GEORGE, KEN (Hrsg.): *An Gerlyver Meur: Kernewek-Sowsnek, Sowsnek-Kernewek.*
Cornish-English, English-Cornish Dictionary. Second edition. Bosvenegh: Kesva an
Taves Kernewek/Bodmin: The Cornish Language Board, 2009. 940 S., ISBN 978-1-
902917-84-9. £ 29.99.

In any work dealing with Celtic languages, it is problematic to speak of "Cornish"
without some qualifying adjective, as "Cornish" can refer either to the Brythonic lan-
guage spoken in parts of Cornwall until the end of the eighteenth century (hereafter
described as "traditional Cornish") or to any of the various forms of revived Cornish
promulgated by scholars and language activists in the twentieth and twenty-first cen-
turies. Since Cornish was effectively a dead language for a period of at least a hundred
years between ca. 1800 and 1904 (the publication date of Henry JENNER's *Handbook*
of the Cornish Language, commonly taken as the starting point of the revival move-
ment) and since the surviving textual records of Old, Middle, and Late Cornish do
not provide enough linguistic data to reconstruct the traditional language in full, all
forms of revived Cornish contain vocabulary derived from other sources: elements
preserved in Cornish place-names, words drawn from the English dialects spoken
in Cornwall, neologisms based on attested traditional Cornish roots, forms calqued
on words used in modern Breton and Welsh, and loanwords from English, French,
and Celtic languages. A similar caveat applies to the morphology and grammar of re-
vived Cornish, since these are at least partly reconstructed with reference to Breton
and Welsh, and the correct pronunciation of Cornish at any period in its history is
still a hotly debated topic among historical linguists and present-day Cornish speak-
ers alike. Given these concerns, it is hard to imagine that any Cornish dictionary
could satisfy the needs and wishes of both researchers and revivalists, and while the
trend in Cornish lexicography has been to include more material of interest to Celtic
scholars and linguists, all the Cornish-English dictionaries published in the last eight
decades have been aimed primarily at speakers and learners of revived Cornish. In
this, the second edition of Ken GEORGE's *Gerlyver Meur* is no exception, although it
contains a great deal of useful information on the etymology, semantics, cognates,
and historically attested forms of traditional Cornish words which will make it an im-
portant reference work for philologists, provided they are able to come to terms with
Kernewek Kemmyn ('Common Cornish'), George's 'morpho-phonemic orthography'
(p. 1) for revived Cornish.

   Linguists will find the book valuable for the insight it provides into George's most
current theories about Middle Cornish phonology and etymology, since the *Gerlyver*
Meur allows his reconstructions to be examined on a word-by-word basis. Nonethe-
less, researchers otherwise unfamiliar with George's orthography may have trouble
looking up individual words, since the *Kernewek Kemmyn* spelling of a given word of-
ten differs significantly from the written forms found in Middle and Late Cornish texts
– or, for that matter, revived Cornish texts produced before the 1980s, when *Kernewek*
Kemmyn was introduced. Although the Cornish-English section of the dictionary in-
cludes numerous examples of attested Old, Middle, and Late Cornish spellings, these
are always listed under a headword in *Kernewek Kemmyn*, and the front matter does
not provide any information about the relationship between *Kernewek Kemmyn* and

the spelling systems used by writers of traditional Cornish – nor, indeed, between *Kernewek Kemmyn* and other revived Cornish orthographies.

For the same reason, students reading Middle Cornish texts will find R. Morton Nance's Cornish-English dictionaries (such as NANCE 1990) more useful than the *Gerlyver Meur*, as Nance's Unified Cornish orthography is largely a regularisation of Middle Cornish forms, and his dictionaries contain a number of variant spellings found in Middle Cornish manuscripts. Students of Late Cornish will prefer Richard Gendall's dictionaries (particularly GENDALL 1997), as these list Late Cornish forms in attested spellings. *Kernewek Kemmyn* is a morpho-phonemic spelling applied to George's reconstruction of Middle Cornish phonology ca. 1500 (p. 9), and as such is not well suited to the representation of Late Cornish, given the sound changes which took place in the traditional language during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is worth noting, however, that George has made an effort to accommodate specifically Late Cornish forms like *anjey* 'they' and *mallo* 'that he/she may be able' in the new edition of the *Gerlyver Meur*, even though these are seldom if ever used by speakers and writers of *Kernewek Kemmyn*.

