Adelung's English-German dictionary (1783, 1796): its achievements and its relationship to the dictionaries of Samuel Johnson and Johannes Ebers

Abstract

This article examines Johann Christoph Adelung's English–German dictionary (1783, 1796). The dictionary deserves our attention because it was undertaken by the author of the ground–breaking German dictionary (Adelung 1774–86, [2]1793–1801), working from Samuel Johnson's equally epoch–making English dictionary (1755, [4]1773). Yet the work has thus far been almost entirely overlooked. This article seeks to address that research gap. It reveals the very significant differences between the first dictionary volume (1783) and the second (1796), and argues that the second volume – for which a dictionary by Johannes Ebers is a major source (Ebers 1793–1794) – is almost certainly not the work of Adelung at all. Close analysis of the first volume nevertheless reveals the care that Adelung took with it, drawing not just on Johnson, but also on his own German dictionary and other sources, resulting in a dictionary that was innovative in English–German lexicography. I also show that Adelung's experience of preparing the English–German dictionary informed his revision of his better–known German dictionary (1793–1801) in at least two concrete ways: his treatment of pronunciation and his use of metalinguistic labelling.

Zusammenfassung

Der Beitrag befasst sich mit dem *Neuen grammatisch-kritischen Wörterbuch der Englischen Sprache für die Deutschen* (1783, 1796) von Johann Christoph Adelung. Adelung war der Autor des bahnbrechenden *Grammatisch-kritischen Wörterbuchs der Hochdeutschen Mundart* (Adelung 1774–1786, [2]1793–1801). Sein Wörterbuch Englisch-Deutsch, das er auf der Grundlage von Samuel Johnsons ebenso bahnbrechendem Werk *A dictionary of the English language* (1755, [4]1773) verfasste, fand in der wissenschaftlichen Literatur bisher so gut wie keine Beachtung. Im Beitrag wird gezeigt, dass es zwischen dem ersten (1783) und dem zweiten (1796) Band des Wörterbuchs große Unterschiede gibt und dass der zweite Band, für den ein Wörterbuch von Johannes Ebers eine wichtige Quelle darstellte (Ebers 1793–1794), höchstwahrscheinlich gar nicht von Adelung stammt. Eine genaue Analyse des ersten Bandes zeigt jedoch, wie sorgfältig Adelung bei der Herstellung des Wörterbuchs vorging. Er stützte sich nicht nur auf Johnson, sondern auch auf sein eigenes Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache sowie weitere Quellen, was für das Sprachenpaar Deutsch-Englisch zu einem innovativen Wörterbuch führte. Darüber hinaus beeinflussten Adelungs Erfahrungen bei der Vorbereitung des Wörterbuchs seine eigene Überarbeitung des bekannteren Wörterbuchs der deutschen Sprache (1793–1801) in mindestens zweierlei Hinsicht: im Hinblick auf die Behandlung der Aussprache von Wörtern und den Gebrauch metalinguistischer Prädikate.

Résumé

Cet article examine le dictionnaire anglais-allemand de Johann Christoph Adelung (1783, 1796). Ce dictionnaire mérite notre attention car il fut réalisé par l'auteur d'un dictionnaire

allemand pionnier (Adelung 1774–86, [2]1793–1801), à partir du dictionnaire anglais de Samuel Johnson (1755, [4]1773), qui a lui aussi fait date. Pourtant, jusqu'à présent, cette œuvre a été presque entièrement ignorée. Cet article vise à combler cette lacune dans la recherche. L'existence de différences très importantes entre le premier volume du dictionnaire (1783) et le second (1796) nous permet de défendre l'hypothèse que ce second volume – qui a pour principale source un dictionnaire de Johannes Ebers (Ebers 1793–1794) – n'a presque certainement pas été composé par Adelung. Une analyse approfondie du premier volume révèle en revanche le soin apporté à son élaboration par Adelung, qui s'est appuyé non seulement sur Johnson, mais aussi sur son propre dictionnaire allemand et sur d'autres sources, avec pour résultat un dictionnaire novateur dans le domaine de la lexicographie bilingue anglaise-allemande. On montre également que l'expérience acquise par Adelung lors de la préparation du dictionnaire anglais-allemand a influencé la révision de son mieux connu dictionnaire allemand (1793–1801) d'au moins deux façons concrètes: son traitement de la prononciation et son utilisation de l'étiquetage métalinguistique.

1. Introduction

This article offers the first detailed examination of Johann Christoph Adelung's English-German dictionary (1783, 1796). Thus far neglected, the dictionary ought to be of particular interest in lexicographical history, because its starting point is the nearest thing English had to an academy dictionary (Johnson 1755, [4]1773), and it was produced by the author of the nearest thing Germany had to an academy dictionary (Adelung 1774-86, [2]1793-1801).[1] Adelung and Johnson were already viewed as comparable figures at the time, as a review in *The Critical Review* of a translation of three essays by Adelung (to which I return below) attests: "His [i.e. Adelung's] dictionary of the German language is the completest lexicographical work ever published; and, compared with it, the dictionary compiled by Dr. Johnson is a trifling work" (Anon. 1798: 447). Yet although Adelung is one of the best-researched lexicographers of German (Haß-Zumkehr 2001: 107), his English-German dictionary has received only the most cursory attention to date. It did not rate a mention in Jellinek's review of Adelung's achievements (Jellinek 1913, vol. 2: 329-331), it did not feature in the biography of Adelung by Strohbach (1984), and none of the contributions in Kämper et al. (2008) dealt with it. In a monograph on Adelung, François (2020a: 150-158) devoted a few pages to the dictionary, but an unpublished Masters thesis (Zimmermann 2003) remains the most detailed examination to date. This article seeks to address this research gap, and, in so doing, to point out something which previous research has failed to recognize: the significant differences between the 1783 first volume of the dictionary and the second volume, published only in 1796, which make it highly unlikely that the second

---

[1] On Johnson and Adelung as lexicographers whose works arguably have much in common with Europe's academy dictionaries, see Considine (2014: 121-143).

volume is the work of Adelung at all. Close analysis of the first volume nevertheless shows the care that Adelung took with it, drawing not just on Johnson, but also on his own German dictionary and other sources, and highlights its innovation in its semantic contents. I also show that Adelung's experience of preparing the English-German dictionary informed his revision of his better-known German dictionary in at least two concrete ways.

2. English lexicographical authorities and English-German dictionaries in the eighteenth century

The first English-German bilingual dictionaries were not based on monolingual dictionaries. Rather, the very first such dictionary, Ludwig (1706), used two English-French dictionaries by Abel Boyer as his basis (Boyer 1699, 1700), while for his German-English dictionary (Ludwig 1716), a German-Italian dictionary was a key source, if not the only one (Hausmann & Cop 1985: 187; McLelland 2023). Twenty years later, Ludwig's competitor Theodor Arnold realized the value of an authoritative English dictionary as a source, taking Nathan Bailey's *Orthographical Dictionary* (1727), containing "common and familiar words […] to assist the Ignorant" (including "Foreigners") (Bailey 1727: A2r) as the starting-point for his English-German dictionary (Arnold 1736). While Bailey's *Orthographical Dictionary* was itself rarely reprinted and was soon forgotten in England, Bailey's larger *Universal Dictionary* ran to over thirty editions by 1807, and so the name of Bailey continued to serve as a marker of authority in the title pages of later editions of Arnold's dictionary right up to 1822.

However, a new authority replaced Bailey as the highest authority in English lexicography: Samuel Johnson's (1755) English dictionary, which, received positively in England (see Reddick 1996: 83–84; Hitchings 2005: 198–201), was also swiftly and positively reviewed in Germany. An anonymous reviewer in the *Göttingische Anzeigen von gelehrten Sachen* (Anon. 1756: 34-37) praised Johnson's service to lexicographers of other languages in providing attestations of words from English writers, and concluded (p. 37):

> Wir wollen hoffen, das bey neuen Ausgaben Englisch-Deutscher Wörter-Bücher Herr Johnson wird zu Hülfe gezogen werden, damit sie immer vollständiger und zuverläßiger werden"
>
> ('Let us hope that for new editions of English-German dictionaries, Mr Johnson will be drawn on, so that they become ever more complete and reliable')

Johann Bartholomew Rogler seemingly took the reviewer's recommendation to heart, for he used Johnson's dictionary for his substantial revision and expansion of Ludwig's English-German dictionary (Ludwig and Rogler 1763).[2] Twenty years after Rogler, Johann Christoph Adelung followed suit, drawing on Johnson's fourth edition (1773) for his *Neues grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der englischen Sprache für die Deutschen […]* (Adelung 1783, 1796). It is that dictionary which is the focus of this article.

The first volume of Adelung's English-German dictionary was published by Schwickert in 1783, slotted in between the fourth and fifth volumes of Adelung's much better known *Versuch eines vollständigen grammatisch-kritischen Wörterbuches der hochdeutschen Mundart* (published by Breitkopf: Adelung 1774–1786), and one year after his German grammar for the

---

[2] On Rogler, see Brekle et al. (1992-2010, vol. 7: 213-217).

use of schools in Prussia (Adelung 1782).[3] The second volume (K-Z) appeared only in 1796, at a time when Adelung was in the midst of his work on the second edition of his monolingual dictionary (Adelung 1793-1801) – and, importantly, after Ebers had published the second volume of his own English- German dictionary in 1794 (Ebers 1793, 1794).[4]

2.1 Adelung and the sources for his English-German dictionary

Adelung's statement that he used the fourth (1773) edition of Johnson's English dictionary as a basis (Adelung 1783: III) has remained the assumption of scholarship to date. Comparison of many entries in the first volume shows this to be broadly true. For example, Table 1 shows the entry for *class* in Adelung's English-German dictionary, with Johnson's 1773 dictionary on the left, and the cognate entry for *Classe* from Adelung's own monolingual German dictionary on the right. In this instance Adelung dispenses with Johnson's attestations of usage altogether (often he merely abridges them), but he carries over Johnson's three senses. Yet under the first sense, Adelung also brings out an aspect at most implied in Johnson's entry (and which he did not consider pertinent in his entry for German *Classe*): the usage to indicate *social* class.[5] Comparing in the other direction, Adelung's attention to the use of German *Classe* in biological (Linnaean) classification is not carried over to his English dictionary, and nor is the specification that in German, *Classe* can apply metonymically to the classroom itself ("auch wohl das Zimmer, in welchem sich jede Ordnung versammelt"). To a considerable extent, then, Adelung's English-German and German dictionary projects are separate enterprises, and Adelung is no slavish follower of Johnson either.

