

which is derived from UniDicDB and can attach the hierarchical structure of *UniDic* to each word in an input plain unsegmented text automatically (<https://unidic.ninjal.ac.jp/>). Only UniDicMA is open to the public, whereas all other UniDics are not accessible outside NINJAL.

In this paper, we discuss what is a ‘new word’ in Japanese, our hierarchical definition of word indexes, and how to register new words in UniDicDB using UniDicExplorer.

Keywords: electronic dictionary, Japanese, corpus, annotation, database system, morphological analyzer, neologisms

Adding neologisms to the Hebrew online dictionary *Rav-Milim*

Noga Porath



Noga Porath has studied at the Department of Hebrew Language in Tel-Aviv University, and received a PhD for her dissertation examining metaphors in the language of developmental cognitive psychology and special education in 2017. She is a lexicographer at

Melingo Ltd, which publishes online the Hebrew dictionary *Rav-Milim* and the English/Hebrew dictionary *Morfix*.

nogap@melingo.com

This paper describes the process of finding Hebrew neologisms and adding them to the online dictionary *Rav-Milim*. The editorial board of the dictionary uses different methods to find such neologisms, including crowdsourcing (suggestions from users), and tracking new terms in the media and in official announcements by the Academy of the Hebrew Language. We discuss the criteria and methodology for adding new words to the dictionary, with emphasis on the decision-making process of labelling foreign words (mainly from English) as neologisms in Hebrew. Various kinds of neologisms have been added to the dictionary in recent years: new technological terms, including terms for new tools and appliances (רַחֲפָן, *rachfan*, ‘drone’); internet and social media slang; terms that have emerged in recent years in media coverage of news events; terms that have arisen in recent general discourse regarding new concepts (מֵזוֹן-עַל, *mezon-al*, ‘superfood’); new military terms; neologisms added by the Academy of the Hebrew Language, some of which are the equivalents of existing loanwords. Most of these types of neologisms include loanwords, that are mainly borrowed from English.

Our dictionary is a practical, descriptive tool rather than an etymological documentation project. Therefore, new words in the dictionary are, in general, not indicated as such, though we do note whether a neologism has been formally suggested by the Academy of the Hebrew

GWLN 2019. Globalex Workshop on Lexicography and Neologism <https://globalex.link/events/workshops/gwln2019/>

DSNA. Dictionary Society of North America <https://dictionaryofsociety.com/>

DSNA 22. 22nd biennial meeting of the Dictionary Society of North America <https://indiana.edu/~iucweb/dsna/>

DICTIONARIES. Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America <https://dictionaryofsociety.com/journal/>

GLOBALEX. Global Association for Lexicography <http://globalex.link/>

Language. These neologisms are linked to earlier loanwords with the same meaning.

Rav-Milim has also added new meanings to existing entries. New technological meanings have emerged in words like אָנָן (*anan*, ‘cloud’). In other cases, existing terms have been replaced with new ones due to considerations of political correctness in contexts such as gender and disability.

Keywords: neologisms, Hebrew, foreign words, internet slang

The formation of neologisms in a lesser used language: The case of Frisian

Hindrik Sijens and Hans Van de Velde

Hindrik Sijens studied Frisian language and



literature and lexicography at the University of Amsterdam, and has written on neologisms, spelling and lexicography. He is a lexicographer at the Fryske Akademy at Leeuwarden/Ljouwert, and currently serves as editor of the

Online Dutch-Frisian Dictionary and of *Taalweb*, a website with Frisian language tools such as online dictionaries, spelling tools and automatic translation.

hsijens@fryske-akademy.nl

Hans Van de Velde is chair of sociolinguistics at



Utrecht University, and specializes in language variation and change and in standardization processes.

He is a senior researcher at the Fryske Akademy, focusing on Frisian, Dutch and the mixed varieties spoken in Friesland, and is

responsible for the development of Frisian language tools such as online dictionaries, spelling tools, automatic translation and speech recognition.

hvdvelde@fryske-akademy.nl

Frisian is the language spoken in the Dutch Province of Friesland. Its approximately 440,000 speakers use it mainly for informal and oral communication. Dutch is the official language in the Netherlands, also in Friesland. With approximately 24 million speakers worldwide, Dutch is used in almost all areas of society. It is a widely supported standard language with a large written production.