Historical linguists seeking to use the dictionary as a source of information about the traditional Cornish lexicon should approach it with caution, particularly if they do not themselves have extensive experience with Cornish. Many words in the *Gerlyver Meur* are neologisms, and although these are marked as such in the Cornish-English section of the dictionary (by means of a 'frequency code' [p. 25] appended to each entry),[1] no such distinction is made in the English-Cornish section. In addition, some traditional Cornish words and phrases have undergone semantic broadening or narrowing in the revived language, and the English-Cornish section of the *Gerlyver Meur* reflects only George's recommended revived Cornish usage. A case in point is *nija*, which originally meant 'fly, swim, float' but which in *Kernewek Kemmyn* is only used for 'fly.' This semantic shift is discussed in the Cornish-English section (p. 478), but in the English-Cornish section the headword 'swim' is translated only as *neuvya* – a word not even attested in traditional Cornish – and *nija* is not mentioned (p. 906).[2]

In other instances, the *Kernewek Kemmyn* headword given in the *Gerlyver Meur* does not represent the morpho-phonemic spelling of a word found in traditional Cornish, but rather is a reconstructed form that is not attested anywhere in the historical Cornish corpus. One example of this phenomenon is the *Kernewek Kemmyn* entry *noethedh* 'nakedness, nudity', representing the word attested in the Late Cornish drama *Gwreans an Bys* (1611) as *nootha*. George explains that in this case 'the supposed [pre-1611] ending -¹EDH has been restored, in order to avoid a homograph with *noetha* "to winnow".' The word *noetha*, however, is itself a neologism, and George notes that it was originally introduced in Nance's 1938 Unified Cornish-English dictionary – as *nothya*, since Nance had retained the form *notha* for 'nakedness' (p. 479). Once again, the relevant information can be found in the Cornish-English section of the *Gerlyver Meur*, but the English-Cornish section makes no distinction between historically attested and reconstructed forms.[3]

---

[1] See below for further discussion of this feature.

[2] George credits Nance's *New Cornish-English Dictionary* (1938, reprinted as the Cornish-English section of NANCE 1990) as the source of the revived Cornish verb *neuvya*, a word modelled on Welsh *nofio* and Breton *neuñviñ* (p. 477).

[3] This example says a great deal about the similarities and differences between Nance's and

While it bears almost the same name as his 1993 Cornish-English dictionary (*Gerlyver Kernewek Kemmyn: An Gerlyver Meur*), the second edition of George's *Gerlyver Meur* is considerably more than a simple revision of this earlier work, and can best be understood as the latest and most comprehensive in a series of revived Cornish and English word-lists and dictionaries edited by George and published under the auspices of the Cornish Language Board (*Kesva an Taves Kernewek*). As the 'Foreword to the First Edition' (p. 3) makes clear, the first of these works was a list of some 1100 Cornish words produced in 1988, the year after the Cornish Language Board (one of the principal organizations responsible for the promotion of revived Cornish) decided to begin using George's *Kernewek Kemmyn* in place of Nance's Unified Cornish, which had been the generally accepted orthography for revived Cornish since the 1930s. This initial word-list was followed five years later by the first edition of the *Gerlyver Meur* ('Great' or 'Large Dictionary'), a vastly expanded work containing about 9,000 headwords[4] as well as information about the etymology of each word, its Breton and Welsh cognate forms, and its attestations (if any) in the traditional Cornish corpus. This first edition of the *Gerlyver Meur* was a one-way Cornish-English dictionary only; a provisional English-Cornish companion volume listing English headwords and their Cornish translations (with no other etymological or linguistic information provided) was published in 1995. The first two-way *Kernewek Kemmyn* and English dictionary, the *Gerlyver Kres* ('Medium[-Sized] Dictionary') was released in 1998, with a second, slightly expanded edition of this work appearing two years later. In 2005 this was followed by the *Gerlyvrik* (or *Mini-Dictionary*), a pocket-size two-way dictionary with a similar layout to the *Gerlyver Kres*, but containing fewer entries ('about 8,000 words or translations' according to the back cover).[5]

All of these works, including the new edition of the *Gerlyver Meur*, were produced by George using software of his own design with entries assembled from "source-files" of traditional and revived Cornish which he also compiled and edited. These files, their accompanying software, and the *Kernewek Kemmyn* orthography itself have been revised or rewritten periodically over the past twenty-five years (p. 4), and each new publication has included additional vocabulary and at least a few words that have been re-spelled as a result of further research into traditional Cornish phonology. The recent (1999) discovery of *Bewnans Ke*, a hitherto unknown work of

---

George's approach to the creation of a revived Cornish lexicon. NANCE (1990: [I:] 118) retains the attested form *nootha* for 'nakedness', respelling it *notha* in Unified Cornish to conform to his conception of Cornish phonology, and then introduces a different form *nothya* to translate the English 'winnow' (the root is attested in Middle Cornish *nothlennow* 'winnowing-sheets,' but the verbal noun formed from it is not recorded in traditional Cornish texts). George (p. 479) reconstructs the verb 'winnow' as *noetha* based on a parallel with Breton *nizhañ*, and, to avoid a homophone, replaces the historically attested form *nootha* 'nakedness' with a putative earlier Middle Cornish form *noethedh* for which there is no textual evidence. It is interesting to note, however, that both Nance and George seem to have made a particular effort to avoid homophony in this specific case.