Table 1: Comparing the English dictionary of Johnson, Adelung's English-German dictionary, and his German dictionary: the noun 'class'

Johnson (1773)	Adelung (1783) (English-German)	Adelung's German dictionary (1774; identical in the second edition, 1793)

---

[3] Lewis (2013: 51, Table 2.1) shows the relative chronology of the Adelung and Ebers dictionary volumes.
[4] Ebers also published a German-English dictionary 1796-99. Although Adelung concluded his 1783 preface with the remark that if a German-English companion to his dictionary was wanted, the publisher would 'have to seek […] a more competent compiler' ("sich dazu einen geschicktern Verfasser […] erbitten müssen" (p. XII). Hausmann & Cop (1985: 189) err in suggesting the task was "placed in the hands of Johann Ebers". Ebers' German-English dictionary is, on the contrary, the complement to his English-German dictionary; both works were published by Breitkopf. Hausmann & Cop cite entries in Hamberger & Meusel (1795-96, Vol. II, p. 134, Vol. IX, p. 268, and Vol. XVII, p. 468), but these make no mention of Ebers being entrusted with the task by Schwickert. In fact, the German-English dictionary ultimately published by Schwickert came out under the names of Küttner & Nicholson (1805-1813), although unpublished research by Christopher Husbands, kindly made available to me, casts doubt on their authorship: Küttner died in 1805, years before the second and third volumes of the dictionary appeared, and his biographer Ratzel (1883) makes no mention of him having worked on such a dictionary. The biographer of the second named author, Nicholson, records that to relieve debts he lent his name to the publishers of the *British Encyclopaedia, or, Dictionary of arts and sciences* (6 vols., 1809; see Golinski 2015); perhaps he did so here too, and the dictionary may be the work of less well-known German compilers for whom the names of Küttner and Nicholson served as fronts. This would not seem to be out of keeping with what we know of Schwickert. See Wittmann (1976) and the discussion below.
[5] As we shall see below. Adelung also drew on Rogler (1763), but Rogler's entry does not cover this usage either.

| CLASS. n.s. [from *classis*, Latin.]
1. A rank or order of persons.
  Segrais has distinguished the
  readers of poetry, according to
  their capacity of judging, into
  three *classes.*
  Dryden.
2. A number of boys learning the
same lesson at the school.
  We shall be seized away from
  this lower *class* in the school
  of knowledge, and our
  conversation shall be with
  angels and illuminated spirits.
  Watts on the Mind.
3. A set of beings or things; a
number ranged in distribution,
under some common denomination.
  Among this herd of politicians,
  any one set make a very
  considerable *class* of men.
  Addison's Freeholder.
  Whate'er of mongrel, no
    one *class* admits
  A wit with dunces, and a
  dunce
    with wits.
  Pope. | Class, *subst*. (fr. classe, lat. classis.)
1) Eine Anzahl Menschen von gleichem äußern [sic] Verhältnisse in der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft, die Classe, zuweilen der Stand.
2) In den Schulen, eine Anzahl Schüler von gleichen Fähigkeiten, die Ordnung, Classe
3) Eine Anzahl Dinge von einerley allgemeinen Beschaffenheit, eine Classe. | Die Classe, plur. die –n, aus dem Latein. *Classis*, die Ordnung, nach welcher die Dinge, in Ansehung gewisser gemeinschaftlicher Eigenschaften eingetheilet werden, und diese Dinge einer Art selbst. So theilen die neuern Schriftsteller des Pflanzenreiches die Pflanzen in Classen, die Classen in Ordnungen, und diese in Geschlechter. Ein Ungeheuer ist er, würdig zu der niedrigsten Classe der Bösewichter verstoßen zu werden. Besonders ist dieses Wort in den Schulen gebräuchlich, die Ordnungen der Schüler nach ihren Fähigkeiten zu benennen, da denn auch wohl das Zimmer, in welchem sich jede Ordnung versammelt, eine Classe genannt wird. Die erste, die zweyte Classe u. s. f. |

Adelung was not solely reliant on Johnson. Considine (2014: 142) takes Adelung at his word when Adelung reports drawing for conversational idioms on "Boyer's [sic] englisch-französischen Wörterbuche […], welches in dem bekannten Ludwigschen ganz zum Grunde liegt" as a source ('Boyer's English-French dictionary, which is the very basis of the well-known Ludwig dictionary'; Adelung 1783: v; see also pp. x-xi). However, the claims of prefaces – in essence marketing material – should be treated with caution (Haß-Zumkehr 2001: 107). In fact, Adelung's wording is artfully ambiguous, for his source is not Boyer, but John Bartholomew Rogler's 1763 revision of Ludwig (1706), which in turn was indeed based on Boyer (1699) and Boyer (1700).

Browsing the first entries under B in Adelung and Johnson shows what this method looked like in practice. Adelung's explanation of the pronunciation of B is a partial, abridged explanation of Johnson's, where Johnson's remark that the letter "is confounded by the Germans with *P*" becomes Adelung's warning to German readers that *b* "must not be confused in pronunciation

with the harder [i.e. unvoiced] p" ("in der Aussprache mit dem härtern p nicht verwechselt werden darf"). Adelung's next entry, *Bab*, glossed as an abbreviation for the proper names *Baptist* and *Barbara*, is not found in Johnson, but is carried over from Ludwig (1706), repeated in Rogler (1763). Under *babble*, Adelung adopts the four senses identified by Johnson, reduces the length of one quotation, and omits others – and in the process mistakenly re-attributes lines from Shakespeare to Prior. As well as adding *babbling* as a noun and cross-references from *Bable* to *Bawble* (following Rogler 1763, but already found in Ludwig 1706), Adelung also adds a new entry of his own for *Bacchus* and then incorporates Johnson's headword for the flower *Bacchus-bole* under that entry.

Adelung draws on Rogler (1763) not just for lemmas and examples, but also for definitions. For example, s.v. *Bencher* Adelung's definition "Ein Beysitzer in einem Gericht oder Collegio" is a more concise summary of Ludwig's *'einer von den vornehmsten juristen in einem rathe oder collegio'* and *'einer der mit auf der richterbanck sitzt'*. For a particular sense of the noun *Battle*, "ein nur auf den englischen Universitäten übliches Wort, für ein Färdin Brot oder Bier zu bezeichnen" ('a word usual only in English Universities, to designate a farthing of bread or beer'), the definition is taken largely verbatim from Rogler (1763); cf. *OED* s.v. *battel*). The source of a small number of other additions made by Adelung can only be surmised. For example, *banmoot* is an error for *barmoot*, for which the *OED* gives a 1727 attestation from Daniel Defoe. *Barley-sugar* is found for instance in Chamber's *Cyclopaedia* (1741). Another addition, *barrow-bunter*, is found neither in Rogler (1763), Arnold (1752), Ludwig (1706), Prager (1757), Boyer (1768), nor Bailey (1776). However, the OED gives a 1771 attestation from Smollet's *Humphrey Clinker*, which was available in Germany as part of Ebeling's *Vermischte Aufsätze* (1781). Adelung's marking of the word with * shows his interpretation of context to determine its 'low' sociolinguistic status: the Smollett attestation reads "I saw a dirty barrow-bunter in the street, cleaning her fruit with her own spittle" (Ebeling 1781: 166).

In a systematic analysis of all lemmas under B, Zimmermann (2003: 14–27) found that Adelung added more than 800 lemmas in this range compared to Johnson.[6] The vast majority of the ca. 250 additional compounds and other new words included by Adelung under B compared to Johnson are taken from Rogler (1763) (Zimmermann 2003: 28–30).[7] Most that are not from Rogler already occur in Johnson's quotations, even if Johnson did not give them the status of lemma. For example, in Johnson's attestations under *bosom* "in composition", we find *bosom interest, bosom-secret, bosom-thief*, all of which Adelung treats as new lemmas.

---

[6] Of these, about 40 are personal names, 17 place names, 53 plant names, and 35 animal names – these in addition to the 100+ plant names and 60+ that Johnson already included, and proportionally rather more than in modern bilingual lexicographical practice, according to Zimmermann (noting that Swanson (1962 [2022]) recommended between 100 and 200 of the most common plant and animal names). Adelung also added 139 verbal nouns ending in *-ing*, 17 irregular inflexion forms such as *began* and *broke*; and 117 lemmas with cross-references. Some of these are pure cross-references, while some of them include equivalents as well as a cross-reference.

[7] Zimmermann cross-checked against Ludwig (1706) rather than the most recent 1763 edition by Rogler (1763); checking against the Rogler edition fills some of the apparent gaps, e.g *butter-print* (in the sense of *Butterform*) is found in Rogler (1763) (cf. Zimmermann 2003: 111).

2.1 Adelung, Johnson, and the existing English-German lexicographical tradition

Adelung's preface includes an assessment of Johnson's dictionary (Adelung 1783: iii–xi, also published as a separate essay in English translation in 1798, Adelung 1798). Under seven numbered points, Adelung first praises the completeness of Johnson's dictionary, except in the area of technical terms, especially in natural history (pp. iv–v; see also p. x). Second, Adelung commends Johnson's labelling of words according to their usage (p. v); and third, he approves the grammatical information provided, except for a lack of detail on pronunciation, specifically the failure to indicate whether stressed syllables are short or long (pp. v–vi). Fourth, Adelung criticizes the quality of Johnson's etymological information, and the fact that he treats homonyms with distinct etymological histories as one and the same word (vii–viii). Fifth, Johnson's word definitions are good, but he is overly generous (*überaus freygebig*, p. ix) in the number of separately numbered senses that he gives: Adelung notes the 70 senses for the word *go*, for example (in Johnson 1773, expanded from 68 in Johnson 1755). Adelung also considers the lack of hierarchical structure of the relationship between meanings to be unhelpful (viii–xi). Sixth, Johnson's illustrative examples are very lengthy and full, even 'wasteful' (*verschwenderisch*, p. x), and Johnson's emphasis on the language of well-known writers resulted in lack of examples from social life (*aus dem gesellschaftlichen Leben*, p. xi). For whereas Johnson's focus was on written sources, in his German dictionary Adelung saw his object language as including the spoken language, at least that of the better classes (Haß-Zumkehr 2001: 107; Schrader 2012: 166, 169); and he evidently expected the same of an English dictionary. Lastly, Adelung notes that Johnson provides useful information, where necessary, on how words are used in combination with each other.

