

**BEYOND THE DESCRIPTIVE-PRESCRIPTIVE CLINE:
ENCODING LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY IN *HOBSON-JOBSON*,
A VICTORIAN DICTIONARY OF INDIAN ENGLISH**

Rita Queiroz de Barros*

Abstract: This paper considers the presence of language ideology in dictionaries through both prescriptive bias and descriptive procedures. To that purpose, it examines the example provided by *Hobson-Jobson*, a dictionary of Indian English first published in England in 1886, and it investigates how this work encodes imperialistic language ideology. Two major tenets of Victorian language ideology are considered in particular – standard British English superiority and the global status of English – and shown to be overtly or covertly reflected in both the paratexts (title, preface, introductory remarks) and lexicographic text (word list, definitions and translated illustrative quotations). Ideological stance is thus identified in both prescriptive and descriptive procedures, and *Hobson-Jobson* is thus shown to be a good example of how the ideological bias in dictionaries extends beyond the descriptive-prescriptive cline.

Keywords: *Hobson-Jobson*, language ideology, world English, descriptivism, prescriptivism

1. Introduction

The descriptive paradigm of modern lexicography originated in the historical dictionaries of 19th-century Europe. It was in this lexicographic genre that, for the first time, “evidence rather than opinion would form the basis for definition”, with chronologically ordered quotations allowing words to tell their own story and meaning (Mugglestone 2011: n.p.); in Archbishop Trench’s famous words (1857: 4), the lexicographer became “an historian [...], not a critic”. Since then, the development of procedures governing good practice in lexicography has been dominated by the purpose to fulfil this descriptive aim, which has become the undisputed paradigm of dictionary-making. However, it is clear by now that “dictionaries continue to prescribe explicitly or implicitly” (Benson 2001: n.p.). In other words, description and prescription have proved not to exclude each other in lexicography, constituting instead the opposite extremes of a cline along which dictionaries can be positioned, closer to or further away from the descriptive ideal (see e.g. Mugglestone 2016). Although an element of normativity will always be present in dictionaries (Zgusta 1971: 211), also because the common reader expects them to be rule books, metalexical critique tends to attribute prescriptivism to lexicographers’ inability to escape bias resulting from their ideological stance as members of a historically situated community. Commenting on the *Oxford English Dictionary* (hereafter, *OED*), which was projected to be a descriptive account of English, Beal claims prescriptivism is brought in “by the back door” (2004: 62), showing how it is taken in the literature as a prejudiced diversion, albeit inescapable, from the intended descriptive aims of lexicographic practice.

However, prejudice can also find a place in pure descriptive procedures, with ideology permeating dictionaries beyond their prescriptive components (see, e.g. Buzon

* University of Lisbon Centre for English Studies; ritaqueirozbarros@letras.ulisboa.pt.

1979, Benson 2001). The aim of this paper is to present and discuss an example of this fact – *Hobson-Jobson*, a dictionary of Indian English – considering how it hosts two tenets of the linguistic ideology of its Victorian context (standard language ideology and the belief in the world status of English). To this purpose, it will draw on the semiotics and critical theory of the dictionary (summarized in Benson 2001); rely on previous insights into the linguistic ideology of the Victorian period (in particular Bailey 1991 and Watts 2011); and make use of preceding analyses of *Hobson-Jobson*, especially of its thorough description by Lambert (2014, 2018a, 2018b), to which this paper is much indebted.

2. *Hobson-Jobson*: The lexicon of British India

Hobson-Jobson (hereafter, *HJ*) is the shorter version of a much longer title – *Hobson-Jobson: A Glossary of Anglo-Indian Colloquial Words and Phrases, and of Kindred Terms, Etymological, Historical, Geographical, and Discursive* – first published in London in 1886. It was authored by Colonel Henry Yule (1820–1889), a retired military engineer who served for a long time in India and presided over the Hakluyt Society (1877–1889), and by Arthur Coke Burnell (1840–1882), a judge and renowned specialist in Sanskrit and southern Indian languages stationed in India for two decades (Teltscher 2013, Lambert 2014). Burnell died before the glossary was published, so it was Yule who organised and edited the material into book form and produced the paratextual sections. The authorship of the work has always been credited to both, despite a complex textual history outlined by Lambert (2014: 165-167).