[4] GEORGE 1993: 12.

[5] GEORGE 2005; presumably this figure refers to the total for the Cornish-English and English-Cornish sections taken together. Unlike the other dictionaries listed, this work is a joint publication by the Cornish Language Board and the Breton-based publisher Yoran Embanner; it has essentially the same dimensions and format as the other bilingual dictionaries in his 'Liligast' series.

Middle Cornish drama, added some 250 new items to the traditional Cornish lexicon (p. 6), and led scholars to re-examine the pronunciation of a few words. In 2006, the same year his own edition of the play was published, George released a provisional list of the additions and changes made to *Kernewek Kemmyn* as a result of the discovery of *Bewnans Ke*, and these have likewise been incorporated into the *Gerlyver Meur* (p. 4).

Given the comparatively small size of the potential readership for any Cornish dictionary, George's publications have been subject to a remarkable degree of scrutiny and have indeed been harshly criticised in a number of review articles and books.[6] Much of this criticism has been directed at the *Kernewek Kemmyn* orthography itself: George's "morpho-phonemic" spelling system for revived Cornish, in which each phoneme in the language is represented by a distinct graph, with exceptions made in cases where a purely phonemic spelling would mask important facts about the morphology of a word (p. 10). Some object to *Kernewek Kemmyn* on aesthetic grounds, describing the spelling as unattractive or even "un-Cornish": Others disagree with George's decision to apply a standardised spelling to a reconstructed Middle Cornish phonology rather than simply standardising the orthographic practices of Middle Cornish scribes, since although these historical spellings are often inconsistent with one another even within the same text, they are at least attested in works written and copied by native speakers of traditional Cornish, while any phonological reconstruction of the language can only be hypothetical. As a morpho-phonemic orthography, *Kernewek Kemmyn* is to some extent only as good as the phonological reconstruction upon which it is based, and a number of critics have called George's work in this area into question. George's use of computer files as an aid to linguistic reconstruction and lexicography has also been challenged, and lengthy lists of dictionary entries perceived to contain errors in phonology, etymology, or orthography have been published.[7] In fairness to George, however, it should be noted that many criticisms of *Kernewek Kemmyn* have been put forward by writers who are themselves the inventors or publishers of competing spelling systems for revived Cornish.[8]

In his introduction to the second edition of the *Gerlyver Meur*, George responds:

'This dictionary uses **Kernewek Kemmyn** because it is the best orthography available. The Cornish Language Board is determined to ensure that this continues to be the case … All criticisms of **Kernewek Kemmyn** are taken seriously and examined in detail. If they are justified, then action is taken to rectify the perceived faults. This has been the case with some individual words. Criticisms of the system as a whole have been found to be untenable.' (p. 10; emphasis original)

---

[6] See for example EVERSON 1999, 2006; EVERSON ET AL. 2007; MILLS 1999a, 1999b; WILLIAMS 2001, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c.

[7] See for example WILLIAMS 2001 (= 2006a: 138–185); 2006b: 127–129; 2006c: 188–234.

[8] I myself am one of the co-authors of the specification for the new Standard Written Form (SWF) of Cornish, a different revived Cornish orthography from *Kernewek Kemmyn* (see note 10 below), and am involved in the production of a forthcoming SWF dictionary. Unlike Williams, Everson, and Mills, however, I have no philosophical objections to *Kernewek Kemmyn* as a spelling system for revived Cornish, and have sought in this review to evaluate George's *Gerlyver Meur* in terms of its usefulness as a reference work for researchers and students interested in traditional and revived Cornish rather than to critique the *Kernewek Kemmyn* orthography itself.

George is perhaps to be commended for not using his dictionary as a platform for hurling barbs at his critics or inveighing against alternative orthographic systems, a pitfall which not all editors and publishers of reference works for revived Cornish have avoided.[9] Indeed, the front matter of the second edition of the *Gerlyver Meur* does not even refer to any competing spelling systems by name, except for Nance's Unified Cornish, which *Kernewek Kemmyn* and other orthographies have largely supplanted.[10] Nonetheless, his simple assertion that 'criticisms of [*Kernewek Kemmyn*] as a whole have been found to be untenable' is bound to raise some eyebrows, given the amount of time and effort the system's detractors continue to devote to publishing such criticisms. It is clear that George has carefully examined the published lists of errors and perceived errors in *Kernewek Kemmyn* and made modifications in cases where he finds compelling evidence, as in the case of *hedre* [heˈdrɛː] 'while, as long as'. This word appeared in the first edition of the *Gerlyver Meur* as *hedra* – presumably representing [ˈhedra], although in the first edition, no IPA transcription was given for words deemed to have regular (penultimate) stress – but in the second edition it has been re-spelled and its pronunciation reanalysed in the light of further research.[11] In a pair of review articles, the typographer and publisher Michael Everson criticised the overall layout of both the *Gerlyver Kres* and *Gerlyvrik*, including George's decision to use a combination of Times and Helvetica or Arial as the principal fonts in these dictionaries;[12] the new edition of the *Gerlyver Meur* has addressed some of these aesthetic issues, and uses the more appealing font Book Antiqua for headwords, translations, and annotations – although, surprisingly, not for most IPA transcriptions, which are instead rendered in a sans-serif font that does not seem to contain all the standard IPA characters (an inverted upper-case omega is used in place of IPA [ʊ], for example).[13]