How does Adelung's own English dictionary measure up against the points he made about Johnson's dictionary, particularly the weaknesses identified? As for the first point, completeness, Adelung provides far more precise information than Johnson had in the area of natural history, mentioning Miller's *Gardeners' Dictionary* (Miller 1724, 8th ed. 1768) and "der Hausvater" (i.e. Münchhausen 1764–1773) as sources, p. x) and drew on "Enticks bekanntes Werk" (p. V; presumably Entick 1774-1775) for English constitutional matters (according to Adelung 1783, pp. v, x). It is Miller who gives *bachelor's buttons* as a plural [no. 24 in the 1724 edition, n.p], as in Adelung, compared to Johnson's entry in the singular, though the 1768 edition of Miller gives the singular. Adelung's addition of *Bachelor's pear* as a headword, and its Latin binomial, is presumably also taken from Miller (1768), where the English term is listed in the index and is described under the entry for *solanum mammosum*.

As for metalinguistic indications of usage, Adelung praised the way in which Johnson "carefully marked" (*sorgfältig angemerket*) such information. Like Johnson, Adelung himself also used a wide range of explicit indications, analysed in detail by Zimmermann (2003: 113–141) under the headings of diachronic (e.g. "ein veraltetes Wort", 'a dated word'), diatopic (e.g. "in einigen Gegenden", 'in some areas'), diaintegrative (e.g. "ein türkisches Wort", 'a Turkish word'), diastratic (e.g. "ein nur noch im gemeinen Leben übliches Wort", 'a word now only current in common life'), diatextual (e.g. "in der Bibel", 'in the Bible'), diafrequent (e.g. "ein ohne Zweifel seltenes Wort", 'indubitably a rare word') and diaevaluative (e.g. "verächltich", 'contemptuous'; "im Scherze", 'jokingly'), diatechnical (e.g. "in der

Astronomie", 'in astronomy'), and dianormative (e.g. "auch, obgleich nicht so richtig", 'also, although not so correct').

However, Adelung also ("Zum Ueberflusse […] auch noch", 'in addition […] also') adopted a system of three symbols (*, ** and †), no doubt influenced by the use of such markings in earlier English-German lexicography. Ludwig (1706) had already used three symbols, covering proverbs (marked *P*), obsolete words (marked †), and 'figurative & jocose' usage (marked *) (Ludwig 1706: *Advertisement to the Reader* [b3v]). These three marks are maintained in Rogler's (1763) revision, which Adelung drew on frequently.[8] Adelung (1783: v) similarly introduces three labels, but he makes different distinctions to those of Ludwig and Rogler, and he omits the marking of proverbs (which he in any case tended to exclude as belonging to the lower registers of speech, Adelung 1774-1786, I: xiv). First, Adelung uses ** to mark "ganz veraltete Wörter" ('very dated words') but which are still encountered in works such as the Bible, Shakespeare and Spenser. Second, a dagger (†) marks "Provinzial- oder nur unter manchen Umständen übliche Wörter" ('words that are regionally restricted, or current only in certain circumstances'). Finally, a single * indicates words that are "niedrig" ('low') and too "unedel" ('ignoble') for use in written language or the language of society ("anständigere Schrift- oder Gesellschaftssprache", Adelung 1783: v). When, in the second edition of his German dictionary, Adelung introduced metalinguistic markers * and † to signal old, unusual or low words,[9] he was building on what he had done first in his English dictionary, influenced by pre-existing bilingual lexicographical practice.[10]

In practice, where Johnson supplied an explicit metalinguistic comment, Adelung often – but not always – omits the commentary from Johnson, replacing it with his own appropriate symbol (see the first and third examples in Table 2); for *addle* in the sense of 'increase', Adelung does retain the explicit comment, however). In other cases, Adelung adds a metalinguistic comment of his own, e.g. s.v. *Bab*, taken from Rogler (1763), "eine im gemeinen Leben Verkürzung" ('an abbreviation used in common life').

Table 2: Examples of Adelung's metalinguistic markings compared to Johnson (1773)

Johnson (1773)	Adelung (1783)
To ACTIVATE. *v.a.* […] To make active. This word is perhaps used only by the author alleged. [A [A citation from Bacon follows.]	*to 'Activate. *v. act.* […] thätig machen, in Bewegung setzen, *Bacon*.
To ADDLE, *v.n.* To grow; to encrease. Obsolete.	†to Addle, *v. neutr.* wachsen, welches aber wenig mehr gebraucht wird […]
To ADDÚLCE. *v.a.* […] To sweeten: a word not now in use. […]	** to Addúlce, *v. act.* […] versüßen, ingl. [sic] figürl. mit Glimpf beylegen.

---

[8] Ludwig's use of three labels was a systematic change compared to Boyer's six labels (whose usage has been analysed by Cormier 2008); Ludwig also used the labels less (see McLelland 2023).

[9] Adelung (1793-1801) uses * for 1546 "veraltete oder nur in besonderen Fällen übliche" words, and † for 543 "niedrige" words (Schrader 2012: 173).

[10] Haß-Zumkehr (2001: 108) notes that Steinbach had also used "normorientierend gedachte[n] Markierungen" in his German-Latin dictionary (Steinbach 1724).

On Adelung's third point, the grammatical information supplied by Johnson, although he was largely satisfied with Johnson's approach, Adelung makes one systematic addition, indicating where words lack a singular or plural form (Zimmermann 2003: 78). For example, Adelung's entry for *bachelor's buttons* is, unlike in Johnson, given as a plural form only, with a note that there is no singular.

As for pronunciation ("which was a difficult matter indeed for any eighteenth-century lexicographer", Considine 2014: 142), Adelung's comment on Johnson's failure to mark short or long vowels surely reflects his – or his publisher's – awareness of expectations in the English-German dictionaries, in which acute and grave vowels had been used since Ludwig (1706) to mark short and long stressed vowels, something Ludwig had taken over from Boyer (1700). Indeed, it seems very likely that the publisher Schwickert had a hand in the way pronunciation is dealt with in Adelung's dictionary. For the first two and a half letters of the dictionary, stress is marked only on words longer than one syllable (as in Johnson), except for monosyllabic words whose spelling – especially a silent final -e – might suggest bisyllabicity to a non-native speaker (e.g. *to Báke*; *Brúte*); here Adelung adds a marking, not found in Johnson (Zimmermann 2003: 83). Vowel length is not marked at all. One can imagine that this lack would not have satisfied the publisher, aware of the dictionary of Ludwig & Rogler (1763), in which vowel length was indicated. [11] Adelung's promise in his preface to mark vowel length using acute and grave from the second half of A- onwards (Adelung 1783: vi) suggests a decision made part-way through compilation, very possibly in response to feedback from the publisher on the first portions of the dictionary delivered by Adelung. The fact that the promise is not realized until later in the dictionary than stated (from *Cod* onwards) further suggests a change in practice made part-way through the process. Haß-Zumkehr (2001: 105) noted that the role of publishers in lexicography has been neglected – here, it seems likely to have been important, not just in commissioning the dictionary, but in influencing its final form.

Again, Adelung's experience of marking vowel length in his English dictionary evidently influenced him in preparing the second edition of his German dictionary. Having, he says, paid insufficient attention to pronunciation in the first edition ("Für die Aussprache war in der ersten Ausgabe zu wenig gesorgt", Adelung 1793: v), he now introduced acute and grave accents to mark vowel length wherever it was not predictable, i.e. on foreign words, as well as on vowels before consonants such as *ch* and -*sch*, to contrast short vowels in words like *láchen, dréschen* with long vowels in *sùchen, ich dràsch*, etc. (Adelung 1793: V).

Other dictionaries not only marked word stress, but also provided a full indication of pronunciation for many words, using German spelling conventions. For example, we find "TO ABA'NDON tu äbändon" in Arnold (1752), carried over into its later editions revised by Klausing (1771, 1778, 1783) and in Arnold's *Complete Vocabulary* (1757, revised by Rogler (1777). Adelung does the same for a small number of words, ostensibly following Rogler's 1777 edition of Arnold's *Complete Vocabulary* (cf. Adelung 1783: vi), but many of Arnold's pronunciation indications differ (Zimmermann 2003: 84). Compare for example s.v. *egregious*,

---

[11] A review of a later pocket dictionary published by Schwickert (Anon. 1800) criticized the lack of marking vowel length on stressed syllables.

where Arnold rev. Rogler (1777) gives *igredschios* but Adelung *igredshos*; for *gorge,* Arnold rev. Rogler (1777) indicates *gharrdsch* – there is no such indication in Adelung.

As to Adelung's response to Johnson's treatment of meaning, Adelung frequently restructures Johnson's entries for lemmas with multiple meanings.[12] Where Johnson saw polysemy (with multiple meanings differentiated for a single lemma), Adelung often sees homonymy, i.e. using separate, numbered lemmas. Adelung comments on this in his preface in the case of homonyms of historically different origin. Beyond this, however, Adelung, unlike Johnson, also consistently treats neutral and active verbs as homonyms, each presented as separate lemmas e.g. *bake* (*v.a.* to bake a cake; *v.n.* to be heated or baked; Zimmermann 2003: 50–64). Adelung also adheres, more rigorously than Johnson, to a strict alphabetical order, as he had done in his own German dictionary (Haß-Zumkehr 2001: 108). For example, *brand-goose* and *brand-new* are treated by Adelung as individual lemmas in alphabetical order, separated both from *brand* itself and from each other by *brandish, brandishing, brandling.* (Yet we find *brandy-bottle* and *brandy-shop* treated under the lemma *brandy,* perhaps because they are both transparent compounds with *brandy*).

