special privilege of advising the BBC on the standards of spoken English presented by them,\(^2\) and the opportunity to discuss the issues with some of the famous broadcasters of our time. I have also participated in many programmes, on both radio and television, in which the English language has been the main topic of discussion or of entertainment, from the studios of Radio 3 and of the external services to the more relaxed ones broadcasting programmes like ‘Call My Bluff’ and ‘Desert Island Discs’. I have tried throughout to insist on the permanent value of the primary canons of my trade: the necessity of recording the indelicate as well as the delicate or neutral works of our century, demotic vocabulary as well as that which is taken to be elegant, words that offend ethnic sensibilities as well as those that cause no offence, overseas English vocabulary as well as that used in the United Kingdom, and the literary language as well as the ordinary printed word.

Now time has moved on. Volumes I and II of OEDS have already been reprinted twice and Volume III once. This Supplement, begun in a small house in a back street in Oxford and finished nearly three decades later in a Georgian mansion in one of Oxford’s noblest streets, will surely stand as a lasting testament to the fruitfulness and inventiveness of the language of our age.

In a recent visit to Washington I came across the following statement on a plaque in the Capitol:

After the departure of British Forces from New York, American Independence was close at hand.

*George Washington resigned his military commission at the State House in Annapolis before the Continental Congress. 'Having now finished the work assigned to me, I retire from the great theatre of action.' 23 Dec. 1783.*

---

1 A convenient description of the project by its Editor, E. S. C. Weiner, can be found in the *Journal of English Linguistics* (April 1983), pp. 1–13.
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With the completion of a task assigned to me in 1957, I now retire from the 'great theatre' of lexicography, and will devote myself in the years ahead to a reconsideration of English grammar.

R.W.B.

Oxford

June 1985