The variety described in *HJ*, identified by the then common but linguistically dubious term “Anglo-Indian”, is explained by Yule in his “Introductory Remarks”: it is the language spoken by “the English in India” (1886b: xv), thus excluding the specificities of English as used by natives of India¹. Despite this ethnic restriction, Anglo-Indian was still spoken by an extensive community, as India included at the time not only the Republic of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh, independent from each other only after the 1947 Partition, but also all or parts of present-day Afghanistan, Myanmar, Nepal and Sri Lanka (Lambert 2018a: 250), all under British dominion at roughly the same time.

For this reason, Anglo-Indian glossaries were already a familiar lexicographic product when Yule and Burnell started their work. Various of those glossaries are acknowledged, used and listed as references in *HJ* (Yule 1886b: xxiii-xiv), including Whitworth’s (1885) *Anglo-Indian Dictionary*, which appeared just six months earlier (Lambert 2014: 120). *HJ* proved, however, to be very innovative: in the first place, because it was a historical dictionary, then a fairly recent type (Mugglestone 2011: n.p.) and certainly so in England (such a project was first envisioned in Trench 1857 and the first volume of the future *OED*, covering the entries *A – Ant*, was published in 1888); *HJ* was innovative, in the second place, because it was not only utilitarian, like the other Anglo-Indian glossaries, but aimed instead to combine instruction and accuracy with

¹ In this sense, Anglo-Indian is first attested, according to the *OED*, in the second edition of Hotten’s *A Dictionary of Modern Slang, Cant and Vulgar Words*, dated 1860.

interest and amusement (Yule 1886a: x). Therefore, it included: the official jargon of the Raj, e.g. *collector*, “the chief administrative official of an Indian District” (Yule et al. 1903: 235); entries of an encyclopaedic nature, e.g. *Macao*, “the name applied by the Portuguese to the small peninsula and the city built on it, near the mouth of Canton River” (Yule et al. 1903: 526); informal terms, e.g. *anna*, “the 16th of the rupee [...] also sometimes applied colloquially to persons of mixed parentage” as in “Such a one has at least 2 annas of dark blood.” (Yule et al. 1903: 32); slang, e.g. *ditch*, *ditcher*, “disparaging sobriquets for Calcutta and its European citizens” (Yule et al. 1903: 319).

HJ was thus more than a glossary of Indianisms. It proved to be a profoundly learned work, as evidenced by the quantity (812) and nature of the sources in the “List of Fuller Titles of Books Quoted in the Glossary” (1903: xxvii-xlii), and combined serious philological work (see e.g. Kachru 1973, Teltscher 2013) with commentary and entertainment.

Maybe because of this heterogeneous nature, *HJ* was an editorial success from the start. It was surely well received by experts, since Yule’s work has been shown to have “contributed significantly to the information that *OED1* presented about South Asian words”, with “50% to 75% of those entries show[ing] evidence of Yule’s influence” (Nagle 2014: 280); it also was acclaimed by the press, with a review describing it as “an excellent book”, “full of interest both to the scholar and the general reader, to every Englishman sojourning to the East but also to every intelligent person at home” (“Homeward Mail from India, China and the East”, 6/4/1886: 3-4); and it met with an enthusiastic reception of the reading public, so that the original edition, with a print run of 1000 copies, was soon followed by a second one.

Dated 1903, the new edition included the revisions of a third editor, William Crooke. Traditionally undervalued, Crooke’s revisions were shown by Lambert (2014: 259-263) to include new entries, new illustrative quotations, additional comments (amounting to c. 12% of the text), and increased accuracy in the lexicographic details provided. It was this second edition – including 2467 entries covering 3813 lexical items and 4332 separate definitions – that was often reprinted: fourteen times in full until 2017, including ten facsimile reprints since 1960, issued in England, India, and the United States. For this reason, this is the edition quoted in this paper, from a facsimile copy available at the Internet Archive.

As the publishing history just sketched makes clear, *HJ* remains of contemporary relevance. It is still widely available and, more importantly, still perceived as “the pinnacle of Indian English lexicography” (Lambert 2014: 2)². It has attracted the attention not only of academics and the common reader, but also, and explicitly, of renowned writers such as Salman Rushdie (1991: 81-83) and Amitav Gosh (2008), both “drawn to the hybrid language of *Hobson-Jobson*” while “fashioning a literary Indian English” (Teltscher, 2013: n.p.)³. This long-lasting success of Yule and Burnell’s glossary is a noteworthy achievement, since it happens despite its outdated coverage and spelling, its lexicographic deficiencies (for a summary see Lambert 2018a: 250), and clear

² An important addition to the lexicography of Indian English was published in 2017 (Carls et al. 2017), but *HJ* has not lost its central role.