At 940 pages, the second edition of the *Gerlyver Meur* is by far the largest two-way

---

[9] See, for example Nicholas Williams' *English-Cornish Dictionary*, s.v. *Cornish*, where the phrase 'Common Cornish' is translated as 'Kernowek Kemyn. (*abusive*) füg-Gernowek ['phoney Cornish']; "Kennywek"' and the word 'pseudo-Cornish' is glossed as '(*abusive*) füg-Gernowek, Kernowek Kemyn' (WILLIAMS 2006d: 75; see also WILLIAMS 2006d: 291 s.v. *pseudo-Cornish*). Michael Everson's 'Preface to the First Edition' of this same dictionary likewise devotes considerable space to a critique of *Kernewek Kemmyn*, including remarks like 'Kernowek Kemyn is a house of cards susceptible to criticism both of its fundamental principles and of the details of its expression … it is based on circular arguments and a good deal of wishful thinking' (EVERSON 2000: xv).

[10] George's silence regarding competing revived Cornish orthographies may create a false impression among users and potential purchasers of the *Gerlyver Meur* that George's *Kernewek Kemmyn* is the only, or at any rate the standard, spelling system currently in use for revived Cornish. In fact, a new Standard Written form for revived Cornish – a spelling system designed with input from various Cornish orthographic factions including users of *Kernewek Kemmyn* – has been in existence since 2008 and was in its planning stages as early as 2007, two years before the second edition of the *Gerlyver Meur* was published. Given that this SWF has been accepted by a number of Cornish cultural organisations and is already being used for official communications, on bilingual street signs, and in educational programmes for primary and secondary schools in Cornwall, it is remarkable that George makes no reference to it whatsoever.

[11] GEORGE 1993: 135; in the second edition of the *Gerlyver Meur*, George credits Nicholas Williams for the conclusion that this word had final stress in Middle Cornish (p. 287). The form is discussed in WILLIAMS 2006c: 198–199; see also WILLIAMS 2006d: 433 s.v. *while*.

[12] EVERSON 1999, 2007.

[13] I would like to thank Albert Bock for bringing this to my attention.

Cornish and English dictionary yet published: 'the most up-to-date and comprehens-ive single-volume Cornish dictionary available today', according to the back cover. However, taking the length of the book itself as a basis for comparison is somewhat misleading, as the font size used in the *Gerlyver Meur* is considerably larger – and the number of headwords per page considerably smaller – than in other Cornish and English dictionaries. On average there are about two dozen headwords per page in the Cornish-English section (including roots and affixes for which a separate defini-tion is given, as well as words marked as 'unassimilated loans' [p. 20]), which gives a figure of roughly 15,000 headwords for the entire section. In the English-Cornish section (a simple word-list where only the part of speech and the Cornish trans-lation is supplied) the figure is closer to four dozen headwords per page, yielding a total of more than 12,000 headwords in all.[14] Unfortunately, exact figures are not supplied by the editor or publisher; the back cover of the dictionary describes it as containing 'over 22,000 words and phrases,' which presumably refers to the total for both sections. While the Cornish-English section thus contains considerably more than the roughly 8,000 headwords (excluding cross-references) found in Nance's 1938 *New Cornish-English Dictionary* (reprinted as the Cornish-English section of NANCE 1990), the English-Cornish section is much shorter than the second edition of Nich-olas Williams' *English-Cornish Dictionary* (WILLIAMS 2006d), which claims over 25,000 headwords.

