

## Reviews

Sabine Heinz, *Welsh Dictionaries in the Twentieth Century: a Critical Analysis* (= *Lincom Studies in Indo-European Linguistics* 21). München: Lincom Europa, 2003 (2nd edn). Pp. 536. €82. ISBN 3–89586–750–0.

This book is the author's 2002 Habilitationsschrift, presented at the University of Vienna. It was published that same year but, due to some technical problems, the first print run was republished as a second edition in 2003. Previously, the author has published a Welsh–German glossary in Heinz (1994) and collaborated with Johannes Heinecke on an unfinished online Welsh–German dictionary.

The work is divided into the following seven chapters: (I) aims and terminological classification (pp. 7–81); (II) historical lexicography in Welsh (pp. 82–175) (see also the conclusions in 479–85); (III) historical lexicography in other Celtic countries (pp. 176–236); (IV) twentieth-century Welsh dictionaries (pp. 237–472); (V) general conclusion (pp. 473–92); (VI) appendices (pp. 493–500). Chapter IV is clearly divided into two thematically distinct parts: (IVa) dictionaries and Welsh cultural identity (pp. 237–88) and (IVb) the analysis of contemporary Welsh dictionaries (pp. 289–472).

There can be no doubt that the most important contribution of this book is in chapters I and IVb in which the author analyses, compares and criticizes ten contemporary general-purpose Welsh dictionaries (one being on CD-ROM). Comparison with a wide range of lexicographical works for German leads the author to the conclusion that Welsh lexicography is lacking not only in types of lexicographical works but also in the way the language is presented and analysed in those works that do exist (p. 488). The author is to be thanked, not only for determining the extent and nature of the many failings of contemporary Welsh dictionaries, but also for recommending many clear improvements. Future dictionary-makers involved with Welsh are advised to make themselves familiar with the conclusions and arguments presented in this chapter.

However, the work as a whole is marred by a number of flaws. The first to be mentioned here seems like a strategic oversight. Beyond

advocating a copious one-volume comprehensive dictionary aimed at being of practical use to both contemporary users and learners, I was not able to discover how many types of dictionaries the author believes Welsh as a language needs and what differences in criteria should be applied to each class of dictionary when composing them. I would suppose that three classes deserve priority: a pocket dictionary especially useful for learners or those on the move, a one-volume medium dictionary for everyday use, and a large comprehensive reference dictionary for home or office. Despite occasional references to such questions (pp. 11, 30, 32–3, 233–6, 264, 283, 473–6, 478–9, 490), I would also have liked to have known more clearly the author's views on the need for the production of specialized dictionaries such as those aimed at children, and questions concerning metalanguage (i.e. the language of annotation) in dictionaries: should priority be given to dictionaries aimed at native, or at English speakers, or even both? Rather than developing these questions, the author concentrates her attention on the way Welsh-to-English sections of dictionaries are structured and on the best way to impart grammatical information relevant to each headword (p. 12). Her general conclusions relating to these questions intrinsic to the quality of any dictionary are given on pages 463–72, 476–7 and 485–90.

A second flaw is the book's length. The composition gives the impression of more than one book awkwardly combined into one. This reviewer feels that the content had the potential of forming a far shorter, tighter book primarily focused on the failings of contemporary Welsh dictionaries and would be the better for it. With the dispersal of thematic strands throughout the book in mind, this review attempts to provide helpful page references to the main linguistic themes addressed by Heinz.

Reasons of space prevent me from discussing all of the contents. Chapters II and III, which run to over a quarter of the book, contain a 142-page discussion on the evolution of Welsh lexicography up to 1900 followed by the tabulation of dictionaries in Celtic languages up to 2001 (p. 176). This content seems marginal in its relevance to the subject of twentieth-century Welsh dictionaries, the stated subject of the book, and suggests, rather, the promise of another book. More relevant for the subject chosen, I believe, would have been the charting of the correlation between official recognition of Welsh and the organization and funding of

lexicographical work in the late twentieth century. This important aspect of twentieth-century Welsh lexicography is wholly neglected in Heinz's work. (There is an all too brief paragraph on Welsh language planning on page 266.)