³ For a critique of the influence of *HJ* on Rushdie see Mishra (2009).

ethnocentric and imperialistic bias – discussed by e.g. Anand (2011) and candidly displayed by the authors in the following lines of the “Introductory Remarks” (Yule 1886b: xxi):

Taking our subject as whole, however considerable the philological interest attaching to it, there is no disputing the truth of a remark with which Burnell’s [...] intended introduction concludes [...]: “Considering the long intercourse with India, it is noteworthy that the additions which have thus accrued to the English language are, from the intellectual standpoint, of no intrinsic value. Nearly all the borrowed words refer to material facts, or to peculiar customs and stages of society, and, though a few of them furnish allusions to the penny-a-liner, they do not represent new ideas.

3. Victorian language ideology

Emerging from the Ethnography of Speaking school developed in the 1960s (Irvine 2012), the concept of language ideology is now pivotal in Sociolinguistics. Defined by Swann et al. (2004: 171) as “set(s) of attitudes and beliefs about language, underpinned by certain cultural or social values”, language ideologies are shaped from and help construct the social structures and the power relations in speech communities. So, though consisting specifically of collections of beliefs about language, language varieties, their users and their uses, linguistic ideologies are linked to and dependent on the broader political, social and cultural systems in which they emerge. The ethnocentric and imperialistic worldview characterising Victorian England thus necessarily modelled the linguistic ideology of the period. The purpose of this section is to elaborate on this statement by identifying particular features of that language ideology encoded in *HJ*.

Though under other titles, Victorian language ideology has been treated in various sources. A critical summary of those analyses goes far beyond the purposes of this section, which intends to highlight the features of that ideology emerging as dominant. In this process, it will ignore complexities and tensions that a more ambitious picture would necessarily involve. To this purpose, a few lines from Romaine’s introduction to volume IV of *The Cambridge History of English* (1998: 1) prove the ideal starting point:

In the nineteenth century and early part of the twentieth, the success of England as an imperial nation combined with romantic ideas about language being the expression of a people’s genius would engender a triumphalist and patriotic attitude to English [...]. The language was now not so much to be improved but preserved as a great national monument and defended from threat.

Based on this description and on concepts and insights presented in Milroy & Milroy 2012, Bailey 1991, and Watts 2011, two dominant components of Victorian language ideology stand out. The first one is standard language ideology, i.e., the “culturally dominant belief that there is only one correct way of speaking” (Swann et al.

2004: 296). That variety, the “great national monument” no longer in need of improvement but purely of protection, in Romaine’s description quoted above, was not simply standard English – already used by some, pursued by many, and actively prescribed by all kinds of tools of linguistic guidance (Tieken-Boon Van Ostade 2020). It was, more precisely, British standard English. In fact, at this stage, extraterritorial Englishes were already developing, so standard English ideology encompassed a centre-periphery and imperialistic view of the English language. It involved the perception of colonial varieties as “illegitimate offspring”, in Mufwene’s (2001: 182) well-known description, and was characterized by a firm belief in the superiority of British standard English⁴.

This conviction is in line with the triumphalist attitude additionally pointed out by Romaine, which is the basis of the understanding of English as a world language long before it became one. Described by Watts as a “modern myth” (2011: 259), the global status of English originated as an idea in the mid-19th century, as English was being construed “as an imperial language preeminent among others”, “destined to become the language of the world” (Watts 2011: 261). A search through grammar books and histories of English from around 1850 reveals an increasing number of references predicting this status for the language. Bailey (1991: 107-118) lists an impressive number of 19th-century quotations from these and other types of texts addressing the topic in more and less fanciful ways. The alleged global status of English is often sustained with statistical data on the demographics of English-speaking countries, an interestingly modern approach. The defenders of this view failed however to acknowledge the multilingual status of African and Asian colonies and the low penetration of English besides the governing elites (e.g. Axon 1888: 204). Furthermore, practical policies for the construction of the global role of English are suggested at this stage: that is the case of a work candidly entitled *A Scheme for Making the English Language the International Language of the World* (Bradshaw 1847), which, although described by an anonymous contemporary reviewer as “a curious instance of ignorance and incapacity” (Anon. 1848: 82), discloses the extent of the ideological stance under discussion.