Adelung praised the quality of the definitions supplied by Johnson, but his task as a bilingual lexicographer was different, and Adelung's own entries consist variously of a definition and/or one or more German equivalents (where the definition may precede or follow equivalences, and may be more or less encyclopaedic); and/or a paraphrase. These semantics-related elements may occur in various combinations and orders. Where Adelung judges a German equivalent incomplete, an indication of register or context may be added.

Often Adelung's entries include paraphrases or definitions which closely follow those in Johnson, even though a good German equivalent is available, so that a paraphrase would not have been strictly necessary, e.g. *bake* and *backen.* The additional explanation is perhaps valuable because, as Adelung (1783: ix) points out, no two words in different languages are completely "gleich bedeutend" ('identical in meaning'), so that it is useful "jede Bedeutung in Worte aufzulösen" ('to break down each meaning into words').

Within individual entries, the form-related elements of Adelung's article structure (in Volume 1) follow the sequence presented in Table 3, which summarizes the very detailed analysis of Zimmermann (2003: 65–148): broadly, lemma, grammatical information, pronunciation, and then etymology. All of this precedes the semantic information provided. (By contrast, in his German dictionary, Adelung's etymological notes appear at the very end of each entry).

Table 3: The structure of dictionary entries in Adelung's English-German dictionary

Element	Details and examples
Lemma	• word-stress is marked on the lemma itself. For examples, see under Pronunciation, below.
Grammatical information	• word class; whether regular or irregular; whether nouns lack a singular or plural, e.g. Bílboes, *Subst. Sing. car.* [i.e. singular is lacking]

---

[12] For detailed analysis of the microstructure of Adelung's dictionary entries, see Zimmermann (2003: 65–148).

	• Irregular inflectional forms are regularly given after the indication of the word class. • There is no grammatical commentary on the German equivalents.
Pronunciation	• word-stress is marked on the lemma (not always in accord with Johnson). • Adelung marks word-stress on monosyllabic words if their spelling suggests bisyllabicity (Zimmermann 2003: 83), e.g. *Bíle*, compared to *Bill* [no word-stress indicated]. • vowel quantity is also marked from *Cod* onwards (the preface had promised this from the second half of A- onwards: Adelung 1783: vi), e.g. *Cód* [short vowel], *Còde* [long vowel]. • for some words, indicative pronunciation using German spelling conventions is added. Examples: s.v. *Bílge*: "(*billdsch)*"; s.v. *Egrégious*: "(*igredshos*)".
Etymology (including onomatopoeia and cognates)	• includes onomotapoeia, including instances where Johnson does not note it, e.g. s.v. *belch* "eine unmittelbare Onomatopöie", 'a direct onomatopoeia'. • German cognates are sometimes added, even where the meaning is different, e.g. under *belong* 'holl. und deutsch belangen" ('Dutch and English *belangen* ['to concern']'). • many of Johnson's etymologies are considerably shortened.

Adelung made it clear that he did not consider Johnson's single-level microstructure satisfactory (Adelung 1783, viii–xi). In his own German dictionary (1774–1786), Adelung used a carefully hierarchical structure. For example, for the lemma *Herz*, Sense 1 in Adelung (1775) subsumes all literal senses of the word, while Sense 2 subsumes all figurative senses – a primary categorization taken from rhetoric (Haß-Zumkehr 2001: 110). Next, meanings under Sense 2.4 relate specifically to the human soul and its capacities: "Am häufigsten die Seele des Menschen und deren besondere Fähigkeiten". Within Sense 2.4, at a third level, sub-section b. concerns feelings and desires:"Die inneren Empfindungen, das ganze Begehrungsvermögen, der Wille im weitern [sic] Verstande, das Gemüth". Finally, at a fourth step in the hierarchy, *γ.* is a second level of figurative meaning, a person viewed in regard to their feelings and desires: "nach einer noch weitern Figur, auch eine Person, besonders in Betrachten ihres Empfindungs- und Begehrungsvermögens".

Although there are some instances of four levels of hierarchical structure in Adelung's English dictionary (Zimmermann 2003: 68–70), to implement the multiple levels of his German dictionary across the board would have been an enormous task starting from Johnson's single-level microstructure. Nevertheless, Adelung did make many interventions, often re-ordering senses in ways that differed both from Johnson and from the order common to Boyer, Ludwig, and Rogler. The lemma *bachelor* (Table 4) offers a straightforward example. Johnson's order of the three senses reflects his principle of beginning with the most concrete meaning (Considine 2014: 124) (here: an unmarried man), and leaving till last the largely obsolete sense (here: a kind of knight). Adelung seems instead to follow the principle, as in his monolingual

dictionary, that entries should begin with "the primary meaning of a word and trace its history forward" through time (Considine 2014: 138), and so Adelung begins with the sense of a university qualification. Possibly Adelung's addition of the information that the order of the bachelor knight was instituted in 1240 helps make his chronological order explicit.

Table 4: The order of senses for bachelor *in selected dictionaries of English (the summarizing labels for the three senses are mine)*

Boyer 1699/ Ludwig 1706/ Rogler 1763	Johnson (1755)	Adelung (1783)
1. University *baccalaureus* 2. Unmarried man 3. Knight	1. Unmarried man 2. University *baccalaureus* 3. Knight	1. University *baccalaureus* 2. Knight 3. Unmarried man

Adelung also tends to reduce what he sees as the excessive number of distinct senses given by Johnson. For the noun *back*, Adelung reduces Johnson's nine numbered senses to seven, easily achieved because Johnson's senses 8 and 9 are figurative usages of the phrase *to turn one's back*, which are presumably listed last and separately by Johnson precisely because they are figurative. For Adelung, though, they can fall under sense 1, the back part of the body. Adelung also amends Johnson's sense 2 (the back of the hand) to refer to the back part of other things too, and he supplements Johnson, as he promised to do in the preface, with numerous idioms and phrases (back of the hand, chair, chimney, coach), all verbatim from Rogler (1763). (All but the last of these are already in Ludwig 1706). Adelung also contributes an additional example not found in these sources: "A book gilt on the back, auf dem Rücken vergoldet" (incidentally also not in his monolingual dictionary s.v. *Rücken*).

However, Adelung did not only reduce senses. He also added them in some cases, and seems to have used his own German dictionary to check for completeness of possible senses. In a detailed comparison of Johnson and Adelung's dictionary entries for *heart* and *Herz*, François (2020a: 155–157) finds that fourteen of the twenty numbered senses in Johnson (1773) have a corresponding numbered sense in Adelung (1783). But two further senses are added by Adelung,[13] and both of these have a corresponding sense under *Herz* in Adelung's German dictionary: for *6. Das Empfindungsvermögen* in Adelung (1783) compare *2.4.b. Die inneren Verbindungen, das ganze Begehrungsvermögen* in Adelung's German dictionary; and for *13. eine geliebte Person*, cf. *2.4.b.γ. Nach einer noch weitern Figur, auch eine Person* […];[14] (and Adelung explicitly comments "wie das Deutsche, mein Herz", i.e 'like in Geman, *mein Herz* ['my heart']'). This case illustrates the flattening out of Adelung's hierarchy in practice in his English-German dictionary compared to his German dictionary: meanings that were on two

---

[13] In fact, François counted three senses added by Adelung, but he overlooked Johnson's sense 19 in his analysis, which corresponds to a sense mistakenly identified by François as new in Adelung, the sense of *life*, as in "For my heart, wenn es mir auch das Leben kosten sollte". Besides François (2020a), note also the author's blog (2020b), covering some of the same material in English.

[14] Francois used the 1755 edition of Johnson as his point of comparison. Generally, the differences between the 1755 edition and the 1773 folio edition that Adelung used are minor, though Zimmermann (2003: 98) identifies an instance where a more encyclopaedic definition for the herb *Avens* was cut in 1773.

different hierarchical levels in his German dictionary (2.4.b and 2.4.b. *γ*) become simply two senses on the same level in Adelung (1783), senses 6. and 13.

Like Johnson, Adelung uses the technique of defining *ex negativo*. Thus, just as *go* is to be understood in contrast *to come* and *to run* for Johnson (Johnson's senses 4, 9), for Adelung *gehen* is in contrast to *kommen* (sense 2 in Table 4), and, in his German dictionary, is also in contrast to *laufen* (s.v. *gehen* I.1.). Adelung's own lexicographical habit of discriminating literal and figurative senses is also apparent, as in s.v. *break*, where the active verb is divided into literal and figurative senses (Zimmermann 2003: 69). Elsewhere, meanings may merely be grouped under a new heading which explicitly allows for both literal and figurative senses, as when sense 15 for *go* groups together "sowohl eigentlich, als figürlich", 'both literally and figuratively' (see Table 4).

As for Johnson's 70 senses for *go* – singled out by Adelung (1783, ix) as an example of Johnson's excesses – Adelung reduces the senses for the bare word without a particle from 50 to 20 (see Table 5). (Adelung's other main reference point, Rogler (1763), offered only a seemingly unordered listing of examples over three columns). In Adelung's process of restructuring,

- one sense (sense 14) is added by Adelung because he found it illustrated (but not defined) in Rogler (1763). (Similarly, the second sense that Adelung gives for *go about*; see Table 4);
- five senses each group together meanings that Johnson had separated (Adelung's senses 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, and 15, which between them account for some twenty senses in Johnson);
- three of these five senses also re-use more generalizing definitions that Adelung had already arrived at for *gehen* in his German dictionary (see sense 4, 8, and 9).

Adelung thus combined material from at least three different sources to arrive at a semantic microstructure that is significantly different from, and better than, all of them. This is ground-breaking work in English-German lexicography.