Nor indeed can the number of headwords alone provide an accurate point of com-parison, since the average number of translations provided for each headword in the *Gerlyver Meur* is smaller than in other Cornish dictionaries – and this despite the fact that George has done away with a previous (and rather arbitrary rule) from the first edition of the *Gerlyver Meur* whereby 'the number of meanings given [for a particular headword] was limited to three or less' (p. 22; see also p. 8). In his introduction, George suggests that this difference is due to a greater concern on his part for 'precision' in translation: 'There is always a risk of widening the semantic range of an existing Cornish word to such an extent that precision is lost. Nance's 1938 dictionary ... suf-fers from this, as does Williams' 2000 dictionary [the first edition of WILLIAMS 2006d]'. George is correct to note that since the English language has a much larger vocabulary than Cornish, 'there is a temptation to assign several English words to each Cornish word' in cases where English provides numerous synonyms or near-synonyms, and it is true that examples of this phenomenon can be found in the works of Gendall, Willi-ams, and Nance (p. 8). It is unclear, however, that this is in itself a drawback, since the alternatives to 'widening the semantic range' of existing Cornish words are to coin a number of new (historically unattested) words to "fill in the gaps" in the lexicon or to leave some English words out of the dictionary altogether on the grounds that no existing Cornish word provides a suitably precise translation; it can be argued that George's dictionaries suffer from both of these phenomena.[15]

---

[14] One factor which likely contributes to the difference in the number of headwords between the two sections is the fact that the Cornish-English section includes a number of headwords marked as 'unassimilated loans' from English, French, or Latin as well as roots, prefixes, suffixes, place-names and personal names from the texts and 'exclusively Late Cornish forms' (p. 20); these items are not, in general, included in the English-Cornish section.

[15] George discusses various approaches to 'filling gaps in the lexicon' on pp. 6–7; on p. 8 he discusses some of the rules that have been formulated for 'devising new words' with more

The second edition of the *Gerlyvver Meur* is without a doubt the most complete source of Cornish etymological data yet published, and as such will be of great value as a reference work for philologists researching the historical development of the Brythonic languages. For each headword in the Cornish-English section of the *Gerlyver Meur*, George provides copious information, including:

- a phonetic transcription of its *Kernewek Kemmyn* pronunciation (based on George's reconstruction of Middle Cornish phonology);
- an etymology (for 'roots and simple affixes' [p. 23]; for headwords comprising more than one morpheme, only the component morphemes are listed);
- information about the word's attestation in traditional Cornish texts;
- samples of 'the range of spellings used in traditional Cornish,' where applicable (p. 27);
- the Breton and Welsh cognates, if any.

For neologisms and words attested three or fewer times in the traditional Cornish corpus, George also lists the source(s). Unfortunately, much of this valuable data is presented in an idiosyncratic format involving various one- to five-digit codes and abbreviations which are explained in the dictionary's front matter (pp. 12–17, 22–27) but which will not be immediately transparent even to readers familiar with Celtic linguistics and standard lexicographical practices. Nance's dictionary was content to mark neologisms with an asterisk and words respelled from Old or Late Cornish sources with a single or double dagger respectively.[16] George, by contrast, assigns each headword a numerical 'frequency code' F using a logarithmic scale which indicates how often that word and its derivative forms are attested in the traditional Cornish corpus; in the case of neologisms, F = 0 (p. 25). And while George is to be commended on providing detailed information about the sources for rare or newly coined words, his use of two- to five-letter abbreviations for the names of sources is also problematic: unlike most other dictionaries and reference works which use such abbreviations in citing sources, the *Gerlyver Meur* does not contain a table in which the abbreviations are listed in alphabetical order. As a result, users seeking the source of a particular Late Cornish citation (introduced by the code letter L) in George's dictionary must on occasion read through the entire list Late Cornish texts on pp. 13–17, where 93 individual works and their corresponding abbreviations are arranged chronologically and thematically rather than alphabetically. This list of Old, Middle, and Late Cornish source materials is in itself of considerable value to students of the language, as it provides an exhaustive inventory of the component texts of the traditional Cornish corpus, arranged roughly in chronological order (pp. 12–17).[17] It should be noted, however, that George's classification of texts as Middle or Late Cornish is based largely on orthographic considerations rather than the dates of composition, so that some seventeenth-century works appear in the Middle Cornish list

---

precise distinctions of meaning.

[16] NANCE 1990: [I: I–ii], [II: i]; Nance's notation is also discussed in MILLS 1999b.

[17] An equivalent list of revived Cornish sources – representing a cross-section of the revived Cornish corpus rather than an exhaustive list of all texts – appears later in the dictionary (pp. 25–26).

and some sixteenth-century works in the Late Cornish list.[18]

A lengthy section on the phonology of *Kernewek Kemmyn* including a discussion of the relationship between spelling and pronunciation has been included in the dictionary's front matter (pp. 28–35), and the recommended *Kernewek Kemmyn* pronunciation of each headword in the Cornish-English section is given in the IPA. George's use of IPA characters is somewhat idiosyncratic, however, particularly with respect to the vowel sounds. For example, the vowel *Kernewek Kemmyn* spells <e> usually represents George's reconstructed Middle Cornish phoneme /ɛ/ (p. 30). The phonetic transcriptions [ɛ] and [ɛː] are used for this sound in George's discussion of word-stress on pp. 28–29 (possibly in error, given that these characters appear in a different font from that used in most other IPA transcriptions in the dictionary), but in the pronunciation guide on pp. 30–31 and in the dictionary proper, this sound is transcribed as [ę], using a 'Polish hook' diacritic that is not standard IPA, but is likely intended to indicate that the vowel is lower than the mid-high cardinal vowel [e]. In a 2007 article, Michael Everson identified similar transcription problems with *Kernewek Kemmyn* <e> as part of a larger critique of George's use of IPA in the second edition of the *Gerlyver Kres* (2000) and the *Gerlyvrik* (2005), which makes it all the more surprising that this issue has still not been resolved in the second edition of the *Gerlyver Meur*.[19]