Although mainly stated by the English, understandably enthusiastic at the height of British imperialism, the belief that the English language deserved worldwide spread was curiously sanctioned by foreigners, and even justified by them by reference not only to statistics but to the intrinsic merits of the language. That is the well-known case of Jakob Grimm, who claimed in an 1851 speech delivered to the Royal Academy of Berlin and soon reported in England that “of all modern languages, not one has acquired such great length and vigour as the English”, so it “may be called justly a Language of the World: and seems, like the English nation, to be destined to reign in the future with still more extensive sway over all parts of the globe” (quoted and translated in S. H. 1853).

The two dominant ideological strands just outlined shared motivations in an imperialistic context. Interestingly, history has proven them to conflict at times, as the

⁴ For less-known contemporary testimonies of condescending attitudes to extraterritorial Englishes see, e.g. the articles entitled “Canton-English” (Milne, 1857) and “Depravations of English” (Anon, 1863) published in *All the Year Round* and *Household Words*, two weekly magazines edited by Charles Dickens and available from *Dickens Journals Online*.

spread of English involved its continuing adaptation to new linguistic ecologies. Signs of this tension are naturally present in *HJ*, as a work devoted to the description of a new Asian variety.

4. Encoding language ideology in *HJ*

As a historically situated product, *HJ* was bound to be conditioned by the ideological construction of English described above, namely the beliefs in British standard superiority and in English as a world language. Following metalexicographical practice and considering in particular Benson's (2001) description of the semiotics of the dictionary, illustrative evidence will be taken from paratexts – title, preface to the first edition, introductory remarks – and text – wordlist, definitions and citations. All instances of language ideology encoding mentioned below are mere examples, no exhaustivity being claimed.

4.1 British standard superiority

The belief in British standard superiority, an obvious consequence of the ethnocentric bias in place in Victorian England, can be found in the very first words of the glossary: its main title, *Hobson-Jobson*. This intriguing choice was so peculiar that Yule felt the need to explain it in his Preface, included in both editions, and did it in the following terms (1886a: ix):

It seemed to me that 'a glossary' or 'a vocabulary' would be [...] unattractive and that it ought to have an alternative title at least a little more characteristic. If the reader will turn to *Hobson-Jobson* in the glossary itself, he will find that phrase, though now rare and moribund, to be a typical and delightful example of that class of Anglo-Indian argot which consists of Oriental words highly assimilated, perhaps by **vulgar lips, to the English vernacular**; whilst it is the more fitted to our book, conveying as it may, a veiled intimation of authorship (emphasis added).

The allegedly prime intention of attracting readers by means of a "rare and moribund" Anglo-Indian word, which would make the title choice a marketing strategy, is called into question by the reference to "vulgar lips" and "English vernacular" as channel and recipient of the lexical borrowing. The latter expressions sound critical of the Indian non-standard variety described in the dictionary, a possibility that was thoroughly examined and confirmed by Nagle (2010). Bearing on various archival sources, Nagle shows that Yule and Burnell kept their title choice from editor and friends until the final proofs were ready, and traces negative comments about the title in contemporary and otherwise extremely complimentary reviews; furthermore, Nagle highlights the fact that reduplication was already infantilizing or disparaging in English, and shows, with evidence taken from the *OED* and dated from 1607 onwards, that the cultural associations of the name *Hobson* and the collocate *Hobson and Jobson* were very unflattering in Victorian England, meaning "at best, yokes, and, at worst, idiots" (Nagle 2010: 122).

Hence, the choice of *HJ* could hardly be attributed to plain commercial aims, disclosing instead a pejorative and offensive view of Indians and of Indian English, and thereby the belief in the superiority of the British standard⁵.

This tenet of Victorian language ideology is also traceable in the clarification of the object of the glossary. As explained by Yule (1886b: xv-xvi), *HJ* was “intended to deal with all that class of words” used in the “daily intercourse of the English in India, either as expressing ideas really not provided for by our mother-tongue, or supposed by the speakers (often quite erroneously) to express something not capable of just denotation by any English term”. In other words, the authors chose to describe the variety of Indian English which was closer to the British standard – that used by the English and in need of not so many additions. As a consequence, despite *HJ*’s long-lasting role as a reference for Indian English, it includes almost no examples of the English used by speakers of Asian descent. Its authors in fact showed contempt for the English spoken by Indians, as indicated by the definition of the entry *Butler-English*, quoted below with added emphases in the most ideologically marked sections (Yule et al. 1903: 133-134):

BUTLER-ENGLISH. The **broken** English spoken by native servants in the Madras Presidency; which is **not very much better than the Pigeon-English of China**. It is a **singular** dialect; the present participle (*e.g.*) being used for the future indicative, and the preterite indicative being formed by ‘done’; thus *I telling* = ‘I will tell’; *I done tell* = ‘I have told’; *done come* = ‘actually arrived.’ **Peculiar** meanings are also attached to words; thus *family* = ‘wife.’ The **oddest** characteristic about this **jargon** is (or was) that masters used it in speaking to their servants as well as servants to their masters.