Table 5: Go *in Adelung (1783).*

Adelung's entry for Go	Inspiration/ source (with wording adapted by Adelung (1783) in bold)
Es bedeutet überhaupt sich fort bewegen, wie das Deutsche gehen, besonders im Gegensatz des Kommens	Note the added explicit comparison with German.
1. sich vermittelst der Füße Schritt für Schritt fortbewegen, gehen	Johnson sense 1. *To walk; to move step by step* and 5. *To march or walk a-foot.* It also covers Johnson's senses 3. *To walk solemnly.* 4. *To walk leisurely, not run*
2. fortgehen im Gegensatze des *Come*	Johnson sense 9. *To depart from a place to move from a place; the opposite of to come*

3. Reisen, sich begeben, es sei auf welche Art es wolle, reiten, fahren, segeln u.s.f.	Paraphrase from Adelung (Adelung (1775) s.v. *gehen*:)
	1I.2 "**In weiterer Bedeutung, den Ort verändern, ohne die Art und Weise zu bestimmen, sich begeben, reisen,** in welchem Verstande das Zeitwort auch in vielen der vorigen Arten des Ausdrucks genommen werden kann
	      (1) Für reisen […]
	      (2) Sich begeben […]"

4. machen, handeln, verfahren	Verbatim from Adelung (1775) s.v. *gehen:* sense 3. [= Figürlich] (2) **"Machen, handeln, verfahren"** Includes "so I go with you" from Rogler and from Johnson sense 17 "go mechanically to work", quoted from Bentley
5. Schwanger gehen schwanger sein	Johnson sense 35. *To be pregnant*
6. Im Begriffe sein etwas zu tun	Johnson sense 19. *To be about to do*
7. Seine Zuflucht zu etwas nehmen	Johnson sense 18. *To have recourse to*

8. Sich bewegen, beweget werden	Verbatim from Adelung (1775) s.v. *gehen*:
	II. Von leblosen Körpern, den Ort vermöge seiner eigenen Schwere, oder vermittelst einer fremden Kraft verändern, **sich bewegen, oder beweget werden**
	    1. Eigentlich […]
	    2. Figürlich […]
	
	Example taken from Johnson sense 27. *To pass, to be received*:
	'Tis with our judgments as our watches, none
	Go just alike, yet each believes his own.
	Pope
	
	Adelung's sense covers the following in Johnson:
	2. *To move; not stand still*.
	6. *To travel; to journey*.
	7. *To proceed; to make a progress*.
	8. *To remove from place to place*.

	10. *To move or pass in any manner or to any end.*
	11. *To pass in company with others.*
	12. *To proceed in any course of life good or bad.*
	13. *To proceed in mental operations.*
	14. *To take any road.*
9. Von der Richtung, gerichtet sein	Verbatim from Adelung (1775) s.v. *gehen*: II.2.(5) **Von der Richtung, gerichtet sein** Example taken from Johnson sense 32, *To have any tendency*, "Against right reason all your counsels go" (*Dryden*)
10. Sich zum Ende zum Verfalle neigen, abnehmen, doch nur in den Participiis *going* und *gone*	Johnson sense 21. *To decline; to tend towards death or ruin*
11. Sich zu einer Handlung neigen	Johnson sense 24. *To tend to any act*
12. Für etwas gehalten werden	Johnson 27. *To pass, to be received.* Example from Johnson, sense 27, "She goes for a woman, wird dafür gehalten".
13. Sich verbreiten, bekannt werden	Johnson sense 26. *To be talked of; to be known*
14. Einen gewissen Teil von etwas bekommen, als ein Aktivum	No equivalent sense in Johnson or Adelung, but the examples are taken from Rogler (1763), such as e.g. "to go halves with one"
15. Sich bis zu etwas erstrecken, sowohl eigentlich, als figürlich, der Meinung, den Wirkungen und Folgen nach	This combines senses 41.-44/ from Johnson (1773): 41. *To extend to consequences* 42. *To reach by effects* 43. *To extend in meaning* 44. *To spread; to be dispersed; to reach*
16. Einfluss haben, Gewicht haben	Johnson sense 45. *To have influence to be of weight; to be of value*
17. Mit einem anderen Dinge verglichen werden, betrachtet werden	Johnson sense 46. *To be rated one with another; to be considered with regard to greater or less worth*
18. Zu etwas beitragen, mitwirken, dazukommen	Johnson's sense 47. *To contribute; to conduce; to concur; to be an ingredient*

19. Von Statten gehen, ausfallen	Johnson sense 48. *To fall out, or terminate; to succeed*
20. Sich in einem Gewissen zustande befinden	Johnson sense 49. *To be in any state. This sense is impersonal.*
"So auch mit vielen Adverbiis und Partikeln", [*listed in alphabetical order, beginning as below:*]	
Mit *about* 1. Umgehen, 2. einen Umweg machen, 3. Unternehmen, mit etwas umgehen	Here, Adelung's sense 2 is from Rogler (1763), and is not defined or illustrated by Johnson (1773). Rogler has "You went a mile about, ihr seyd eine Meile umgegangen".

Adelungs's first volume, then, stands, uniquely, at a three-way intersection of monolingual English lexicography, monolingual German lexicography, and English-German lexicography (which in turn has its roots in other bilingual works, Boyer 1699, 1700). First, Adelung used Johnson's English dictionary as a starting point, but drew on his own lexicographical practice both to critique Johnson and to address some of the shortcomings he identified. He thus variously abridged, expanded, and re-shaped Johnson's material, in more or less systematic ways. Second, Adelung consulted his own German dictionary when re-organizing Johnson's senses, whose number he tended to reduce compared to Johnson. Yet, third, Adelung also clearly stands in the established tradition of English-German lexicography, not least in responding to the demands of the market (via his publisher) for guidance on pronunciation, as well as in his adoption of metalinguistic markers.

3. The second volume of the Adelung dictionary (1796) – indefatigable Adelung?

So much for Volume 1. The case is very different for the much delayed second volume of the dictionary, ultimately published in 1796, thirteen years after the first. I shall argue here that although there is no preface or paratextual indication of the change, this second volume is probably not by Adelung at all. Furthermore, while it still draws on Johnson, we shall see that it is certainly not based on Johnson's dictionary as primary source in the same way – a fact which escaped both Zimmermann (2003) and François (2020a) because, by chance, they both chose samples from the first volume for their detailed examinations.

It is easy to demonstrate that the second volume is a very different work to the first. For example, under the headword *length*, we find seven numbered senses compared to Johnson's ten. We saw a similar reduction of senses when comparing Johnson and Adelung's entries for *heart* and *go*. However, in this case, there is no need to analyse Adelung's systematization compared to Johnson. The reduction to seven senses had already been achieved by another lexicographer, Johannes Ebers, whose dictionary had recently appeared (1793–1794). It was Ebers who combined Johnson's senses 1 and 2, omitted sense 6, reversed the order of sense 7 and 8, and incorporated the figurative usage of sense 10 "at length" under an earlier sense. The compiler of the second Schwickert dictionary volume followed Ebers in all of this, and indeed

copied him word for word to a large extent, although adding the detail "ohne Plural" for the first sense.[15]

Table 6 shows a number of entries, taken at random from the early parts of the second volume of the "Adelung" English dictionary, alongside Johnson's corresponding entry and that of Ebers (1794). For *Ka* (as a variant of *claw*), not even given by Johnson, the source can only be Ebers, and the wording is clearly abridged from Ebers. The entry for *lenity* is similarly abridged from that of Ebers, with the mere addition of the Latin *lenitas*. In place of Johnson's famously humorous entry for *pension*, apart from the straightforward etymology ("*franz*. Pension"), supplied from Johnson, the entry is identical to that of Ebers two years earlier. The Ebers entry is in turn largely derived from Rogler (1763), itself virtually verbatim from Ludwig (1706). We saw above that Adelung drew on Rogler (and thus Ludwig) for additional material in the first volume, but here, what passes as the second volume of the prestigious Adelung dictionary of English based on Johnson's prestigious dictionary is in fact very largely the work of Ebers, and much of it indeed only lightly adapted since Ludwig (1706) ninety years earlier. However, the compiler of Volume 2 did also have Johnson to hand, occasionally including an illustrative quotation given by Johnson but not by Ebers (e.g from the writer Roscommon s.v. *mist*), as well as adding etymological indications – which Ebers does not concern himself with – from Johnson. A comparison of the entry for *see* in the "Adelung" volume with Johnson and Ebers produces a similar result: the sense distinctions made (six for the active verb, five for the neuter verb) are simply all verbatim from Ebers, although the "Adelung" compiler has added three attestations from Johnson (two from Shakespeare, one from Dryden). This is very different to the careful reshaping undertaken by Adelung in Volume 1 in his entry for *go*.

Table 6: Comparing entries from Johnson (1773), Ebers (1794), and "Adelung" (1796)

Johnson (1773 ed.)	"Adelung" (1796)	Ebers (1794)
[No equivalent entry, nor in the 1755 edition]	*Kà, im gemeinen Leben für claw, doch nur in der niedrigen Redensart Kam me, ka thee, d.i. als dienst du mir, so dien ich dir wieder.	Kà, Käh, im gemeinen Leben für claw; man sagt in der niedrigen Redensart oder sprüchwortsweise, Ka me, ka thee, soviel als dienst du mir, so diene ich dir wieder, oder bratest du mir eine Wurst so losch [sic] ich dir den Durst.
LENITY, *n. s.* [*lenitas*, Lat.] Mildness; mercy; tenderness; softness of temper. [followed by three illustrative quotations]	Lénity, subst. (lat. lenitas,) Gelindigkeit, Güte	Len'ity, lenn'-iti, S. Gelindigkeit, Güte, Barmherzigkeit, Zärtlichkeit, Gutwilligkeit.
MIST, *n. s.* [mist. Saxon]	Míst, *subst*. (angels. mist) 1) der Nebel. And mist's	Mist, mist, S. 1) der Nebel.

---

[15]As in Volume 1, ultimately, some of the idioms found in Ebers are taken, in the same order, from Rogler (1763), and already found in Ludwig (1706).