I consider chapters I and IVb to be the most important and pertinent research contained in the book. Chapter I discusses the technical terminology whilst chapter IVb contains useful discussions of the various ways in which Welsh dictionaries present and could present different features of Welsh, grammatical or otherwise. The chosen features are discussed in the following pages: verbs (pp. 55–61, 302–26), nouns (pp. 62–3, 327–49), adjectives (pp. 64–5, 350–74), pronouns (pp. 66–8, 377–80), prepositions (pp. 69–70, 381–94), conjunctions (pp. 71–4, 395–402), numerals (pp. 75–8, 403–12), particles (pp. 79–81, 413–15), hyphenation (pp. 416–34) and phonological transcription (pp. 435–56).<sup>1</sup> The comparison with reference material for the other Celtic languages and German is illuminating and I generally find that her recommendations and strictures are sound. I would like to add some points to those touched upon by the author, most especially the failure of Welsh dictionaries to note systematically the verbal root. This is especially inconvenient when it occurs in a book sold under the title *The Welsh Learner's Dictionary* (Gruffudd 1998). Heinz prefers the solution verb-noun followed by the 'present' 1sg and 3sg, e.g. *aros* (*arhosaf; erys*) (p. 304), whereas I believe the basic dictionary presentation should be the verb-noun followed by the verbal root, e.g. *aros* (*arhos-*).<sup>2</sup> An objection to using the 'present' 1sg to indicate the verbal root was raised long ago by Watkins (1963: 181), who wrote, 'It might also be argued that the decision to list first "present" indicative verbal forms (rather than verb-nouns) has resulted in many hypothetical verbs, e.g. *adanaf* (< the v.n. meaning "regenerate"), *adaraf* (< the v.n. meaning "to fowl"), or in verb-nouns for which no verb is quoted (or, presumably, can be imagined), e.g. *bugunad* "to bellow", *clochdar* "to cluck".' As to the 'present' 3sg, it must be emphasized that it is by now almost solely a literary form (restricted to proverbs in colloquial Welsh) which has been supplanted by the regularly suffixed *-iff* or *-ith* in the related 'future' 3sg. This makes it a far less basic feature than the verbal root, but when it deviates from the root form I propose it should be noted in the following manner *aros* (*arhos-*; 3sg present *erys*). The same

should apply to a class which Heinz neglects to mention, the vowel-affected variants of the root of verbs with <a>, e.g. *canu* (*can-*; 3sg present *cân*; 1sg, 2sg preterite & 2pl imperative *cen-*). But from the point of view of the dictionary user the information given is not enough. The forms *cân*, *cenais*, *cenaist*, *cenwch* are archaizing literary forms which contrast with the regular modern forms *caniff* ~ *canith*, *canais*, *canaist*, *canwch*. The suffixless and affected forms should thus be preceded by 'lit.' for 'literary', in the archaizing sense, giving a rather more complex entry, e.g. *canu* (*can-*; lit. 3sg present *cân*; lit. 1sg, 2sg preterite & 2pl imperative *cen-*). Irregular verbs are not easily fitted into a dictionary format and the way the forms are presented for *dod* (*do-*, *deu-*, *daw-*; *daw*) by the author (p. 325) clearly remains insufficient.

Heinz criticizes the lack of comprehensiveness in supplying feminine forms of adjectives (p. 352) but, in view of the general obsolescence of adjectival gender in colloquial Modern Welsh, is it incumbent on the smaller dictionaries to note them comprehensively? The only feminine forms that seem productive in Modern Welsh are *gwen* and, maybe, *melen* and *braith*, other feminine forms are at best found fossilized in phrases such as *Y Ford Gron* 'the round table', *buwch goch gota* 'ladybird' or in place-names (interestingly, in the case of *hysb* 'dried up, not yielding milk' it is the masculine form which is no longer used since *hesb* usually refers to either *ffynnon* 'well' or *buwch* 'cow' which are both feminine). A comprehensive inclusion of the feminine gender in smaller dictionaries would persuade those not familiar with the language to produce what are, to Modern Welsh speakers, incongruous forms such as *afon sech*, *gardd wleib* (Thomas 2000: items 481, 483) and it is likely that most Welsh speakers would differentiate *llaw fyr* '(a) short hand' from the calqued neologism *llaw-fer* 'shorthand'. The solution in lexicographical terms, it seems to me, is for 'lit.' to precede any gender forms of adjectives that are not common. In a similar vein, the author criticizes the provision of plural forms of the adjectives in dictionaries (p. 353) and here I would like to point out the somewhat ironic fact that there is a general tendency in contemporary written Welsh to write *ifanc* rather than *ifainc* (pron. *ifenc* or *ifinc*) despite the fact that the plural form is far from obsolete in most Welsh-speaking areas even among *yr ifainc* 'the youth' which is irritatingly most usually found as *yr ifanc* (pp. 259, 502) in the written

