

Introduction: Meetings between Languages

The collection of essays in this book developed from the conference Languages and the First World War, held at the University of Antwerp and the British Library in June 2014. That conference offered the opportunity to bring together several aspects of the wartime and post-war linguistic interpretations of the experience of the First World War: language collecting, change within languages, influences between languages, interpretation, status difference between languages, dialects, and argots. The second volume deals with *Memory and Representation*; this first volume concerns *Communicating in a Transnational War*.

The essays in this volume look at how languages changed, connected and were observed during the period of the conflict. The problems and opportunities of dealing with foreign languages are explored in the first section, *Languages at the Front*, communication with home and the imagination and creation of a sense of 'home' in *Writing Home*, the second section, the management of language and languages away from the combat zones in the third section, *The Home Front*, and reactions to language change in the final section, *Collecting Languages during the Conflict*.

While many of the essays are based on the extraordinary phenomenon of the Western Front, there are intriguing facets of language change and manipulation elsewhere, some unconnected with events in France and Flanders, and focusing less on combatants than on civilians, administrators and politicians.

Languages at the front

Krista Cowman's paper notes that as regards language the starting point for some soldiers was the surprise that there was such a thing as a foreign language. The British Expeditionary Force in France was ill-equipped to manage this situation. Phrasebooks provided a language which was both selected and predictive, relating to the ultimate predictive language of the Field Service Postcard, which itself reflected the predictive parameters in soldiers' postcards home, set both by concerns over censorship and by the soldiers' own sensibilities and emotional protection of loved ones. Cowman points out that phrasebooks appeared partially within the paradigm of health and safety; sometimes this was explicit, as in the case of *Sprechen Sie Deutsch and Parley Voo!* (1917), which carried advertisements for soldiers' dental care products.¹ Despite the obvious and growing importance of phrasebooks for the British soldier operating abroad, there was little development from the 'traveller's guide' model. The *Automatic Interpreter*, published in France in 1918 'for the British Soldier In

France with the Allies, In Germany in case of Captivity', offered a list of parts of the body as locations of wounds that matches the pattern of requests elsewhere to purchase a mirror, a rug, or a pair of slippers. It is difficult not to read as poignant naivety the final exchange in the 1914 'How To Say It In French' phrasebook.

IMAGE Intro.1 <How To Say It In French, 1914>

In soldiers' slang glossaries unintentional humour was inevitable. Everyday war experiences were not that much an ongoing *divertissement*, quite the contrary; but boredom, apparently futile routine, and petty officialdom have long provided ground for humour in the military experience, as evidenced in countless trench journals. This is confirmed by Julie Coleman:

Humour isn't just for light-hearted entertainment, though. It can be used to avoid confronting unpleasant realities, and many dictionaries of the slang of soldiers serving in the First World War favoured misdefinition as a way of making light of inhuman conditions and incompetent or incomprehensible bureaucracy. (Coleman 2008: 11)

Occasional glossaries in trench journals indicate the idea of the foreign language as inherently funny (e.g. the *Fifth Glo'ster Gazette*, July 1918, provides a joke glossary of Italian). The overarching question here is how did the soldier deal with foreign languages? For British soldiers reactions were guided by experience, and by social class. How did the school teaching of French in Britain for example, or the provider of phrasebooks, shape attitudes?

The need to manage foreign languages was both a matter of safety and political expedience. Within the Austro-Hungarian armies, as shown by Tamara Scheer's essay, tactical caution was needed in the management of language; particular languages among the more than a dozen in use could carry connotations of disloyalty or separatism, yet all carried official approval. The model of diglossia-convergence can be seen in two variations of English apparent at the time, military slang and standard English, brought together in the expectation of civilians to be conversant with soldiers' slang. Witness to that are the frequent jokes in *Punch* pointing out the mistakes of those got slang wrong, usually elderly women. Lynda Mugglestone gives the example of Andrew Clark's awareness of 'war enthusiasm' expressed in, for example, the appropriation into female fashion of military 'accessories'. Parallel to this can be seen a divergence, most often seen in the growing distance between soldier and civilian, deriving largely from the wholly disparate experiences of life and death. Koen du Pont's essay points out how this divergence was used in an Italian trench journal as a morale booster.

Amidst the military chaos that was the First World War and among its linguistic representation stand the interpreter and the censor, whose jobs as much as anything were to read between the lines for indicators of morale. The need for interpreters was acknowledged and called for by Jeroom Leuridan (Marnix Beyen), within a diglossal single political unit, the Belgian army, where French was used by the officer class, and Flemish was largely used by rank and file soldiers from Flanders. Sandrijn Van Den Noortgate's essay shows how the role of the interpreter was key in the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. For those who took on the role of interpreting, there was a context which ranged from 'having a go', outrageous expectations, suspicion and resentment to appreciation, applause and a place in the vanguard of the professionalisation of the role.