1. A low thin cloud; a small thin rain not perceived in single drops. [followed by four illustrative quotations, of which the second is:] And *mists* condens'd to clouds obsure the sky, And clouds dissolv'd, the thirsty ground supply. *Roscommon.* 2. Any thing that dims or darkens. My peoples eyes once blinded with such *mists* of suspicion, they are missed into the most desperate actions. *K. Charles.* His passion cast a mist before he sense And either made or magnify'd th' offence. *Dryden*	condens'd to clouds obscure the sky, *Roscomm.* to go away in a Mist, sich heimlich aus dem Staube machen. to be in a mist, irre gemacht seyn a Scotch Mist, ein starker Regen. 2) Was verdunkelt, im figürlichen Verstande, der Nebel. His Passion cast a mist before his sense, *Dryd.*	to go away in a Mist, sich heimlich aus dem Staube machen. to be in a mist, irre gemacht seyn a Scotch Mist, ein starker Regen. 2) was verdunkelt, im figürlichen Verstande, der Nebel. his Passion cast a Mist before his Sense, seine Leidenschaft oder Hitze zog einen Nebel vor seinen Verstand
PENSION, *n. s.* [*pension*, Fr.] An allowance made to any one without an equivalent. In England it is generally understood to mean pay given to a state hireling for treason to his country. [two illustrative quotations follow]	Pénsion *subst.* (*franz.* pension) 1) Ein Jahrgeld, Gnadengeld, Pension. 2) das Kostgeld. 3) Pensions in the Inns of Court, gewisse Summen, welche jedes Glied in einem Collegio der Rechtsgelehrten zahlen muß. 4) the Pension of Gray's Inn, der Rath in dem Collegio, welches Gray's Inn genannt wird.	Pen'sion penn'-schönn, S. 1) Ein Jahrgeld, Gnadengeld, Pension. 2) das Kostgeld. 3) Pensions in the Inns of Court, gewisse Summen, welche jedes Glied in einem Collegio der Rechtsgelehrten zahlen muß. 4) the Pension of Gray's Inn, der Rath in dem Collegio, welches Gray's Inn genannt wird.

The substantial differences between the volumes raise two questions. First, to what extent are the lexicographical principles applied in the first volume also applied in the second? Second, we must ask to what extent Adelung was in charge of the second volume of the dictionary at all. Before turning to these questions, I examine the main source of the second volume, the English-German dictionary of Johannes Ebers (1793–94).

4. The English-German dictionary of Johannes Ebers (1793-1794)

Lewis (2013: 52) rightly calls Johannes Ebers's two volume octavo English dictionary (1793–94) "original" yet "little known". Ebers, who had taught English at the Collegium Carolinum in Kassel as well as teaching the prince's pages in Kassel and in 1796 became an assistant professor at the University of Halle, had already produced a successful *Englische Sprachlehre* in 1792.[16] For his English-German dictionary, it would have been possible for Ebers to draw on the first volume of Adelung's dictionary (1783), but Ebers makes no mention of Adelung. On the contrary, as Lewis (2013: 50) points out, Ebers was at pains to make clear that he was the sole compiler of the dictionary, and to emphasize his use of the best English dictionaries as sources: Johnson's dictionary in its sixth, 1785 edition, as well as Sheridan (1789), Walker (1791); Chambers' *Cyclopaedia* (1st ed. 1728, here presumably the most recent 1778–83 edition) for scientific terms; and Grose's 1785 *Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue* for "cant" words, albeit without neglecting the work of his German predecessors Ludwig and "Bailey" (i.e. Arnold's dictionary and its successors) (Ebers 1793: x–xi).

Examining the dictionary itself bears out Ebers's claims. For example, Ebers' explanation of the pronunciation of the letter B bears no resemblance to Adelung's; his wording "Der richtige Laut wird durch Zusammenschließung der Lippen hervorgebracht" is, though, close to Johnson's "by pressing the whole length of the lips together". His entry for *back* lists three senses in total, which correspond to the first three given by Johnson, and he follows Johnson rather than Adelung in limiting the second sense to the back of the hand rather than to the back of other things too. Ebers' wording "der auswendige Teil der Hand, wenn sie geschlossen ist" is a close translation of Johnson's "the outer part of the hand, when it is shut". The remainder of Ebers' entry for the noun *back* then gives phrases and idioms largely taken verbatim from Rogler (1763) (and already in Ludwig 1706).[17] His entry for *bachelor* follows Johnson's order of the three senses, not Adelung's (see Table 3 above). He treats the plant name *bachelor's button* as a singular noun, as in Johnson, rather than Adelung's plural; and he gives entirely different German equivalents to Adelung's. There is, then, no evidence that Ebers used Adelung (1783). Having himself lived several years in London and had many years "Umgang mit Engländern von jedem Stande", so that he spoke English "eben so fertig und fließend, wie meine Muttersprache" ('just as readily and fluently as my mother tongue', p. VIII), Ebers evidently had the confidence in his own abilities as a lexicographer.[18]

---

[16] On Ebers, see Schröder (1987–2001, vol. 2: 55-56).

[17] Rogler (1790), in theory an additional potential source for Ebers, is a more concise dictionary: its entry for back reads simply "Back, b:ack, der Rücken."

[18] In some cases, Ebers makes additions to Johnson's nomenclature. For example, he adds *knee-holly* as a synonym for *knee-holm*, possibly following their joint listing in the index of Miller (1768), or Rees' edition of Chambers' *Cyclopaedia* (1781), which lists "KNEE *holm*, or KNEE *holly*. See BUTCHERS' *Broom*"; Johnson had given only *knee-holm*. Ebers' entry (in the form of a definition + equivalent) is also much fuller than Johnson's laconic "KNE'EHOLM, *n.s.* An herb" or Rees' entry, giving "der Name einer Pflanze, kleine Stechpalme, Mäusedorn, wird auch von einigen Butcher's-Broom genannt". Johnson named Ainsworth's English-Latin thesaurus as his authority, which has the entry "knee-holm [herb] Aquifolium, n.". Ebers may have consulted Ainsworth (1746) directly, including the Latin-English part, to obtain his additional information, for there we read, s.v. *Aquifolium*, "[quod acutum folium habet] *A kind of holm-tree, with prickly leaves. Some take it for the holly-tree*".

5. Who compiled the second volume of the Schwickert English-German dictionary?

I return now to the question of the extent to which the second volume of the Schwickert dictionary – while clearly heavily indebted to Ebers (1794) – adhered to the same principles as Volume 1. In many ways it does. Accent and vowel length are marked on lemmas in the same way as in Volume 1 (from *Cod-* onwards; see above). Cross-references are used in similar ways. Word-class is given using the same abbreviations (e.g. *subst., adj., verb, adu., interi.*), although in both volumes there is variation in how active and neutral verbs are indicated.[19] The same three metalinguistic markers are used in both volumes (*, **, †), even if in Volume 2, these are often applied on the basis of information given by Ebers rather than Johnson. For example, Volume 2 lists **Késh*, not included by Johnson; it is in Ebers that we find *Kesh* labelled "(gemeine Redensart)". The second Schwickert volume also lists "†Kóck, *subst.* im Bergbaue, eine Klippe"; again *Kóck* is not found in Johnson, and the entry repeats Ebers verbatim, with the addition of †, in recognition of the restriction to the context of mining.

The compiler of the second volume at least occasionally supplements the etymological information of his sources, Ebers and Johnson, e.g. adding the Italian form s.v. Kersey: "Kérsey, subst. (holl. Karsaye, franz. Carisee, ital. Carisea)", not supplied by Johnson (Ebers provided no etymology). Etymological information sometimes extends to including German cognates and examples of onomatopoiea, as already in Volume 1, e.g. *"Kàle, subst.*, (deutsch Kohl)" and s.v. *Knóll* in the sense of a bell's toll: "*nnall*, auch eine eigene Onomatopöie". In both these cases, the information is added by the compiler. It is not found in Johnson or Ebers. In sum, Volume 2 of the Schwickert dictionary followed the same principles as in Volume 1 in many of its formal features, but for the semantic content the primary source was now Ebers, rather than Johnson. There are, however, also some minor but systematic differences between the volumes. The first concerns some details of pronunciation. The pronunciation of individual words provided in Volume 2 still appears to be based on that of Arnold rev. Rogler (1777), as in Volume 1. However, while Adelung's Volume 1 did not follow Arnold (1777) in using *h-* to help indicate vowel length (e.g. s.v. the word 'cite': Arnold (1777) *seiht*, vs Adelung *seit*),[20] Volume 2 does so, e.g. giving *nneiht* for *knight* (cf. Arnold 1777 *dneiht* vs. Ebers *neit*). In other cases, the indicative pronunciation adopted in Volume 2 is neither that of Ebers nor that of Arnold, but some sort of compromise. For example, the pronunciation of words beginning *kn-* is systematically indicated as *nn-*, compared to *dn-* (!) in Arnold (1777) and *n-* in Ebers.

There are also minor differences in the organization of grammatical information. In both volumes, irregular verbs appear as lemmas (e.g. *laid, lain*). However, only in the first volume are irregular inflectional forms of verbs regularly given after the indication of the world class (e.g. "break, v. irreg. I broke oder brake Partic. broke oder broken"; see Zimmermann, 2003: 80, for examples, showing that Adelung followed Johnson in this). In Volume 2, this information is less systematically provided. It is given for *see* and *lose* ("to See, *verb. irreg.* Präter. I saw, Particip., seen"; "to Lòse, *verb*. Präter and Partic. lost", the latter information contained neither in Johnson's entry nor in Ebers), but not for *lay, lie, make*, or *wake*. We also

---

[19] Variously: in Volume 1 "to Admíre, *verb*. Es ist, 1. Ein Neutrum […] 2. Ein Activum", but also "to Admónish, *v. act*, v *neut*."; in Volume 2 "to Knít, *v. act. et neut*."; "To Knóck. 1. Ein Neutrum […] 2. Ein Activum"; "to Knót, *verb*. Es ist: 1. Activum […] 2. Ein Neutrum. […]".

[20] Zimmermann (2003: 84) lists other such examples where Adelung removes an <h> used to mark vowel length in Arnold's pronunciation (as well as some seemingly less systematic differences).

find "to Wind, verb. Imperfekt. *wound, winded*, Particip. *wound"* (not given either by Johnson or by Ebers).