media. The underlying reason for this is that there is a marked tendency in colloquial north-western Welsh for the singular form *ifanc* to supersede the traditional plural *ifinc* still heard even there amongst some of the older people (Thomas 2000: item 484).

Chapter IVa (pp. 237–88), the fifty-or-so pages dealing with the complex sociological issue of how dictionaries are involved in the shaping of contemporary Welsh cultural identity is the least satisfactory chapter of the book. I am not convinced that this section constitutes a thorough treatment of the issues raised, and I sense that it detracts from the otherwise more technical approach of the rest of the book. It would have worked better had it been published as a separate paper, and, given the theme of the book under review, it would have been enough to have written a few paragraphs explaining that Welsh speakers are a minority in twentieth-century Wales and to have taken the institutional neglect of Welsh as given. This reviewer would have preferred to see more attention paid to how the increasing official recognition of Welsh since the 1960s has directly affected lexicographical work (official vocabularies, grants for lexicographical work and publishing thereof: I will simply note that I believe the first prescriptive terminological publication for Welsh to have been *Geirfa Natur* ‘Vocabulary of Nature’ in 1945 by the then Ministry of Education).

The third flaw in this work is due to Heinz’s restricted interpretation as to what should be the ultimate aim of a Welsh dictionary and whom it should serve (she pronounces at length upon these questions in chapter IVb). Certainly, we can all agree that a dictionary should aim to serve all users of a language even if we cannot avoid the fact that these users can be usefully divided into native speakers and second-language learners (whose mother tongue is usually English). Given the societal anomie of Welsh as a vehicular language in present-day Wales, Heinz is acutely aware of the power dictionaries have to shape the ‘Welshness’ of the Welsh language, in the present and in the future, both through the maintenance of pre-existing features of the language and by easing its acquisition by those who wish to learn it. She notes that formal education in Welsh is becoming more important, both because of the weakening of Welsh environments for younger native speakers (ever-increasing dealings with English monoglots, ever-increasing intrusion of English-

language media) as well as because of the increase in non-native participation in the learning of Welsh (pp. 490–1). Education then ‘has become the principle (*sic*) means of transmission of Welsh to the younger generation’ (p. 264) and Heinz is aware of the danger that a rapid expansion of the teaching of Welsh will form a large body of ‘semi-speakers’ (not her term) who may change the character of the Welsh language (p. 261), a change which she fears may make it into a kind of pidgin (p. 263), which according to her is, to some extent, the result of the deficiencies of reference material such as dictionaries (pp. 264–5). With this societal situation in mind, reference material for Welsh should be made as clear as possible. I believe that she is correct in making these points (though it is evident that the native speakers have not waited for the influx of learners to embark upon large-scale calquing, code-switching and extensive use of loans from English).

In the approach advocated by her for the improvement of Welsh lexicography, Heinz prioritizes second-language learners, approvingly quoting authors who state that ‘the learner is the key’ (p. 254), even going so far as to say that without second-language learners Welsh ‘has no chance of survival’ (p. 389). She is not alone in voicing this view, but it is nevertheless a rather contestable opinion. Where do the actual native speakers stand in her scheme of things? The numbers and relative percentages of native Welsh speakers, of Welsh learners and English monoglots, as well as the contemporary evolution of these factors, are important, especially so since the problem posed by the great number of learners is central for Heinz. To emphasize the justification of her priorities she states that three-quarters of contemporary Welsh speakers are learners (p. 492), and how she came to this figure is revealing. According to the census of 1991, the number of Welsh speakers was approximately 510,000: Heinz subtracts from this total some 390,000 individuals by invoking the numbers in 1998 learning Welsh as a second language in various educational programmes (50,000 in pre-school education, 210,000 in primary education, 110,000 in secondary education, 20,000 in adult education) and arrives at a percentage of learners of 76% amongst the total of Welsh speakers, which is the ‘minimum percentage we can assume’ (pp. 261–2). She questions the figure of 55% native speakers amongst the total number of Welsh speakers given by the Welsh

