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1. Introduction

This paper presents preliminary data emerging from an on-going study of what are sometimes referred to as ‘lexical fossils’. The term ‘fossil’, in a linguistic sense, is defined in the OED (3rd edn.) as “A word or other linguistic form which has become obsolete except in isolated regions or in set phrases, idioms, or collocations”.¹ The first citation in the OED is: “We see, then, that this fossil word ‘-hoe’ rather indicates a ‘social’ condition than a natural feature of the locality” (1872). The source of this quotation is an issue of Notes and Queries (see Kerslake 1872 in the References), in which there is a short article discussing the lexical element -hoe found in place names. It is to be noted that in written form, hoe usually occurs today as a part of a word (e.g. Pinhoe), and we could therefore extend the OED definition of ‘fossil’ so as to apply not only to phrases of one sort or another but also to single-word lexical units.

The word ‘fossil’ is also used by Greenough and Kittredge (1901 – the source of another OED citation), who devote a chapter of their book to the notion of linguistic fossil (pp. 193–218), including both grammatical and lexical phenomena. The following is an expanded version of the OED citation, taken directly from the original work (p. 195): “English abounds in such fossils, and they are of every conceivable kind. Sometimes a word or a meaning has become obsolete except in an idiom or two, which, however, are still in common use. Again, an old construction, once widespread, has died out in general, but still lingers in a few phrases. So also an old grammatical form may occasionally survive, because it has become petrified, as it were, in a single expression or a small group of words”. Note that the authors say “a word or a meaning has become obsolete”, extending the notion of ‘fossil’ still further to include specific senses of words.

Another word sometimes found in the literature with the same meaning as ‘fossil’ is ‘relic’, used, for example, by Burridge (2002: 79–84), and Wray (2009: 33), who refers to ‘etymological relics’. See also the entries for relic (4e) and relict (3f) in OED3.

2. Aims and methodology of the on-going study

Whereas various authors have exemplified the notion of ‘lexical fossil’ and discussed a certain number of individual cases, I am not aware of any in-depth study of the phenomenon. The present study aims to fill this gap, examining a sufficient number of lexical items to be able to provide a more detailed account of the characteristics of fossils and how they may be compared with other, related phenomena. Fossils can be studied from the perspective of any historical period: the present study takes present-day English as its starting point, and more specifically British English. Furthermore, it is concerned primarily with fossils surviving in phraseological units or compounds, and not with those which are found in particular regional varieties or in local dialects. Thus, for example, the word poke is of interest as a component of the phrase to buy a pig in a poke, but not by virtue of its still being used in

¹ The OED was consulted on line and, where I consider it useful to specify the edition, it will be cited in the form OED2 or OED3, according to which of the two is the more recent edition for a specific entry.

some regions to refer to ‘a bag’. An example of the latter usage quoted in OED3 is “nothing else on the road but taxis and discarded chip pokes” (1996).²

A first methodological aspect of the study is, of necessity, the collecting of fossils (or rather those items which could turn out to be fossils or have something in common with them). This part of the work is being carried out in four different ways. Firstly, the relevant linguistic literature is being consulted, including both historically oriented studies and synchronically focussed studies in which lexico-phraseological, as well as morphological, anomalies are discussed. This literature includes Burridge 2002 and 2004, Crystal 2010, Durkin 2009, Ekwall 1960, Gledhill & Frath 2005, Greenough & Kittredge 1901, Makkai 1972, Moon 1998, and Wood 1986.

Secondly, specific lexicographical works have been “read” in order to locate items of interest; these are Flavell and Flavell 1993 and 2006, dealing with proverbs and idioms respectively, and Room 1986, which focusses on changes in word meaning. One general dictionary (CODCE — see References) has also been perused, though less intensively than the other dictionaries.

Thirdly, searches have been carried out in the OED for specific meta-linguistic annotations such as ‘arch[aic] exc[ept]’. This was not always as useful or efficient as had been hoped. For example, the search for ‘obs[olete] exc[ep]l’ resulted in more than 1400 hits, many of which were of little relevance to the current investigation, for example because the ‘obsolescence’ related to very specific sub-senses of a given word.