Of course, the passage of thirteen years between the completion of the first and second volumes could explain these relatively minor differences in practice by a single compiler, if we are willing to accept that Adelung, under pressure and seeing Ebers's dictionary already on the market, decided to use Ebers's work to save time and effort. However, even allowing for the fact that all lexicographers routinely copied from their predecessors, it seems unlikely that Adelung – who had taken such care with his first volume, as we have seen in the case of *go*, for example – would pass off as his own a volume largely based on a very newly published dictionary. To do so without any acknowledgement would surely have jeopardized Adelung's national reputation secured through his ground-breaking German dictionary and grammar. What is more, Adelung was still in the process of seeing through the second edition of his own German dictionary with Breitkopf, the publisher of the rival Ebers dictionary that is the main source of Schwickert's Volume 2.

It is surely more plausible to lay the deception at the door of the ambitious publisher Engelhart Benjamin Schwickert, who had set up his own firm in 1770, 13 years before the first volume of Adelung's dictionary appeared (Wittmann 1976: 19, n.70), and who must have been desperate to complete his high-profile project, to which Ebers' now completed dictionary offered direct competition. My efforts to locate publishers' archival material relating to the history of the dictionary have been unsuccessful, but we do know that Schwickert was an ambitious and opportunist businessman, who was not above printing pirated editions to generate capital, and who had even claimed to represent a completely fictional firm in the 1760s in order to drum up business (Wittmann 1976: 6). Wittmann, who published letters from Schwickert to the writer Heinrich Wilhelm von Gerstenberg (1737–1823) attempting to win his business, conjectured that Schwickert probably wrote numerous similar letters to other writers too (Wittmann 1976: 6). Adelung was very possibly a recipient of one such letter from Schwickert, at a time when he himself was – thanks to a similar approach from Breitkopf to carry on the work begun by Gottsched – making his name with the publication of his German dictionary, of which the first three volumes appeared between 1770 and 1780, followed by his German grammar for the use of schools in Prussia (Adelung 1782) and then, in 1783, the first volume of the English-German dictionary. One can imagine that after this highly intensive period, and with his eyes already on a second edition of his German dictionary (the first volume of which appeared in 1793), the "indefatigable" Adelung (Considine 2014: 141) was perhaps not quite so indefatigable after all, and that his enthusiasm for completing the English dictionary had waned.[21] However, for Schwickert, it will have been crucial to the credibility of his young company to complete this flagship project, and the chance to re-use Ebers' dictionary (Ebers 1793-94) as a basis must have seemed a pragmatic solution. Schwickert's second dictionary volume (K-Z) accordingly appeared in 1796, when Adelung was immersed in work on the second edition of his monolingual dictionary (1793–1802). As to who Schwickert

---

[21] The dictionary was not the only ambitious project that Adelung did not manage to complete himself. His supplement to Jöcher's *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon* stopped after the publication of the second volume (up to J), as Meusel bemoaned (Meusel 1802, vol. 1: VII), although it was eventually completed by Rotermund (Adelung & Rotermund, 1787–1897).

commissioned with the task, that remains a mystery. We can say only that they did not disgrace themselves.

6. Conclusion

On the basis of the analysis given here, the Schwickert English-German dictionary arguably lives up to the claim of its title, to be a "Grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch", in the sense that Haß-Zumkehr (2001: 107–108) suggests Adelung understood the term. Like Adelung's dictionary of German, it treats the language as rule-governed, with irregularities frequently – though not always – indicated, and with numerous examples to illustrate how the rules of the language apply to the words listed, supplementing Johnson's material with additional idioms and examples of usage where necessary. It is also critical in the sense that it reflects the critical approach of an analytical observer of the language, using metalinguistic markers to comment on different contexts of usage, and in the careful approach to delineating and discriminating word meanings.

Thus, some of what Haß (2019: 463) identifies as Adelung's innovations in his German monolingual dictionary applies to his English-German volume too: it shows a "style of commenting" that is "reasonable and descriptive, not at all prescriptive", reflected in the metalinguistic markings; it offers the reader brief etymological indications serving to elucidate meaning rather than establish a pedigree for the word. Yet these features are arguably less innovative in the English-German tradition than they were in the monolingual German tradition. Certainly they are at least all superficially in evidence in earlier dictionaries of this kind. Rogler (1765) already tended to provide implicit information about verb arguments (e.g. *abschwatzen (einem etwas)*), and brief indicative etymologies were already provided by Arnold (1752).

The title's promise to be "new" certainly also applies to the first volume, where the care taken by Adelung in devising his sense distinctions – evident in our analysis of the entry for *go* – is really new, based on a thoughtful synthesis of Johnson, his own German dictionary, and Rogler (1763). It offers, no less than Haß says of Adelung's German dictionary, a "systematic and principle-based way of ordering the different senses of an entry word" (Haß 2019: 463), albeit without the rigorously hierarchical meaning structure of the German dictionary, and it also provides explicit description (rather than prescription) and explanation of word meaning, even if for his bilingual work, Adelung could also often restrict himself to providing one or more German equivalents. By contrast, the second volume is not new. Notwithstanding minor adaptations and additions, it is clearly closely based on the dictionary of Johannes Ebers that had appeared just two years earlier.

Ultimately, it was not Adelung's dictionary but that of Ebers which won out. Both the Ebers dictionaries were recommended to English learners of German by Wendeborn (1797: 199). Ebers went on to produce a German-English dictionary in three volumes (Ebers 1796–99); an abridged version of his English-German dictionary appeared in 1800 (Ebers 1800); and Fick (1802) also drew on Ebers. Adelung's dictionary of English seems to have received scant notice either in Germany or England. Even the anonymous reviewer cited above who praised Adelung so fulsomely could only speculate: "We have not yet seen Adelung's English and German dictionary; but, from our acquaintance with his German dictionary, and the remarks

in these essays, we are persuaded that it will be a very useful work to the English student" (Anon. 1798: 447).

Possibly the most lasting legacy of the English-German dictionary is the influence that compiling its first volume had on Adelung himself, for two of the systematic changes that he made in the second edition of his German dictionary reflect that experience: his introduction of vowel length marking, and his use of symbols as metalinguistic markers.

Acknowledgements

Bibliography

Some longer titles are abbreviated, as are long lists of booksellers in imprints.

Adelung, Johann Christoph. 1774–1786. *Versuch eines vollständigen grammatisch-kritischen Wörterbuches der Hochdeutschen Mundart.* Leipzig: Breitkopf. 4 vols.

Adelung, Johann Christoph. 1782. *Umständliches Lehrgebäude der Deutschen Sprache, zur Erläuterung der Deutschen Sprachlehre für Schulen.* Leipzig: Breitkopf.

Adelung, Johann Christoph. 1783 (A-J), 1796 (K-Z). *Neues grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der Englischen Sprache für die Deutschen; vornemlich aus dem größern englischen Werke des Hrn. Samuel Johnson nach dessen vierten Ausgabe gezogen, und mit vielen Wörtern, Bedeutungen und Beyspielen vermehrt.* Leipzig: Schwickert. 2 vols.

Adelung, Johann Christoph. 1793–1801. *Grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der Hochdeutschen Mundart, mit beständiger Vergleichung der übrigen Mundarten, besonders aber der Oberdeutschen.* Leipzig: Breitkopf. 4 vols.

Adelung, Johann Christoph. 1798. "On the relative merits and demerits of Johnson's English dictionary." *Three Philological Essays,* trans. A F. M. Willich, clxix-clxxxvi. London: Longman.

Adelung, Johann Christoph, & Johann Christoph Rotermund. 1784–1897. *Fortsetzung und Ergänzungen zu Christian Gottlieb Jöchers allgemeinem Gelehrten-Lexicon […]*. Rpt. Hildesheim: Olms, 1960–61. 7 vols.

Ainsworth, Robert. 1746. *Thesaurus linguae Latinae compendiarius, or, A compendious dictionary of the Latin tongue* ed. by Samuel Patrick, 2nd ed. (First ed. 1736).

Anon. 1756. "London" [=review of Johnson's 1755 dictionary]. *Göttingische Anzeigen von gelehrten Sachen* 1756.34–37.

Anon. 1798. [Review] "Elements of the Critical Philosophy: containing a concise Account of its Origin and Tendency; a View of all the Works published by its Founder, Professor Immanuel Kant; and a Glossary for the Explanation of Terms and Phrases. Chiefly Translated from the the German of John Christopher Adelung […]". *The Critical Review* 23:August 1798.445–48.

Anon. 1800. *Pocket Dictionary of the English, French and German Languages compiled from the best authorities.* Leipzig: Schwickert.

Arnold, Thedor. 1736. *Mr. Nathan Bailey's English dictionary: showing both the orthography and the orthoepia of that tongue / translated into German and improved, as also added an appendix, by Theodore Arnold.* Leipzig: Printed for the heir of the late Mr. Gross.

Arnold, Theodor. 1752. *A compleat English dictionary: oder vollständiges englisch-deutsches Wörter-buch.* Leipzig: In der Groβischen Handlung.

Arnold, Theodor. 1757. *A compleat vocabulary, English and German, oder: vollständig kleines Wörter-Buch [...].* Leipzig: in der Grossischen Handlung.

Arnold, Theodor, rev. M. Johann Batholomäus Rogler. 1777. *A compleat vocabulary, English and German [...] Durchaus verbessert und stark vermehrt herausgegeben von M. Johann Batholomäus Rogler.* Züllichau: Frommann.

Bailey, Nathan. 1727. *An orthographical dictionary, shewing both the orthography and the orthoepia of the English tongue [...].* [= Volume 2 of *Universal etymological English dictionary.*] London: printed for T. Cox, at the Lamb under the Royal-Exchange.

Bailey, Nathan. 1776, 24th edition. *An universal etymological English dictionary [...].*London: printed for R. Ware, W. Innys [et al.].

Boyer, Abel. 1699. *The Royal Dictionary. In Two Parts, First French and English. Secondly, English and French. [...].* London: Printed for R. Clavel, H. Mortlock [...].