This unflattering definition of Butler-English, the single form of English spoken by locals that is mentioned in *HJ*, is complemented by the entry *Pigeon-English*, cross-referenced in the definition above. This new entry in the glossary (Yule et al. 1903: 709), only arguably an item of Anglo-Indian, also contributes to the glorification of the British standard:

PIGEON ENGLISH. The **vile** jargon which forms the means of communication at the Chinese ports between Englishmen who do not speak Chinese, and those Chinese with whom they are in the habit of communicating. The word “*business*” appears in this kind of talk to be **corrupted** into “*pigeon*,” and hence the name of the **jargon** is supposed to be taken. [For examples see *Chamberlain, Things Japanese*, 3rd ed. Pp. 321 *seqq.*; *Ball, Things Chinese*, 3rd ed. 430 *seqq.* (See BUTLER ENGLISH.)] (emphasis added).

⁵ More intriguing is maybe the fact that this title was kept in all editions of the work to this day. Retitling involved only the long and primarily descriptive sub-title (*A Glossary of Anglo-Indian Colloquial Words and Phrases, and of Kindred Terms, Etymological, Historical, Geographical, and Discursive*), as illustrated by the 1996 Wordsworth Editions reprint, retitled *Hobson-Jobson: The Anglo-Indian Dictionary*, or the 2013 abridgement by Teltscher, retitled *Hobson-Jobson: The Definitive Glossary of British India* and published by the Oxford University Press.

The final cross-reference to *Butler-English* makes sure the reader includes it within the “vile” corruptions of the English language, thus reinforcing the idea of British standard superiority.

4.2 English as a World Language

The ideological construction of English as a world language can also be traced in Yule and Burnell’s glossary. As shown in the following paragraphs, that belief is encoded by means of two lexicographic procedures: the inclusion of non-Anglo-Indian headwords in the wordlist, and the use of illustrative quotations from explicitly and silently translated foreign sources.

The presence of non-Anglo-Indian lemmas in *HJ*’s wordlist is one of its most curious features. An analysis of those entries allows for their classification into three subcategories:

- (i) dubious loanwords from Asian languages, as **rased**, which is primarily an alternative pronunciation of *receipt* as the definition below indicates:
RASEED, s. [...] a native corruption of the English ‘receipt’ (Yule et al. 1903: 757)
- (ii) items loosely associated with the East, despite their non-Asian source and widespread use, such as:
CRAPE, s. **This is no Oriental word**, though crape comes from China. **It is the French *crêpe*, i.e., *crespe*, Lat. *Crispus***, meaning frizzed or minutely curled. As the word is given in a 16th century quotation by Littré, it is probable that the name was first applied to a European texture. [Its use in English dates from 1633, according to the *N.E.D.*] (Yule et al. 1903: 274, emphasis added)
SATIN, s. **This is of course English, not Anglo-Indian.** (Yule et al. 1903: 797, emphasis added)
- (iii) other non-Anglo-Indian words, described as such in the glossary, e.g.:
LIP-LAP, s. A vulgar and disparaging nickname **given in the Dutch Indies** to Eurasians, and corresponding to Anglo-Indian *chee-chee* (q.v.). (Yule et al. 1903:518, emphasis added)

Although subclasses (i) and (ii) could result from a less rigorous selection from the vocabulary used by Anglo-Indians, subclass (iii) deserves attention. Lambert (2014: 499) attributes the presence of such entries in *HJ* mainly to the ancient and more comprehensive denotative scope of the term *India*, which could still include not only the Indian subcontinent but also the Middle East, Russia, Central Asia, China, Japan, Southeast Asia, the Philippines, Java, and even New Guinea. Lemmas from languages spoken in the regions just mentioned or relating to them can indeed be found in *HJ*, e.g. (emphasis added):

CHOP-CHOP. Pigeon-English (or **-Chinese**) for ‘Make haste! Look sharp!’ This is supposed to be from the Cantonese, pron. *Kǎp-kǎp*, of what is in the Mandarin dialect *kip-kip*. In the Northern dialects *kwai-kwai*, ‘quick-quick’ is more usual (*Bishop Moule*). (Yule et al. 1903: 209)