Frisian has a limited tradition as a written language and consequently has a large number of lexical gaps. For many Dutch or international concepts, there are simply no Frisian equivalents. When it comes to new words, Frisian does not keep pace with Dutch either. Because of the limited use of Frisian and the omnipresence of Dutch, there are almost no spontaneously formed Frisian neologisms. Dutch neologisms often have a Frisian equivalent that is based on Dutch or no equivalent at all. Sometimes Dutch words are adopted literally, sometimes they are adapted in the pronunciation or replaced by a loan translation. Because Frisians live in a dominant Dutch context and have an excellent command of this language (as opposed to [written] Frisian), they easily adopt Dutch neologisms.

However, there is an unmistakable, partly ideologically-driven, effort towards a certain standardization in written language, which creates a need for Frisian variants of neologisms. This endeavour to purify Frisian has an impact on the treatment of neologisms in dictionaries. The a-symmetrical bilingual situation outlined above also has its impact on the spontaneous creation of Frisian neologisms and their subsequent incorporation in dictionaries of Frisian.

De Fryske Akademy is working on an extensive bilingual online Dutch-Frisian production dictionary (ONFW). That dictionary has a large, standardized, autonomous language, as its source language, whereas the target language is small, dependent, and far less standardized. The macrostructure of the contemporary *Algemeen Nederlands Woordenboek* (ANW) is the basis for that of ONFW, which means that the ONFW mainly incorporates neologisms identified by ANW. The Fryske Akademy also has at its disposal a corpus of bilingual news items (Dutch and Frisian). This is an interesting source, because the news editors constantly have to think of Frisian equivalents for neologisms from mostly Dutch-language news.

In this paper we discuss the possibilities there are for forming Frisian neologisms, as well as the ideological responsibility of the lexicographer to form neologisms that have the greatest potential to be accepted by the language user, as only widely accepted neologisms contribute to the vitality of Frisian.

Keywords: Frisian, Dutch, lesser used language, dominant language, language ideology, purification, standardization, bilingual dictionary

References

- van der Kuip, F. and Visser, W. 2018. Introduction. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 31.2.1. 127–131. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecy005>
- Sijens, H. 2004. Neologismen yn it Frysk, 'Wat wy net hawwe, dat liene wy'. *It Beaken*, 66.3-4, 256-298.

Anglicisms and language-internal neologisms: Dealing with new words and expressions in *The Danish Dictionary*

Lars Trap-Jensen



Lars Trap-Jensen has a background in general linguistics, Greenlandic, and social studies. Since 1994 he has been working as a practical lexicographer at the Society for Danish Language and Literature, Copenhagen, since 2003 as the managing editor of *The Danish Dictionary* and the dictionary site *ordnet.dk*. He is a former president of Euralex and currently serves as its representative on the Globalex management committee.
ltj@dsl.dk

The corpus-based online *The Danish Dictionary* contains just over 100,000 entries. The dictionary is updated on a regular basis, with batches published two or three times a year. Whenever a new batch is released, it almost certainly becomes the object of public attention. The media love new words and usually assume that a new word in the dictionary is also a new word in the language – a neologism. Of course, popular belief is far from the truth: many newly published words have been in the language for a long time, but were perhaps too infrequent to be included previously.

Given their popularity, neologisms are obviously interesting for the dictionary staff, and in this paper I analyse the ones that have been included recently, and consider whether special selection criteria should apply. The editors do not use a specific method to detect neologisms in particular, but we have, on the one hand, various tools to assist us in finding lemma candidates in general, and on the other, we can analyse the batches that have already been published in recent years. I pursue both these approaches, addressing questions such as the following:

- What broad types of neologisms exist and what are their characteristics?
- How does the pressure from English affect the vocabulary of the dictionary?
- Are Anglicisms dominant or used increasingly over time as compared with language-internal neologisms? Does globalisation promote the import of words from other languages, too?
- Do dictionary users suggest and look up neologisms, and in particular Anglicisms, more often than other words?

Although the notion of 'neologism' pertains to a range of linguistic phenomena, in this context I confine myself to words and multiword expressions as (potential) entries.

Keywords: corpus-based lexicography, lemma selection criteria, Anglicisms, dictionary use, neologisms