Boyer, Abel. 1700. *The Royal Dictionary Abridged. In Two Parts. I. French and English. II. English and French. [...].* London: Printed for R. Clavel, H. Mortlock [...].

Boyer, Abel. 1768. *Dictionnaire royal françois-anglois et anglois-françois: tiré des meilleurs auteurs qui ont écrit dans ces deux langues.* Lions: chez Jean-Marie Bruyset […].

Brekle, Herbert E., Edeltraud Dobnig-Jülch, Hans Jürgen Höller & Helmut Weiß, eds. *Bio-bibliographisches Handbuch zur Sprachwissenschaft des 18. Jahrhunderts. Die Grammatiker, Lexikographen und Sprachtheoretiker des deutschsprachigen Raums mit Beschreibungen ihrer Werke.* Berlin: de Gruyter. 8 vols.

Chambers, Ephraim. 1728. *Cyclopaedia, or, An universal dictionary of arts and sciences.* England: Printed for James and John Knapton [and 19 others].

Considine, John. 2014. *Academy Dictionaries 1600–1800.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ebeling, Christoph Daniel. 1781. *Vermischte Aufsätze in englischer Prose: hauptsächlich zum Besten derer welche diese Sprache in Rücksicht auf bürgerliche Geschäfte lernen wollen.* Hamburg: Herolds Wittwe.

Ebers, Johannes. 1793, 1794. *Vollständiges Wörterbuch der englischen Sprache für die Deutschen. Nach den neuesten und besten Hülfsmitteln mit richtig bezeichneter Aussprache eines jeden Wortes bearbeitet von Johannes Ebers.* Leipzig: Breitkopf. 2 vols.

Ebers, Johannes. 1796, 1798, 1799. *The New And Complete Dictionary Of The German And English Languages composed chiefly after the German Dictionaries of Mr. Adelung and of Mr. Schwan. [...].* Leipzig: Breitkopf and Haertel. 3 vols.

Ebers, Johannes. 1800. *Neues Hand-Wörterbuch der Englischen Sprache für die Deutschen und der Deutschen Sprache für die Engländer. A new hand-dictionary of the English language for the Germans and of the German language for Englishmen, etc.* Halle:

Rengersche Buchhandlung. Part I (English to German) in two vols. Part II (German to English) in one vol.

Entick, John. 1774–1775. *The present state of the British empire: containing a description of the kingdoms, principalities, islands, colonies, conquests, and of the military and commercial establishments, under the British crown, in Europe, Asia, Africa and America [...].* London: Printed for B. Law [and 5 others]. 4 vols.

Fick, Johann Christian. 1802. *Vollständiges englisch-deutsches und deutsch--englisches Lexicon.* Erlangen: Palm. 2 vols.

François, Jacques. 2020a. *Johann Christoph Adelung, linguiste des Lumières à la cour de Saxe.* Paris: L'Harmattan.

François, Jacques. 2020b. "Johann Christoph Adelung, a forerunner of modern bilingual lexicography" (https://hiphilangsci.net/2020/04/21/adelung/ , accessted October 2023).

Golinski, Jan. 2015 (print version 2004). "Nicholson, William (1753–1815), chemist and inventor". *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/20153

Grose, Francis. 1785. *A classical dictionary of the vulgar tongue.* London: printed for S. Hooper, NO. 212, High Holborn.

Hamberger, Georg Christoph, & Johann Georg Meusel. 1795–96, 5th ed. *Das gelehrte Teutschland.* Lemgo: im Verlag der Meyerschen Buchhandlung.

Haß-Zumkehr, Ulrike. 2001. *Deutsche Wörterbücher - Brennpunkt von Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte.* Berlin: de Gruyter Studienbuch.

Haß, Ulrike. 2019. [Chapter 22] "The Germanic Languages Other than English from c. 1700". *The Cambridge World History of Lexicography* ed. by John Considine, 460–83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hausmann, Franz Josef & Margaret Cop. 1985. "Short History of English-German Lexicography". *Symposium on Lexicography II. Proceedings of the 2nd Intermational Symposium on Lexicography,* ed. by K. Hyldgaard-Jensen and Arne Zettersten, 183–97. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Hitchings, Henry. 2005. *Dr Johnson's Dictionary: The Extraordinary Story of the Book That Defined the World.* London: John Murray.

Jellinek, Max. 1913. *Geschichte der neuhochdeutschen Grammatik von den Anfängen bis auf Adelung.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Johnson, Samuel. 1755, [4]1773. *A dictionary of the English language: in which the words are deduced from their originals, and illustrated in their different significations by examples from the best writers. [...].* London: printed by W. Strahan, for J. and P. Knapton [et al.].

Kämper, Heidrun, Annette Klosa and Oda Vietze, eds. 2008. *Aufklärer, Sprachgelehrter, Didaktiker : Johann Christoph Adelung (1732–1806).* Tübingen: Narr.

Klausing, Anton Ernst. 1771, [2]1778, [3]1783, =4th, 5th and 6th editions of Arnold 1736. *A compleat English dictionary, oder vollständiges englisch-deutsches Wörterbuch, anfänglich von Nathan Bailey herausgegeben; jetzt aber fast ganz umgearbeitet, vermehret und verbessert von Anton Ernst Klausing, [...].* Leipzig, Züllichau:

Waysenhaus & Frommann; 1778 and 1783 editions both Leipzig und Züllichau: Nathanael Sigismund Frommanns Erben.

Lewis, Derek. 2013. *Die Wörterbücher von Johannes Ebers. Studien zur frühen englisch-deutschen Lexikographie.* Ph.D. diss. University of Würzburg, Würzburg.

Ludwig, Christian. 1706. *A dictionary English, German, and French: containing not only the English words in their alphabethical order, together with their several significations, but also their proper accent, phrases, figurative speeches, idioms & proverbs, composed from the best new English [...].* Leipzig: bey Thomas Fritschen.

Ludwig, Christian. 1716. *Teutsch-Englisches Lexicon : worinnen nicht allein die Wörter, samt den Nenn-, Bey- und Sprich-Wörtern, sondern auch sowol die eigentliche als verblümte Redens-Arten verzeichnet sind. [...]*. Leipzig: bey Thomas Fritschen.

McLelland, Nicola. 2024. "Language Authority, Language Ideologies, and Eighteenth-Century bilingual Lexicographers of French, German and English: comparing Abel Boyer, Christian Ludwig, and Lewis Chambaud." *Historical and Sociolinguistic Approaches to French* ed. by Janice Carruthers, Mairi-Louise McLaughlin, and Olivia Walsh, pages tbc. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meusel, Johann Georg. 1802–1816. *Lexikon der vom Jahr 1750 bis 1800 verstorbenen teutschen Schriftsteller.* Leipzig: Gerhard Fleischer. 15 vols.

Miller, Philip. 1724, 3rd ed. 1748, 8th ed. 1768. *The gardeners and florists dictionary, or A complete system of horticulture.* London: Printed for Charles Rivington. 3rd ed. 1748 in 3 vols. as "The third edition, corrected; and the whole digested into one alphabet"] England: Printed for Charles Rivington; 8th ed. London: printed for the author.

Münchhausen, Otto von. 1764–1773. *Der Hausvater*. Hannover: In Verlag seel. N. Försters und Sohns Erben.

Oxford English Dictionary. (online edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Accessed September 2023].

Prager, Johann Christian. 1757. *Neueingerichtetes Englisches Wörterbuch.* Coburg/Leipzig: verlegts Georg Otto.

Ratzel, Friedrich. 1883. "Küttner, Karl Gottlob (1755-1805), Reiseschriftsteller". *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 17.443–444.

Reddick, Allen Hilliart. 1990, 1996². *The Making of Johnson's Dicionary, 1746–1773.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rogler, John Bartholomew. 1763. *A dictionary English, German and French, Containing [...], by Mr. Christian Ludwig now carefully revised, corrected, and throughout augmented with more than 12000 words, taken out of Samuel Johnson's English dictionary and others, by John Bartholomew Rogler.* Leipzig: Printed for John Frederick Gleditsch.

Schrader, Norbert. 2012. "Adelung: Grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der hochdeutschen Mundart". *Große Lexika und Wörterbücher Europas: Europäische Enzyklopädien und Wörterbücher in historischen Porträts* ed. by Ulrike Haß, 163–77. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Sheridan, Thomas. 1789. *A complete dictionary of the English language, both with regard to sound and meaning [...].* London: printed for Charles Dilly, in the Poultry.

Steinbach, Christoph Ernst. 1724. *Kürtze und gründliche Anweisung zur Deutschen Sprache. Vel succincta et perfecta Grammatica LINGVAE GERMANICAE Nova methodo tradita.* Rostochii et Parchimi: Apud Georg Ludw. Fritsch.

Strohbach, Margrit. 1984. *Johann Christoph Adelung. Ein Beitrag zu seinem germanistischen Schaffen mit einer Bibliographie seines Gesamtwerkes.* Berlin: de Gruyter.

Swanson, Donald C. 1962 [Rpt. 2022]. "Recommendations on the Selection of Entries for a Bilingual Dictionary". *Problems in Lexicography,* ed. by Fred D. Householder and Sol Saporta, 63–77. Bloomington. Rpt. 2022 Indiana University Press, ed. by Michael Adam.

Walker, John. 1791. *A critical pronouncing dictionary [...].* London: sold by G. G. J. and J. Robinson, Paternoster Row; and T. Cadell, in the Strand.

Wendeborn, Gebhard Friedrich August. 1797. *Exercises to Dr. Wendeborn's Introduction to German Grammar [...].* [London?]: Printed for the Author.

Wittmann, Reinhard. 1976. "Zur Verlegertypologie der Goethezeit. Unveröffentlichte Verlegerbriefe an Heinrich Wilhelm von Gerstenberg". *Jahrbuch für Internationale Germanistik* 8: 1–20.

Zimmermann, Ralf. 2003. *Dictionary of the English Language ― Ein Wörterbuchvergleich.* MA Dissertation. Universität Würzburg.