Finally, specific short texts have been consulted, texts which can be seen as forming part of the cultural (and linguistic) heritage of the English-speaking world. These include religious texts (e.g., prayers, hymns and carols), short literary texts (specifically, famous poems and theatrical speeches, e.g., Sea-Fever and “To be, or not to be”), nursery rhymes, and traditional songs. There were a number of reasons why such texts were considered to be useful objects of study. Firstly, it had been noted that many such texts include archaic words, and therefore at least some members of the language community will regularly use, or at least come into contact with, the words in question. Secondly, the texts, or parts thereof, are easily memorized thanks to their formulaic nature (brevity, ritualistic repetition, musical or rhythmic qualities) and could therefore be considered as extended phraseological units in which the ‘fossils’ are embedded.

Once an item of potential interest has been identified, it is inserted into a database. The unique items in the database are not the fossil-like words themselves, but the larger items in which they have been found. This allows for instances where a particular fossil occurs in more than one item. Thus, for example, “ado” is currently to be found twice in the database, at the entries for without further/more ado and much ado about nothing. Occasionally, the ‘unique’ larger item appears more than once. This happens when it is the ‘container’ for more than one fossil-like item: examples are the phrases hither and thither and to plight one’s troth.

Information on both past and present usage of a (potential) fossil is being recorded. Information on past usage is important especially in order to verify that the lexical element which is perceived as a fossil was in fact used in the past as a (relatively) independent lexical item. Information on current usage is necessary in order to help verify that an item is in fact as highly restricted as it first appears. Evidence for past usage is being obtained primarily from the OED, while information on current usage comes from a variety of sources, especially corpus-based dictionaries, a corpus of modern British English (the British National Corpus, hereafter BNC),³ on-line encyclopedic sources such as Wikipedia, and the OED itself. In the rest of this paper I will give an account of some of the points which have so far emerged from the study.

² For some discussion of the history of the word poke (in the sense of “bag”), see Durkin 2009, 62–68.
³ The BNC is a corpus of c.100 million orthographic words comprising a variety of text types from the latter part of the 20th century. The corpus consists of roughly 90% written and 10% transcribed spoken language. Further details may be found at the BNC website (at the time of writing, http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk).
3. The linguistic containers of fossils

3.1. Fossils in lexical phrases

Most of the fossils so far identified occur within phraseological units of one sort or another, rather than single words. A considerable variety of phrasal types are involved, as can be seen from the examples which follow. In each case the fossil itself is indicated in small capitals, and following the phrase, there is a historical citation (OED) in which today’s fossil is used as a freer word:

1. Proverb: Never cast a CLOUT till May be out; “The poor labouring man .. with a few beggarly clouts about him” (1563).
2. Saying (originally a quotation): Never the TWAIN shall meet; “The twain of young lovers have tarried behind” (1843).
3. Metaphor-based idiomatic phrase: to buy a pig in a POKE; “These pokes [of hops] are .. carried .. to the oust-house, where the hops are to be dried.” (1764).
4. Phrasal verb: to FOB off; “They think themselves fobbed by our dextrous policy” (1861).
5. Delexical-verb phrase: to make AMENDS; “I looked forward to an honourable amends” (1821).
6. Other verbal expression: to WEND one’s way; “I may not wende out of my lande, for mine awne sonnes will rise against me, when I were absent.” (1569).
7. Sentence stem: Woe BETIDE ...; “Whatever fortune betides you.” (1832).
8. Binomial noun phrase: HUE and cry; “As soon as M. Lally appeared, a hue was set up by the whole assembly, hisses, pointing, threats and every abusive name” (1779).
9. Noun compound: sea URCHIN; “The poor persecuted creature to which I allude is the Hedge-hog or Urchin.” (1779).
10. Prepositional phrase: under the AEGIS of; “He cast over them the ægis of his own mighty name.” (1878).

3.2. Fossils within words

Fossils which occur within longer words are, usually, much less apparent than those which are themselves written as individual words. The word handKERCHIEF, for example, is not usually perceived of as being composed of two parts. This is probably for more than one reason: firstly, in speech there is only one stressed syllable and there is also loss of the final consonant of hand; secondly, the referent itself is probably more associated with ‘noses’ than with ‘hands’. In contrast to handkerchief, an example of a word where the morphology is more apparent is playWRIGHT, thanks to the clear presence of the word play. An example of the previous, independent, use of the word wright is “Masons and wrights shall soon my house repair” (1725).