Office in 1992 (p. 262), even though this survey and another of 1995 came up with a ratio of six native speakers to four learners with a ratio breakdown by dates of birth that would imply a ratio of five to five by 2000 (Evas 1999: 120–1; Aitchison/Carter 2000: preface). Heinz's calculation is misleading, since those who learn (some) Welsh as a second language are generally *not* Welsh speakers – even for the purposes of the census – but the calculation serves the purpose, intrinsic to Heinz's agenda, of convincing readers that it is the second-language learners who are the key to the future of Welsh. In this context the term 'learner' is wholly ambiguous and does not distinguish between those who have learnt Welsh as a second language and those who are actually in the process of learning it and who – of course – may never learn it effectively. Evas (1999: 198–200) is pessimistic as to how many of the 21,000 adults registered as Welsh learners will complete the six years of night classes required to reach full competence and estimates that those who succeed completely constitute as little as 5% of the total.

The conceptual error in the calculation given is the failure to distinguish learners who cannot speak the language from speakers of the language (from whatever background), and nowhere does she touch upon the distinct possibility that those who are learning the language are generally less involved with Welsh than are its native speakers. This is certainly the case in my own experience of Welsh life, and hard evidence to this effect can be found in the research carried out by Marion Löffler at the secondary schools of Aberaeron and Fishguard in the 1990s, where that researcher noted a passivity amongst learners with respect to the use of, and their identification with, the Welsh language compared to native speakers and concluded that 'the relationship between linguistic ability and language use becomes especially tenuous in the case of second-language speakers' (Löffler 2000). The aim of Heinz's questionable manipulation of the statistics appears to be to emphasize the importance of producing Welsh dictionaries which should be as informative, clear and unambiguous as possible for those learning the language. However, to this reviewer it seems sufficient to mention the needs of users of the language – both natives and learners – to justify the production of better dictionaries and other reference material.

Heinz's approach neglects the particular needs of native speakers for lexicographical guidance concerning lexical and morphological variation. There is no sustained discussion on how to mark distinctly literary, archaic and colloquial forms, or on how to present dialectal variation (pp. 242, 449, see note 5 below). She is determinedly hostile to the Welsh 'construct' named *Cymraeg Byw* which she claims was introduced 'in order to simplify Welsh for second-language learners' (p. 259) and from which a proportion of Welsh teaching materials 'still suffers' (p. 259). This may be what she believes – and I suspect she is not alone in believing this – however this statement is simply not true as it stands. In the prefaces of the *Cymraeg Byw* booklets of 1964, 1967 and 1970 it is quite clear that *Cymraeg Byw* was first and foremost an attempt by a broad consensus of Welsh scholars to adjust the literary language to the contemporary colloquial Welsh of native speakers (with an eye kept on continuity with literary Welsh and another on uniformity of teaching materials). *Cymraeg Byw* generally did not 'invent' new forms, in most cases it merely approved pre-existing forms; many of the reduced forms of verbs, for example, had already been making an appearance in Welsh literature and even in language-teaching materials prior to 1964. Heinz's view – also held by some Welsh commentators – is that, rather than establishing a more multi-registerial type of codification, *Cymraeg Byw* 'immediately lowered' the prestige of the standard language (pp. 259, 491) and led to what she – after M. C. Jones – calls 'linguistic insecurity' (p. 260), and 'language death' (pp. 491–2) is invoked as a direct result.