George's treatment of diphthongs is also inconsistent: the sequence *ow* is transcribed as as [ɔʊ] in *kowann* ['kɔʊan] 'owl', *kowans* ['kɔʊans] 'excavation', and *kowas* ['kɔʊaz] 'shower', but as [ɔw] in *kowa* ['kɔwa] 'hollow (VN)' and *kowal* ['kɔwal] 'complete'. And while *kowa*, *kowal*, and *koweth* ['kɔwęθ] 'companion, friend' show the vowel [ɔ] as short, it is marked as half-long in *kowell* ['kɔ·węl] 'cage, pannier' (pp. 382–383).[20] As George offers no explanation for these three different treatments of stressed *ow* ([ɔʊ], [ɔw], [ɔ·w]), all of which occur in more or less the same phonological environment (preceding the vowel *a* or *e* in a disyllabic word), the possibility that this variation is the result of an editorial oversight cannot be ruled out. Another apparent phonological inconsistency involves the word *penn-dewlin*, glossed in the *Gerlyver Meur* as 'point of knee', and transcribed as [ˌpęndɛʊˈliːn] with primary stress falling on the final syllable (p. 510). This recommended pronunciation is somewhat surprising, given that the stress accent in Cornish normally falls on the penultimate syllable of polysyllabic words, and it is especially difficult to square with the fact that the word *dewlin* 'knees (du.)' is transcribed elsewhere with penultimate stress as ['dęʊlɪn] (p. 143). Nor does the answer appear to lie in the secondary stress applied to the prefix *penn-*, since the structurally analogous headword *penn-diwglun* 'hips, haunches' which appears on the same page as *penn-dewlin* is transcribed [ˌpęnˈdiʊglyn] with primary stress on the penultimate syllable (p. 510).

In addition to the section on pronunciation and spelling discussed above, George also provides a fairly detailed explanation of the initial consonant mutations in Cornish on pp. 36–38, in which many (but by no means all) of the words triggering

---

[18] 'In this edition of the dictionary, texts have been assigned to Middle or Late Cornish on the grounds of style and orthography. In particular, CW. [the play *Gwreans an Bys*, known from a manuscript dated 1611] has been re-assigned to Middle Cornish. This means that there is considerable overlap between the two phases' (p. 12).

[19] EVERSON 2007: 6, 10.

[20] I would like to thank Albert Bock for bringing these issues regarding the transcription of diphthongs to my attention.

mutations are listed. Such words are also marked in the dictionary itself with a su-
perscript number (^{2}, ^{3}, ^{4}, or ^{5}) indicating the type of mutation which follows them
(lenition, aspiration, provection, and mixed mutation, respectively), using a system
that is familiar to most speakers of revived Cornish, regardless of their orthographic
preference.[21] However, the *Gerlyver Meur* provides little else in the way of supple-
mentary material, particularly when compared with other revived Cornish dictionar-
ies. Unlike most modern Celtic-language dictionaries, for example, the *Gerlyver Meur*
lacks an appendix providing the paradigms of the conjugated prepositions. Instead,
the personal forms of each preposition are listed in the Cornish-English section in
small print under the base form (e.g. *orthiv* 'at me', *orthis* 'at thee', etc. under the
headword *orth* 'at, by, per' [p. 496]). In some cases (as with the common prepositions
dhe 'to, for' and *gans* 'with, by'), each conjugated form of the preposition (e.g. *dhymm*
'to me', *dhis* 'to thee', etc.) is also listed as a separate headword, and in these specific
cases the English-Cornish section generally contains a sub-entry for each such form
(e.g. 'from me', 'from thee', etc., listed under the headword 'from' [p. 775]). George's
appendix listing the conjugated forms of Cornish verbs is also surprisingly brief and
lacking in detail. Only eight verbal paradigms are supplied: the regular verb *prena*,
the irregular verbs *gul* 'do, make', *bos/bones* 'be', *a'm beus* 'have', *mos/mones* 'come',
dos/dones 'come', and the auxiliary verbs *mynnes* 'wish, want' and *galloes* 'be able'
(pp. 684–686).[22] Users of the dictionary are directed to Wella BROWN's *Grammar of
Modern Cornish* or Ray EDWARDS' *Verbow Kernewek* (both works also published under
the auspices of the Cornish Language Board) for information about other verbs. It is
surprising, however, that the editor has not taken the opportunity to include a few
more common irregular verbs, such as *godhvos* 'know (a fact)', which can also be used
as an auxiliary meaning 'know how to' and whose paradigm differs significantly from
that of the eight verbs George provides. Among other revived Cornish dictionaries,
NANCE 1990 contains paradigms for three different classes of regular verbs as well as
eleven irregular verbs and auxiliaries – a fairly complete inventory of the possible
conjugation types – and WILLIAMS 2006d supplies no fewer than 26 different verbal
paradigms. The latter is a particularly surprising contrast, since grammars and text-
books of *Kernewek Kemmyn* tend to promote the use of conjugated verbs, while the
grammar of Williams' Unified Cornish Revised generally prefers to rely on auxiliary
verbs like *bos*, *gul*, *mynnes*, and *dos*.[23]