With regard to the decision to include single words as ‘fossil containers’, it is worth remembering that at some stage in the past, today’s single-word compounds may well have been written as separate words, (though not necessarily by all writers of the same period). For example, playwright was also written as two separate words or in hyphenated form: “Behold the play wright Barney Bidwell” (1806), “.. this damn’d Trade of a Play-wright” (1677).

Fossils can also constitute the only root element within a word, the other part or parts being affixes of one sort or another (rather than the whole word forming a compound). An example is the verb wit, which forms the basis of words such as unwitting and wittingly (and which elsewhere is found only in the phrase to wit). An example of previous usage is “We wit well of many things that we would never prove” (1876). Stockwell and Minkova (2001: 62) give the examples of feckless, reckless, ruthless, listless, uncouth and unkempt, in which, they say, “a root, which used to be also a word at earlier times, became obsolete or disappeared completely, leaving behind only a derivative”.

3.3. Fossils in proper names and titles

As well as being found in items which make up the lexicon of the language, fossils can also be seen within place names, personal names, and the titles of books, films, etc. These cut across the division between phraseology and single words.

With regard to place names, one fossil has already been mentioned, the word hoe (very visible in the phrasal unit Plymouth Hoe). Another is hurst as in Chislehurst, an example of freer usage being “Each rising hurst, Where many a goodlie Oake had carefullie been nurst” (1612). A further example is the obsolete noun cheap, which has survived in its sense of ‘market’ in the place name Chepstow and the London street names Eastcheap and Cheapside.
Two more familiar-sounding fossils are *mount* and *shire*. With regard to the former, the OED notes that it is “now chiefly poet. or in proper names of mountains or hills, as Mount Vesuvius, Mount Everest, the Mount of Olives, St Michael’s Mount, etc”. An example of former usage is: “We ascended a high mount with a good deal of difficulty, as the path was very slippery” (1806). *Shire* is, of course, now mainly used as part of the names of counties, for example *Yorkshire*, though it is also found in some phrases, notably *shire horse*, *shire county*, *shire district* and *the shires*. Also to be noted is its use in Tolkien’s fictional region *The Shire*. For some further discussion of the morphology of place names, see Ekwall (1960) and Stockwell and Minkova (2001: 33).

Some morphologically complex family names also contain fossils. Examples are the trade-based names *Cartwright* and *Wainwright*, both of which contain the previously mentioned *wright* and the latter of which also contains the fossil *wain*.4

Examples of titles which contain fossils are the book *Through the LOOKING-GLASS*, and What Alice Found There, and the painting *the HayWAIN*. Examples of corresponding previous usage are “Lend me a looking glasse” (1608), and “The wains which carried the ammunition remained at the entrance of the moor” (1849).

3.4. Fossils found in longer stretches of formulaic text

As mentioned in section 2, fossils are also present in some longer formulaic texts. Examples of such texts, together with fossilized lexis, are: (1) From “the Lord’s Prayer”: “H ALLOWED be THY name ...”; (2) From a Christmas carol (*God rest ye merry, gentlemen*): “But when to Bethlehem they came WHEREAT this infant lay”; (3) From a nursery rhyme (*Sing a song of sixpence*): “The king was in his COUNTING-HOUSE, Counting out his money”; (4) From the marriage vows: “With this ring I THEE wed”.

The lexis and phraseology of many such texts is not necessarily used ‘productively’, by which I mean that even if they are recited or sung, the “performer” will quite possibly not be thinking of the meaning of the texts but rather be producing the language automatically. However, the texts undoubtedly help keep alive some language units which might otherwise disappear.

4. Lexical fossils: Further considerations

4.1. The number of phraseological uses

Some fossils are normally found in just one phrase. Examples are the already cited *HUE and cry* and the verbal phrase *take UMBRAGE*. The strong association with one phrase, however, does not mean that other uses of the fossil are not found. The following, for example, is an atypical use of the word *umbrage*: “... leaving Melanie staring after them in umbrage” (BNC).