COPECK, s. This is a **Russian** coin, $\frac{1}{100}$ of a ruble. (Yule et al. 1903: 253)
 DAIMIO, s. A feudal prince in **Japan**. The word appears to be approximately the Jap. Pronunciation of Chin. *Taiming*, ‘great name.’ (Yule et al. 1903: 202)

However, the more encompassing meaning of the term India cannot explain the cosmopolitan wordlist: firstly, because India is indirectly defined as Hindustan in the entry “India, Indies” (“It is not easy, if possible, to find a truly native (i.e., Hindu) name for the whole country which we call India”, Yule et al. 1903: 433); and secondly, because many of the non-Anglo-Indian headwords in the list cannot be attributed to the more comprehensive understanding of India. That is the case of:

- (i) items relating to the Americas or Africa, e.g.:
 BRAVA, n.p. A sea-port on the east coast of Africa, lat. 1° 7' N., long. 44° 3', properly Barāwa. (Yule et al. 1903: 113)
 CAYMAN, s. This is not used in India. It is an American name for an alligator; from the Carib *acayuman* (*Littré*). (Yule et al. 1903: 177)⁶
- (ii) items about the East, but part of the vocabulary of other languages, e.g.:
 SARBATANE, SARBACANE, s. This is not Anglo-Indian, but it often occurs in French works on the East, as applied to the blowing-tubes used by various tribes of the Indian Islands for discharging small arrows, often poisoned. (Yule et al. 1903: 795)
- (iii) items with no apparent connection with either the East or Anglo-Indian, e.g.:
 STEVEDORE, s. One employed to stow the cargo of a ship and to unload it. The verb *estivar* [Lat. *Stipare*] is used both in Sp. And Port. In the sense of stowing cargo, implying originally to pack close, as to press wool. *Estivador* in the sense of a wool-packer only is given in the Sp. Dictionaries, but no doubt has been used in every sense of *estivar*. (Yule et al. 1903: 859)
- (iv) a small number of entries in other European languages, especially Portuguese, a particularly important source of lexical borrowings in Anglo-Indian, e.g.:
 BENGALA, s. This is or was also applied in Portuguese to a sort of cane carried in the army by sergeants, &c. (Yule et al. 1903: 86)
- (v) a total of 99 lexical items described as belonging to Hindustani, often corresponding to borrowings, in that language, from English or Portuguese, e.g.:
 DURJUN, s. H. [...] a corr. Of the English dozen. (Yule et al. 1903: 333)
 BOLTA, s. A turn of a rope; sea H. from Port. Volta. (Yule et al. 1903: 102)

The relative weight of non-Anglo-Indian entries in *HJ*'s wordlist is quantitatively low: Lambert (2018b: 501) identifies 193 entries he terms non-Indian and 99 Hindustani items in a total of 2467. However, against the backdrop traced in the previous section, this eccentricity emerges not as a merely defective edition of the final wordlist, but as a means of construing English as a world language: by registering lemmas relating to other

⁶ According to the current edition of the *OED*, “from the second half of the 16th cent. the name India was also applied to America, or some parts of it (mostly reflecting Spanish or Portuguese usage)”; attestations of such use are however limited to 1772.

geographies and taken from other languages, *HJ* places the boundaries of Anglo-Indian beyond India, thereby contributing to the idea of English as a world language. So, *HJ* proves that the inclusion of foreign-derived words in the lexicon can be as ideological as their exclusion, though the latter practice is the most commented on in the literature,

This understanding of *HJ*'s heterogeneous wordlist is reinforced by another important component of the glossary: the translated citations. Lambert's (2014: 199, 207-208) thorough description of the dictionary indicates that it includes 11,619 citations, used either as illustrative quotations or as a contribution to the history of the word, corresponding to 59% of the complete text. Approximately 11% of them are in or include sections in foreign languages (which makes *HJ* surprisingly multilingual for a monolingual dictionary); the remaining 89% are presented in English, either because the texts they were taken from were originally in English or because they have been, openly or silently, translated into English. The first six of the nine citations included in the entry *catechu* (Yule et al. 1903: 173), "also CUTCH and CAUT" defined as "an astringent extract from the wood of several species of Acacia", will suffice to exemplify this practice and their implications. They are quoted below:

1516. – "...drugs from Cambay; amongst which there is a drug which we do not possess, and which they call puchô (see PUTCHOCK) and another called **cachô**." – *Barbosa*, 191.