The almost total absence of back matter in GEORGE's *Gerlyver Meur* may be contras-
ted with WILLIAMS' 2006 *English-Cornish Dictionary*, which arguably goes too far in
the opposite direction: in addition to verb and preposition tables, lists of proper names,
and notes on spelling, Williams includes lists of books of the Bible, letter names in
the Greek, Cyrillic, Hebrew, Arabic, Ogham, and "Coelbren y Beirdd" alphabets, a
diagram showing the evolution of the Indo-European languages, tables of weights

---

[21] This numerical code is also used, for example, in NANCE 1990 and WILLIAMS 2006d, as well
as in numerous textbooks and grammars in *Kernewek Kemmyn*, Unified Cornish, and Unified
Cornish Revised. The superscript ^{1}, seldom used, refers to the 'radical' or unmutated state of
a word (p. 36).

[22] These tables contain an important typographical error: a past participle *gwrys* is listed for
mynnes 'want, wish' (p. 684), although this is properly the past participle of *gul* 'do, make';
the past participle of *mynnes* is not normally used in revived Cornish.

[23] WILLIAMS 2006d: 476.

and measures, the chemical elements, geological epochs, the biological classification of animals and plants, and even the 'Beaufort scale of wind speed' (!).[24] Not surprisingly, Williams' dictionary also provides a large number of sub-headings, phrases, and idiomatic expressions for each entry, an area where the *Gerlyver Meur* is particularly deficient. In his introduction to the first edition of the *Gerlyver Meur*, George noted, 'It was impressed upon the editor by Jenefer Lowe that as many phrases, especially idiomatic phrases, ought to be included as possible ... More work could be done in this respect.'[25] Regrettably, the second edition does not show very much progress in this area, and it is likely that *Kernewek Kemmyn* users will have to continue to rely on Nance's and Williams' dictionaries for suggestions when seeking to translate an English idiom into Cornish. Given that the second edition of the *Gerlyver Meur* comprises 940 pages of text, most of which is printed in a very large font compared to other Cornish dictionaries, it is hard to imagine that George was forced to limit the number of sub-entries and phrases or the amount of supplementary material due to lack of space. Rather, an editorial policy favouring a spare, streamlined approach to content and layout appears to be responsible.

Despite its various idiosyncrasies, minor inconsistencies, and a few surprising omissions, Ken George's *Gerlyver Meur* will be an essential reference work for historical linguists and philologists working with traditional Cornish, if only because it is the only existing Cornish dictionary that provides detailed etymological information for every headword. It will also be a 'must-have' item for many writers and speakers of revived Cornish, as even those who do not themselves use George's orthography will find it useful to know what new words have gained currency among users of *Kernewek Kemmyn* – likely still the largest bloc within the revival movement. In his introduction to the second edition, George remarks, 'This dictionary ... tries to perform two functions simultaneously: to act as a glossary of all words found in the corpus of traditional Cornish literature, and to provide a vocabulary suitable for modern use' (p. 5). It can be argued that the *Gerlyver Meur* succeeds in both of these aims. George's new dictionary does contain all the words attested in traditional Cornish – 'even non-Cornish words', as George makes clear, since medieval Cornish texts often include phrases and whole lines of verse in English, French, or Latin (p. 5; see also p. 19, pp. 674–683). However, the fact that these words are presented in a revived Cornish orthography makes the dictionary impractical for use as a glossary for those reading traditional Cornish literature in the original spelling, and may present difficulties for researchers unfamiliar with (or uninterested in) *Kernewek Kemmyn*. George's dictionary provides a considerable amount of modern vocabulary as well, including revived Cornish equivalents for 'basketball', 'communism', 'laptop [computer]', 'mobile telephone', 'sine-wave', 'terrorist' and 'vegetarian'. Yet although the second edition of the *Gerlyver Meur* is undoubtedly the largest and most complete *Kernewek Kemmyn* dictionary thus far produced, it is by no means clear that writers and learners of revived Cornish will find in it enough vocabulary to meet their day-to-day needs, particularly when it comes to phrases and idiomatic expressions.