There are other fossils which are regularly found in a small number of different phrasal environments. The word *ado* has already been mentioned (*without more ado*, *without further ado*, *much ado about nothing*). Other examples are the nouns *heed* (found in *take heed of*, *pay heed to*, *heedless*) and *score* in its numerical sense (*scores of*, *three score years and ten*, *by the score*). A slightly more versatile fossil is the word *nigh*, which, according to OED3 has, “in all senses”, been replaced by *near*, “except in archaic or regional use”. In the BNC, *nigh* is found in five distinct phrasal uses: *nigh on*, *well nigh*, *(well) nigh impossible*, *to draw nigh* and *The end is nigh*. The latter saying (like many sayings—see Moon 1998) is found in a variety of adapted forms, examples from the BNC being: “The end of the world isn’t nigh”, “The beginning is nigh”, and “The end of the financial year was nigh”.

4.2. Fossils and part of speech

Some words which we might choose to label as fossils are made more familiar by the presence in the language of a word of the ‘same’ meaning but functioning as a different part of speech. An example

---

4 Morphologically simpler names derived from the names for trades people could also be viewed as fossils of a sort. Examples are *Brewster*, *Cooper* and *Fletcher* (in contrast with, for example, *Baker* and *Butcher*, which are still used as common nouns).
is the noun content (=contentment), found almost exclusively in the phrase to your heart’s content (as well as forming the root of discontent). The word content, however, also functions as a fairly autonomous (i.e., not phraseologically bound) adjective and verb, and therefore we might prefer to consider the noun content as at least a different sort of fossil from, for example, ado or umbrage.

4.3. Lexical fossils, homonymy, and word meaning

Some of the ‘fossils’ mentioned so far have homographic counterparts, and some of the homographic pairs (or sets) belong to the same part of speech category. This is the case, for example, of the nouns clout, hue, and poke, where the meanings and origins of the various homographs are quite distinct from one another. This is also true for the word-form urchin, though in this case there is a difference. The two homonyms, the modern meaning, referring to a person, and the original meaning of “hedgehog”, are etymologically connected, the former deriving from the latter.

Another example of distinct meanings of what is, historically, the ‘same word’ is provided by the very common adjective quick. Despite its frequency in contemporary English, it too could be considered as a fossil when used in phrases and words in which its former meaning of ‘living’ can still be seen. Examples of adjectival uses are quicklime and quicksilver, and of nominal uses, the quick and the dead and cut (etc.) someone to the quick.

An interesting case is provided by the word gay, which, despite having changed its primary meaning very recently, could also be considered as a fossil in the phrase with gay abandon. (For some discussion of the recent history of the word gay, see Burridge 2004, pp. 58–62, and Sampson 1980, pp. 56–60). Note too that the adverb gaily has not changed in the same way as the adjective.

However, where different senses are involved, it is not always clear whether to consider a particular use of a word as a fossil. In the phrase in broad daylight, for example, the word broad is used in an idiosyncratic way, from a contemporary perspective, but OED2 includes enough analogous usages to create a specific sub-sense for the word broad (sense 4b). Should we then consider this modern use of broad to be a lexico-semantic fossil? It would certainly help synchronic description to do so; the important thing is that we specify what sort of fossil we are dealing with. A similar case is the use of the word fact in the phrases accessory before the fact and accessory after the fact (see OED2, sense 1c).

Finally, it should be noted that etymologically connected word pairs may in fact have different graphic and phonological forms (and therefore be considered as different words). This is the case of the already mentioned fossil wain and its more normal contemporary equivalent wagon.

4.4. Was the ‘fossil’ always phraseologically confined?

A much quoted fossil is the word dudgeon, as in the phrase in high dudgeon. However, in OED2 we read that dudgeon is found, “Almost always in phr. in dudgeon, and esp. with qualifying adj., as high, great, deep”. Furthermore, there is no certainty as to the origin of the word dudgeon. The question then arises as to whether we can really view dudgeon as a fossil, since we have no evidence that it was ever a relatively free language component. (See also comments made by Moon 1998: 80). The word kilter, as in out of kilter, has similar characteristics to dudgeon.