1551. – "The bahar of **Cate**, which here (at Ormuz) they call **cacho**, is the same as that of rice." – *A. Nunes*, 22.

1563 – "Colloquio XXXI. Concerning the wood vulgarly called **Cate**; and containing profitable matter on that subject." – *Garcia*, f. 125.

1578 – "The Indians use this **Cate** mixt with Areca, and with Betel, and by itself without other mixture" – *Acosta*, *Tract.* 150.

[1616 – "010 bags **Catcha**." – *Foster*, *Letters*, iv. 127.]

1617 – "[...] 7 hhds drugs **cacha** [...]" – *Cocks's Diary*, i. 294.

The quotations dated 1516, 1551, 1563 and 1578 were all silently translated from texts originally written in Portuguese (*Barbosa*, *O Livro de Duarte Barbosa*; *Nunes*, *Livro dos Pesos da Yndia*; *Garcia de Orta*, *Colloquio dos Simples*) or Spanish (*Acosta*, *Tractado de las Drogas y Medecinas de las Indias Orientales*). The detailed information provided in *HJ*'s "List of Fuller Titles of Books Quoted in the Glossary" (Yule et al. 1903: xxvii-xlvii) and a search on the publishing history of these sources indicate that they either had not been translated by 1886 (*Acosta* 1578, *Nunes* 1551, *Garcia da Horta* 1563) or had been translated long after their first publication in the original language (*Barbosa*, dated 1516, was first translated into English in 1866). Yet, those four silently translated quotations stand in exactly the same terms as the latter two, dated 1616 (introduced by *Crook* and hence signalled by [] in *HJ*) and 1617 (and other, later citations, not reproduced above). So, the reader ignoring the Portuguese and Spanish references mentioned or not willing to devote time to an attentive examination of the "List of Fuller Titles of Books in the Glossary" will conclude the word has been attested in an English text as early as 1516 and not in 1616.

The procedure just exemplified is common in *HJ*, as citations prior to 1600 are largely from Portuguese, Dutch, and Spanish sources. So far, this practice was either just noted (Lambert 2014) or understood as a contribution to tracing “the relations between Asia and Europe through the histories of words” (Teltscher 2013: n.p.). Yet, when considered against the ideological framework traced in this paper, the consistent antedating of entries resulting from the silent translation of citations proves to help construct the idea of a longer-established presence of English in the world. The dictionary’s historical principles and methodology and the immense erudition of its authors are thus placed at the service of the imperialistic Victorian language ideology.

5. Conclusions

The analysis presented in the previous section has shown that two major tenets of the imperialistic language ideology of the Victorian age – British standard superiority and English as a world language – are encoded in *HJ*, with ideological bias being included by paratexts (title, preface, introductory remarks) and text (wordlist, definitions, and illustrative citations) alike. The study described has thus identified ideological stance in *HJ* in both primarily prescriptive and primarily descriptive procedures: prescription permeates all traces of the belief in British standard superiority; description is the driving force behind the selection of the cosmopolitan wordlist and of the treatment of each entry according to the principles of historical lexicography, both of which contribute to the construal of English as a world language. *HJ* is thus a good example of how the ideological bias in dictionaries can extend beyond the descriptive-prescriptive cline.

References

- Anon. 1886. Book notices. Hobson-Jobson. *Homeward Mail from India, China and the East*, 6/4/1886, 3-4.
- Anon. 1863. Depravations of the English Language. *All the Year Round* III (68): 418-442.
- Anand. 2011. Cosmopolitanism in *Hobson-Jobson*: Remaking imperial subjects. *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, 31 (2): 521–537.
- Anon. 1848. Review of *A Scheme for Making the English Language the International Language of the World*, by James Bradshaw. *The Athenaeum* 22 (1056): 82.
- Axon, W. 1888. English the dominant language of the future. In *Spray Chapters in Literature, Folk-Lore and Archaeology*, 199-210. London: John Heywood.
- Bailey, R. 1991. *Images of English. A Cultural History of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beal, J. C. 2004. *English in Modern Times*. London: Routledge.
- Benson, P. 2001. *Ethnocentrism and the English Dictionary*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Bradshaw, J. 1847. *A Scheme for Making the English Language the International Language of the World*. London: E. T. Brain & Company.
- Buzon, C. 1979. Dictionnaire, langue, discours, idéologie. *Langue française* 43: 27-44.
- Carls, U., Lucko P., Peter L. & Polzsenhagen, P. 2017. *A Dictionary of Indian English: With a Supplement on Word-Formation Patterns*. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag.
- Ghosh, A. 2009. *Sea of Poppies*. London: John Murray.
- Hotten, J.C. (ed.). 1860. *A Dictionary of Modern Slang, Cant, and Vulgar Words*. London: John Hotten Camden