---

[24] Williams 2006d: 465–475.
[25] George 1993: 19.

References

EVERSON, Michael 1999: „An Event of Great Signicance" [sic]: Review of George's *Gerlyver Kres*. *Cornish Studies* (second series) 7, 1997, 242–253 (reprinted in EVERSON *et al.*, 2007, 13–24).

EVERSON, Michael 2000: ‚Preface to the First Edition'. In: Nicholas J. A. WILLIAMS, *English-Cornish Dictionary: Gerlyver Sawsnek-Kernowek*. Dublin: Everson Gunn Teoranta/Redruth: Agan Tavas (reprinted in WILLIAMS 2006d, xii–xix).

EVERSON, Michael 2007: ‚Recent Typography in Kernowek Kemyn'. In: EVERSON *et al.*, 1–12.

EVERSON, Michael; WEATHERHILL, Craig; CHUBB, Ray; DEACON, Bernard & WILLIAMS, Nicholas 2007: *Form and Content in Revived Cornish: Articles in Criticism of Kernowek Kemyn*. 1st ed. Westport: Evertype (reprinted with corrections 2011).

GENDALL, Richard R. M 1997: *A Practical Dictionary of Modern Cornish. Part One: Cornish-English*. 2nd ed. Menheniot: Teere ha Tavaz.

GEORGE, Ken 1993: *Gerlyver Kernewek Kemmyn: An Gerlyver Meur Kernewek-Sowsnek. Cornish-English Dictionary*. Callington: Kesva an Taves Kernewek.

GEORGE, Ken 2005: *Gerlyvrik Kernewek-Sowsnek & Sowsnek-Kernewek. Cornish-English & English-Cornish Mini-Dictionary*. Kesva an Taves Kernewek/Yoran Embanner.

GEORGE, Ken 2009: *Gerlyver Meur*. Bodmin: Cornish Language Board.

MILLS, Jon 1999a: ‚Reconstructive Phonology and Contrastive Lexicology: Problems with the *Gerlyver Kernewek Kemmyn*'. *Cornish Studies* (second series) 7, 1999, 193–218.

MILLS, Jon 1999b: ‚Cornish Lexicography in the Twentieth Century: Standardisation and Divergence'. In: Anna-Alice DAZZI GROSS & Lorenza MONDADA (Hrsg.), *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée* 69/1: *Les langues minoritaires en contexte / Minderheitensprachen im Kontext: Vol. 1, Les langues minoritaires entre diversité et standardisation / Minderheitensprachen zwischen Vielfalt und Standardisierung*. Neuchâtel: Institut de linguistique de l'Université de Neuchâtel, 45–57.

NANCE, Robert Morton 1990: *A New Cornish-English and English-Cornish Dictionary. Gerlyver Noweth Kernewek-Sawsnek ha Sawsnek-Kernewek*. New edition. Redruth: Dyllansow Truran.

WILLIAMS, Nicholas, 2001: „A Modern and Scholarly Cornish-English Dictionary": Ken George's *Gerlyver Kernewek Kemmyn*'. *Cornish Studies* (second series) 9, 246–311 (reprinted in WILLIAMS 2006a, 138–185).

WILLIAMS, Nicholas 2006a: *Writings on Revived Cornish*. Westport: Evertype.

WILLIAMS, Nicholas 2006b: *Cornish Today: An Examination of the Revived Language*. 3rd ed. Westport: Evertype.

WILLIAMS, Nicholas, 2006c: *Towards Authentic Cornish: A critique of* Kernewek Kemmyn: Cornish for the Twenty-First Century *of Paul Dunbar and Ken George,* Gerlyver Kernewek Kemmyn *by Ken George, and* A Grammar of Modern Cornish *by Wella Brown*. Westport: Evertype.

WILLIAMS, Nicholas 2006d: *English-Cornish Dictionary. Gerlyver Sawsnek-Kernowek*. 2nd ed. Redruth: Agan Tavas.

Bonn   Benjamin BRUCH

GVOZDANOVIĆ, JADRANKA: *Celtic and Slavic and the Great Migrations. Reconstructing Linguistic Prehistory* (= Empirie und Theorie der Sprachwissenschaft, Band 1). Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter 2009. Kl.8°, 253 S., ISBN 978-3-8253-5663-7. € 44,00 (gebunden).

Die Autorin, Professorin für slavische Sprachwissenschaft in Heidelberg (früher Mannheim), mag Keltologen bekannt sein als Herausgeberin eines Sammelbandes über Zahlwörter in den indogermanischen Sprachen (GVOZDANOVIĆ 1992), in dem sich der schöne Beitrag von David Greene befindet (GREENE 1992). Jetzt legt sie in