Other fossil-like words are even more restricted in their past usage, at least in the documentation available. Such a word is scuff, and its variant scruff. These are now usually found in the phrase by the scruff of the neck, and appear always to have been used in this way.

4.5. How noticeable are fossils?

The question of how noticeable fossils are has already been discussed (3.2) in relation to items contained within single words (e.g., playWRIGHT, unWITting). It is also, however, of relevance to fossils found within phrases. Some are words which strike us immediately, as in by dint of, take umbrage, and on tenterhooks. Others are less evident because their forms are more familiar, thanks to homonyms or part-of-speech equivalents. Several examples have already been seen (e.g. hue and poke); a much more
frequent word form is *let*, which, as a noun, is a fossil in the phrase *without let or hindrance*. Some fossils, as Moon points out (1998: 79) “look less peculiar” because of their compositional or morphemic structure. One example is the word *outset*, usage of which is now restricted to the phrases *at the outset* and *from the outset*. Another is the word *highness*, as in “Your Highness”, etc. (cf. Wray 2008: 190).

High-frequency function words constitute a special category. Examples can be seen fossilized in the following phrases: *Hell HATH no fury like a woman scorned*, *I THEE wed*, for *THINE is the kingdom*, ..., *Ye of little faith*. Such words are immediately and obviously ‘old words’. At the same time, however, they will appear very familiar to many people, both because of their phraseological and formulaic uses, and because of their frequent use in well-known texts such as the King James Bible and Shakespearean plays. They also have the characteristic of being easily associative with modern equivalents.

4.6. Phrase-dependent words other than fossils

There are some unusual looking words which might appear at first glance to be fossils, but which in fact turn out to be the product of some completely different process. One such word is *trove*, as in *treasure trove*. It is currently found almost exclusively within this phrase, though occasionally on its own and with the same meaning as the whole (e.g., “... he presented the Center with a trove of illuminated books ...”, BNC). The phrase *treasure trove*, however, is nothing more than the English rendering of a French phrase which in modern spelling would be represented as *trésor trouvé*. Thus, the word *trove*, rather than antedating the phrase, is merely a shortened form of it.

Another interesting case is that of the word *tod* in the phrase *on your tod* (meaning ‘alone’), which, far from being a fossil, is the product of rhyming slang. The lexical form behind this expression is *on your own*, and the last word of this phrase (own) has been assigned the rhyme “Tod Sloane” (the name of an American jockey). In accordance with usual rhyming slang formation, the second (rhyming) element in “Tod Sloane” has been deleted, thus leaving the phrase *on your tod*.

4.7. Other ways in which ‘old’ words survive in the present

Before concluding this survey of primarily phrase-bound lexical fossils, it is worth remembering that there are a number of other ways in which words belonging mainly to the past are still found in contemporary English. First, as has been mentioned above, there are words which survive in regional or dialectal varieties. The example was given of the noun *poke*; another is the verb *ken*. Secondly, and conceptually very similar to the first, there are words which survive in certain sociological varieties. Examples are the word *wheresoever* used in legal language, *furlong* used in horse-racing, and *verily* found in biblical readings. A third way in which old words are used in modern English is through the medium of modern texts which describe the past; these could either be factual descriptions, or historical novels. To exemplify with reference to the latter, in the first chapter of a “Cadfael” novel by Ellis Peters, we find the words *charnel house*, *corsairs*, *hospitaller*, *infirmarer*, *shires*, and *yeoman*.

5. Concluding remarks

The compilation of a database of lexical fossils, and the use of textual evidence from both the past and the present, is providing interesting data regarding the individual fossils, the fossil ‘containers’, and the general concept of ‘lexical fossil’. The latter is by no means a single phenomenon and needs to be described with reference to a number of different parameters.

The study of fossils (both lexical and grammatical) is important from the point of view of both diachronic and synchronic description. With regard, in particular, to the latter perspective, I believe that the historical explanations for supposedly anomalous phenomena can play an important part in synchronic description, whether “pure” descriptive analysis or from a second language learning point of view (and see Bennett 1997). The development of computerized text corpora has led to great advances
in the description of English, especially lexico-grammatical, but at the same time it has drawn attention away from the important role played by the past in creating, and also explaining, the present.
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