In order to carry out any workable adjustment in a language, compromise between competing criteria is unavoidable, and *Cymraeg Byw* is certainly open to criticism for a number of individual solutions it proposed, but Heinz's partisan assessment appears weakly formulated. She asserts that *Cymraeg Byw*'s motivation was to 'avoid *any* difficulties' (my emphasis) (pp. 259, 491). Heinz's fears of the pidginization of Welsh (pp. 240, 260, 263, 490, 492) are attributed to *Cymraeg Byw* which is described as reduced in 'morphology, idiom, and stylistic range' and in contrast to 'a living register of Welsh with full morphology, idiom, and stylistic range' (p. 260). This is simplistic and misleading. *Cymraeg Byw* was not elaborated in order to replace the standard Welsh codified in 1928 and exemplified in the same year by *Orgraff yr Iaith Gymraeg* (Caerdydd:



Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru), but as a codification recognising a supplementary and more colloquial register of the language.<sup>3</sup> In this respect Cymraeg Byw undoubtedly increased the stylistic range of the language, but Heinz is unwilling to welcome a development which she sees as increasing ‘the confusion of Welsh speakers with regard to the choice of [written] forms of the language’ (p. 491). It is evident that she is uncomfortable navigating between the Scylla of simplification and the Charybdis of complexity.

Heinz expresses regret that ‘the morphology of the Welsh verb was reduced’ by Cymraeg Byw, an instance of which she gives as ‘the plural forms of the past tense have been replaced by those of the [present] subjunctive’ (pp. 259–60). But this is a misleading interpretation of the facts. Literary Welsh has preterite *canasom*, *canasoch*, *canasant* against present subjunctive *canom*, *canoch*, *canont*, whereas twentieth-century colloquial Welsh has only a preterite paradigm which it expresses either as *canson*, *cansoch*, *canson* in some areas, or as *canon*, *canoch*, *canon* in others. The modern forms *canon*, *canoch*, *canon* are simply evolved forms of *canson*, *cansoch*, *canson*, and have nothing to do with the literary present subjunctive, to which they show a historically contingent, superficial similarity. Cymraeg Byw originally hesitated between both variants for the preterite, but finally preferred the form without *-s-* as it was commoner amongst contemporary speakers. The subjunctive forms are no longer productive in any variety of Welsh, surviving only in fossilized phrases and contexts, and this was effectively also the state of affairs in the late nineteenth century (cf. Jones 1891: 249). It appears that what Heinz is actually criticizing here (p. 260) is a natural simplification process within the morphology of the language, a process which is not – this needs emphasizing – of Cymraeg Byw’s doing nor is it ‘an element of language death’ (p. 260). For Heinz, the ‘soul’ of the language (pp. 261, 492) is endangered by ‘historically inappropriate forms’ (pp. 261, 492), but this view is incompatible with one of the fundamental insights of linguistic science – against the naive speaker’s culturally and historically conditioned perspective – that languages can and do change more or less drastically over time and therefore cannot be objectively defined by any one single period. Heinz may have a stylistic preference, which is subjective, but this should not be disguised in terms implying scientific

objectivity. Lack of subjunctive forms can hardly be construed as meaning that Modern Welsh is less capable of expression than earlier forms of the language.

Though denying she is a ‘purist’ (p. 288), Heinz does emerge from this work as a traditionalist with a restricted view of what constitutes the literary language. In her view, dictionaries ‘provide the language with the prestige that it is worthy of being used and learned, a message important also for immigrants and non-Welsh speaking Welsh people’ (p. 492). She repeats that ‘high prestige’ is ‘of particularly importance for attracting non-Welsh speaking people’ to accept and learn Welsh (p. 252), and that ‘the availability of dictionaries provides the language with prestige that it is worthy of being used and learned’ (p. 264). Good dictionaries are indeed important, but it is to put the cart before the horse to attribute Welsh’s lack of prestige to flaws in Welsh dictionaries.

I will readily concede that the variety found in reference material can lead to confusion and even frustration amongst learners, but Heinz is quick to make unsubstantiated declarations that inconsistencies in reference materials for Welsh means that ‘learners often give up using the language’ (p. 258), that ‘it is not the difficulty of the language which distresses the learner but the deficient description of Welsh in some popular reference books’ (p. 376), and that ‘the kind of Welsh now produced also discourages native Welsh [speakers] and, at times, tends to make them give up using their language’ (p. 260). I am not aware that these statements are backed up by any kind of study.