- Irvine, J. 2012. Language ideology. In *obo in Anthropology*, <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199766567/obo-9780199766567-0012.xml> (accessed May 13, 2023).
- Kachru, B. 1973. Toward a lexicon of Indian English. In B. Kachru (ed.), *Issues in Linguistics: Papers in Honor of Henry and Renée Kahane*, 352-376. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Lambert, J. 2014. *Beyond Hobson-Jobson: Towards a New Lexicography for Indian English*. PhD dissertation, City University of Hong Kong.
- Lambert, J. 2018a. Anglo-Indian slang in dictionaries on historical principles. *World Englishes* 37: 248-260.
- Lambert, J. 2018b. Setting the record straight: An in-depth examination of *Hobson-Jobson*. *International Journal of Lexicography* 31 (4): 485-506.
- Milne, W. C. 1857. Canton-English. *Household Words* XV (372): 450-452.
- Milroy, J. & Milroy, L. 2012. *Authority in Language: Investigating standard English*, 4th edition. London: Routledge.
- Mishra, V. 2009. Rushdie-Wushdie: Salman Rushdie's *Hobson-Jobson*. *New Literary History* 40 (2): 385-410.
- Mufwene, S. 2001. *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muggleston, L. 2011. *Dictionaries: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Muggleston, L. 2016. Description and prescription in dictionaries. In P. Durkin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Lexicography*, 546-560. Croydon: Oxford University Press.
- Nagle, T. 2010. "There is much, very much, in the name of a book" or, the famous title of *Hobson-Jobson* and how it got that way. In M. Adams (ed.), *'Cunning Passages, Contrived Corridors': Unexpected Essays in the History of Lexicography*, 111-128. Monza: Polimetrica.
- Nagle, T. 2014. The visible and invisible influence of Yule's *Hobson-Jobson* on Murray's *Oxford English Dictionary*. *International Journal of Lexicography* 27 (3): 280-308.
- Romaine, S. (ed.). 1998. Introduction. In S. Romaine (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language, IV: 1776-1997*, 1-56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rushdie, S. 1991. *Hobson-Jobson*. In *Imaginary Homelands*, 81-83. London: Granta Books.
- S. H. 1853. Jacob Grimm on the Genius and Vocation of the English Language. *Notes and Queries* 7: 125-126.
- Swann, J., Deumert, A., Lillis, T. & Mesthrie, R. 2004. *A Dictionary of Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Teltscher, K. 2013. Introduction. In H. Yule & A. C. Burnell, *Hobson-Jobson: The Definitive Glossary of British India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, I. 2020. *Describing Prescriptivism: Usage Guides and Usage Problems in British and American English*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Trench, R. C. 1857. *On Some Deficiencies in Our English Dictionaries*. London: J. W. Parker and son.
- Watts, R. 2011. *Language Myths and the History of English*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Whitworth, G. C. 1885. *An Anglo-Indian Dictionary*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Company.
- Yule, H. 1886a. Preface. In H. Yule & A. C. Burnell, *Hobson-Jobson: A Glossary of Anglo-Indian Colloquial Words and Phrases, and of Kindred Terms, Etymological, Historical, Geographical, and Discursive*, VII-X. London: John Murray.
- Yule, H. 1886b. Introductory remarks. In H. Yule & A. C. Burnell, *Hobson-Jobson: A Glossary of Anglo-Indian Colloquial Words and Phrases, and of Kindred Terms, Etymological, Historical, Geographical, and Discursive*, xv-xxv. London: John Murray.
- Yule, H. & Burnell A. C. 1996. *Hobson-Jobson. The Anglo-Indian Dictionary*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions.
- Yule, H., Burnell A. C. & Croke, W. 1903. *Hobson-Jobson: A Glossary of Anglo-Indian Colloquial Words and Phrases, and of Kindred Terms, Etymological, Historical, Geographical, and Discursive*. London: John Murray.
- Zgusta, L. 1971. *Manual of Lexicography*. Prague: Academia. The Hague: Mouton.