Beyond the fundamental aim of improving Welsh dictionaries as a reference tool, Heinz adopts the less consensual agenda of producing dictionaries whose purposes are the ‘construction of [ethnic] identity’ (p. 283) as well as ‘normalising the language’ (pp. 253, 283), a fashionable term for promoting the permanent use of Welsh throughout society in all parts of Wales (pp. 266, 492). The suggestion that these two additional aims should be adopted will attract otherwise avoidable controversy. English is the societal language of the greater part of the Welsh population at present (even if this was not always the case in the past). That these people need their identity to be ‘constructed’ might be interpreted as a denial of their pre-existing identity. Are we prepared to voice the unsustainable claim that English-speaking people of Wales have

no identities of their own or none of any worth? To describe an attempt to establish Welsh amongst this great body of English speakers as a ‘normalising’ process is misleading from both a linguistic and a societal point of view. The danger in Heinz’s approach is that in trying to prescribe Welsh with an eye for a wished-for outcome she may neglect to describe Welsh as it is. There seems to be a clear intrusion of a biased ideological slant into the argumentation when she describes the majority of the Welsh population as ‘deprived’ of Welsh in ‘the task of ethnocultural construction and social emancipation’ (p. 281). Nowhere does the author allow that there may be some people – in fact many – in Wales who are quite content with the fact that they do not know Welsh.<sup>4</sup> The actual contours of this Welsh ‘cultural identity’ which Heinz advocates is not properly discussed by her beyond a cursory and disappointing mention of such themes as rugby, *corgi*, *bara brith*, laverbread, *eisteddfod*. Such ‘identity-constructing vocabulary’ (p. 287) would be better described as stereotypes and would not be seen by many users as serving their needs.

A further flaw which runs through the work concerns the presentation. It is unhelpful that cross-referencing is to sections, which often have unwieldy numbers such as 1.3.2.3.8 or 4.1.2.3 and run over a number of pages (in one case a section runs to over twenty-seven pages). In the vast majority of cases cross-referencing would have been more effectively implemented as page numbers. I found that in a number of cases the cross-references were not particularly relevant or even misled. The reference ‘(cf. section 4.1.1.)’ (p. 261) actually refers to the current section and there are too many vague occurrences of ‘cf. above’ and ‘cf. below’. In note 25 (p. 263) reference is given as ‘infra’ when ‘supra’ is meant, or to be more precise ‘pp. 259–60’. Typos and poor formulation recur a little too often for comfort, an example of the latter being when the graphemes <ll> and <ff> are said to be ‘letters [*sic*] not contained in the English alphabet’ (p. 279). An impression is often given that too diffuse aims of the work have led to repetition. It seems wasteful to repeat word-for-word on p. 491 four paragraphs from p. 259 (‘In addition’ – ‘Although *Cymraeg Byw*’) and 260 (‘In addition’ – ‘Moreover’). There are many references in the work to websites but the number of times the sites referred to in the work have ceased to function at the address given gives

matter for reflection on the handicap of such sources as consultable reference sources. Within ten years of having commenced her work a significant number of the web references she provides are no longer valid.

There are a number of factual errors in the book, and the imprecise manner in which evidence is dealt with every now and then is exemplified by one of her concluding statements, which affirms that ‘Research has shown’ that Welsh is insufficiently or erroneously taught (p. 492), only for the reader to discover that this impersonally cited ‘research’ refers to her own direct experience of teaching in the 1990s (p. 258) and does not seem to be backed up by any other authority or other research.

Heinz wants an ‘unsimplified’ form of Welsh (p. 264) and justifies her preference by claiming that French and Spanish are not simplified when taught (p. 264), but in French this simply ignores the case of the ‘français fondamental’ elaborated since 1947 at the Sorbonne by Georges Gougenheim, as a pragmatic means of serving the basic diffusion of written French to learners or illiterate speakers through the selection of the most current vocabulary and a simple syntax. C. K. Ogden’s ‘Basic English’, of course, is a well-known method devised for English in the late 1920s. She claims that Dieckhoff (1932) was completed ‘before the invention of IPA’ (p. 446), which ignores the fact that the International Phonetic Alphabet, established in 1888, was becoming quite common by the 1920s. Dieckhoff (1932: xv) was aware of what he termed the ‘international code’ but did not adopt it. Even though it is a wholly unconnected coincidence, she needlessly links (p. 123 n.10) the alphabetical order of the initial elements *a*, *b*, *ch* of a sixteenth-century Welsh vocabulary with the same alphabetical order that ‘still predominates’ in contemporary Breton dictionaries. As a matter of fact, this order only established itself in Breton dictionaries in the period 1956–78 where it had previously been *a*, *b*, *k* (Heinz also disregards the fact that they do not even represent the same sounds: <ch> representing [χ] in Welsh but [ʃ] in Breton). Heinz misleads when she implies that the meaning ‘Welsh speaker’ of *Cymro* ceased in the 1950s, since this meaning is still in use in the early 2000s (p. 270). And if it is true that this meaning of *Cymro* has been increasingly challenged in the late twentieth century by the ‘politically correct’ collocation *Cymro Cymraeg*,

nevertheless it has not yet disappeared as a consequence of the newer coining.

Translations from the Welsh sometimes contain mistakes of a basic nature, e.g. ‘clo!, ar glo’ become ‘close!, closed’ (p. 52), ‘Mae llyfr . . .’ becomes ‘The book is . . .’ (p. 80), ‘Yr wyf yn darlithio’ (underlining in the original) becomes ‘I lecture’ rather than the more precise translation ‘I am lecturing’ (p. 80–81). The mistranslation of *cymrodedd* ‘concord’ as ‘Welshdom’ (p. 269) is potentially significant if one wishes to understand the intentions of the lexicographer Thomas Wiliems in 1604. Heinz’s phonological transcriptions are sometimes quite misleading, on the cover of the book a proposed exemplary presentation of six entries has the realization of the preposition *i* noted as /ɪ/ rather than /i/ and *dodrefn* noted as /ˈdoːdrevn/ (suggesting the influence of German pronunciation) rather than correct /ˈdɔdrevn/. Other examples of faulty transcriptions, often due to her own interpretation, are *angel* /ˈaŋgɛl/ (p. 441), *braf* /brav/ (p. 442), *traed* /traid/ > /traːd/ (p. 442). In three instances, where original older works were consulted by her to illustrate the presentation (or ‘macrostructure’) of data in various lexicographical works, her readings are incomplete. The Greek cited (p. 165) from Lhuyd (1707: 218) should read ‘Περίεργοι τῆς λαλιᾶς’. The reading of the Old Cornish Vocabulary (p. 100) should read:

Auus: hendat. Abauus: hengog. Proauus: dipog. Attauus: guruhhog. Fili’ mab. Filia: much. Liberi: flechet. Soboles: ach. Familia: goscor pi teilu. Frater: broder. †braud. Soror: puir. Victric’: altrou. Nouerca: altruan

The first entries of Gruffudd Hiraethog’s vocabulary (the upper half of folio 3<sup>r</sup> of Peniarth MS 230) of c.1560 (pp. 122–23) should read:

Abid – abadwisc wynebvs yn i abid

Tvdvr aled

irr abad sion

Aban – Ryvel

aban addaw bevnydd yn

in bro ni a bair newyn

Iolo medd hen wr imi



ready availability of a whole gamut of referential material for English – including computer spell and grammar checkers – did not prevent infelicities on more than one occasion e.g., ‘economical factors’ (p. 245), ‘offsprings’ (p. 256), ‘principle means’, ‘complementary’ (p. 264), ‘seperate’ (p. 385).

Heinz offers her readers a partial (in both senses) picture of what Welsh dictionaries can aspire to accomplish, neglecting both a significant portion of those who use the language (the native speakers) as well as one of the official standard forms of the language (*Cymraeg Byw*). In our contemporary, pluralistic society, surely it is not beyond the capacity of a well-designed dictionary to serve all users of the language and to present a certain amount of multi-registerial variation? The author may not be familiar with the details of Welsh dialect variation – indeed, few Welsh people would be competent to issue statements on this subject – but it speaks volumes that she hardly addresses the issue as one that could be resolved more satisfactorily by dictionaries than is the case at present. The question of which Welsh should serve as a model for a phonological entry in dictionaries is not clearly or satisfactorily addressed and she seems to accept the opinion of some Welsh scholars – and it is nothing more than an opinion – that there actually exists a standardized pronunciation, that of educated native speakers (pp. 442–3).<sup>5</sup> Properly addressed, the question of a pronunciation for Welsh dictionary entries will inevitably revolve around choosing between a somewhat abstract supradialectal pronunciation (as was done with Irish under Dónall P. Ó Baoill’s direction in the 1980s) or an actual particular variety of Welsh. Whichever solution is adopted an explanatory section will be essential. For the record, I would recommend bringing to the fore the northern pronunciation of the Penllyn (Bala) area with adequate cross-references to southern and any other widespread pronunciations.

This is a lengthy book, and it stands to reason that, within the confines of even a fairly long review, I could not hope to do justice to every aspect of it. The book is full of material that will provoke reflection as to what dictionaries can accomplish when well thought out and clearly presented. However, it should be reiterated that that which is best and most original in this work (*viz.* the information needed in a contemporary dictionary as well as the conciseness and consistency needed in the

presentation of the linguistic information) is obscured by the copious amounts of historical information and inessential societal background information (some of it of questionable accuracy, as was explained above). One final word, the frontispiece dedication – ‘To all those who have respect for their language’ – will please most English speakers which, presumably, is not what the author had in mind.

**Iwan Wmffre**  
**Lublin Catholic University**

## Notes

1. Twenty-six features for eight dictionaries are tabulated for comparison in pp. 458–62.
2. However in another place she gives the verbal root, e.g. ‘*cynnig* (*cynigi*–; *cynnig*)’ (p. 325).
3. The common ascription of the role of Cymraeg Byw as an ‘oral standard’ (pp. 259, 260) is understandable since in, their prefaces, the Cymraeg Byw booklets do make ambiguous mention of a ‘standard colloquial language’ (*iaith lafar safonol*) and of ‘standard colloquial forms’ (*ffurfiau llafar safonol*). However, the regional variants allowed in the early Cymraeg Byw booklets prove beyond doubt that what was intended was a standardization of colloquial forms, even if some individuals, such as Jones (2000), did advocate a single standard colloquial language, and even if the last Cymraeg Byw booklet of 1973 had excised variants as much as possible in order to leave a single form.
4. Heinz refers to a sample survey of 1999 which indicates the agreement of 88% of the Welsh population to the proposition that the Welsh language is a matter of pride (pp. 281–2). It is well known that there is a significant mismatch between statements of pro-Welsh language sentiment and any actual effort to learn the language.
5. For the entries of her Welsh–German glossary (Heinz 1994) she chose southern Welsh pronunciations in IPA despite the fact that it accompanied her translation of Angharad Thomas’s novel *Si Hei Lwli*, which is characterized by its uncompromising use of northern Welsh colloquialisms.



## References

- Aitchison, J. and Carter, H. (2000) *Language, Economy and Society: the Changing Fortunes of the Welsh Language in the Twentieth Century*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Dieckhoff, H. C. (1932) *A Pronouncing Dictionary of Scottish Gaelic: Based on the Glengarry Dialect According to Oral Information Obtained from Natives Born before the Middle of the Last Century*. Edinburgh: W & A. K. Johnston.
- Evas, J. (1999) *Rhwystrau ar lwybr dwyieithrwydd*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wales, Cardiff.
- Gruffudd, H. (1998) *The Welsh Learner's Dictionary*. Talybont: Y Lolfa.
- Heinz, S. (1994) *Eia Popeia*. Lewiston: Mellen.
- Jones, R. M. (2000) 'Cymraeg Byw' heddiw. *Y Traethodydd* **155**: 8–15.
- Jones, J. P. (1891) Cymraeg Cymreig. *Y Geninen*: 247–51.
- Lhuyd, E. (1707) *Archaeologia Britannica, Giving some Account Additional to What Has Been Hitherto Publish'd, of the Languages, Histories and Customs of the Original Inhabitants of Great Britain: from Collections and Observations in Travels through Wales, Cornwall, Bas-Bretagne, Ireland and Scotland. Vol. I. Glossography*. Oxford: Printed at the Theater for the Author.
- Löffler, M. (2000), The Welsh language movement and bilingualism: what can local organizations achieve? In Jenkins, G. H. and Williams, M. A. (eds), *'Let's do Our Best for the Ancient Tongue': the Welsh Language in the Twentieth Century*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Thomas, A. R. (2000) *The Welsh Dialect Survey*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Watkins, T. A. (1963) Language and linguistics. In Davies, E. (ed.), *Celtic Studies in Wales: a Survey*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.