When it was decided that certain French and Japanese amendments to the Covenant of the League of Nations had been withdrawn, the American President Wilson addressed the League and congratulated it on its constitution. However, in the words of *The Times* of 29 April 1919, the senior Japanese delegate, Baron Makino, expressed his concern and regret in that Wilson's speech had not been translated, the first time any delegate at the conference had overlooked that formality. *The Dundee Courier* of the same day was slightly less reserved in its reporting on the matter and headlined that Japan warned the allies of a danger of 'racial difficulties'. Peculiarly, this post-war insular event of unwillingness or deliberate forgetfulness was representative of a similar absence of linguistic support throughout the war.

Those British soldiers who could not go beyond little more than 'bad French', were often at the receiving end of an unwillingness by the British Army to provide facilities for soldiers to learn French. There was an expressed sense of incompetence in not being able to speak French, but there was no apparent improvement in training to speak French either. This was partly because of the high death-rate among junior officers, who would have been those most intellectually equipped to learn a foreign language. Slowly a sense of creative resignation took the place of shame. (Franziska Heimburger 2014)

While the experience of new soldiers coming into an existing army was partly one of colloquial language learning – learning the 'bad' Hindi of 'cushy', 'blighty', etc. – the experience of soldiering also involved developing a language of the experience of war. There is little surprise then that there should be so many parallels between German, French, and English slang. But what those parallels, and differences, are tells us a lot about the details of experience, expectation, shared cultures and divergent aspirations, concepts examined in the essay by Peter Doyle and Rob Schäfer. Equally there were situations where lexis could become battleground and weapon. One of the mostly deeply felt terms in German military culture was and remains 'Kamerad', subject of the heartfelt soldiers' song 'Ich hatte einen Kameraden'; used to defuse tension while surrendering, it was quickly

appropriated by Anglophone troops as a mocking verb meaning 'to surrender', and later trivialised on the home front.

IMAGE Intro.2 <postcard: 'Kamerad! Kamerad! I surrender!'

The expression of the colonial experience is the subject of Richard Fogarty's essay on the simplified French taught to French officers to use to French colonial troops, a version of the language of a complexity comparable to the 'correct' French which had been geopolitically pitched as the ideal language for liberal republicanism. Standard French was clearly ideal for culture, and the dissemination of French was clearly part of the colonial imperative to 'civilise' the world, but in pragmatic terms it was not given to the 'other'. The position of 'standard' French may be linked to the promotion of standard Italian in *L'Astico*, described in the essay by Koen du Pont; the war provided a field for the linguistic political manipulation within languages.

Odile Roynette in *Languages and the First World War: Memory and Representation* points out that the vigorous investigation by Dauzat and Esnault of the French used within the French army sought to underline the strength of the language. But while such a 'strong' language might be a gift to the colonised it was not deemed appropriate to be fully given over to colonial troops on French soil; rather, standard French was made to fit the perceptions of the structure of indigenous African languages - the perceptions of language structure that is in so far as they fitted European preconceptions of language structure.

Code-switching runs throughout the essays in this section, code-switching for communication, for group-identity creation, as a reflection of political expediency. Sometimes it gave rise to bonding, sometimes to incomprehensibility, and sometimes to resentment. Certainly during the period of the conflict the mixing of people in terms of class and geographic/language place of origin led to code-switching, as both a required and an adopted practice, becoming a common linguistic experience.

Writing home

Letter-writing provided soldiers with an opportunity of creating a sense of home. 'Writing home' portrays a theme of manipulation, both by the individual and the state, as Indian soldiers found ways of using the wealth of their own culture to bypass the censor's gaze, a scenario explored in Hilary Footitt's essay. The same desire to communicate in a family's first language underlay the problems of soldiers wanting to write home in Welsh, which Ifor ap Glyn examines. From the other

direction, Koen Du Pont looks at how the Italian army staff attempted to manipulate the language of the trench journal both to raise morale and to cement a heterogeneous army, characterised by several dialects.

While Indian soldiers used the literary traditions of their own languages to send coded messages to their families to indicate where they were serving, so Welsh soldiers used the rich tradition of the Bible to do the sameⁱⁱ. Language here is proposed as a tool for simultaneous communicating and concealing, in which the demands of family can be met by the use of a linguistic tradition deeper than the exigencies of twentieth-century patriotism.

IMAGE - Intro.3 <Welsh Bible>

Important here too is the structure of status relationships between languages, lexis within languages, dialects, accents, even word order. Throughout this volume and its companion volume, *Languages and the First World War: Memory and Representation* there are frequent incidences to status differences between dialects and languages, and between individual terms whose use acts as markers of social status. The ranking of languages as a symptom of class structures in a multilingual state allows the comparison of class-based structures of language to be made across several language groups involved in the war. The comparisons include:

Standard/slang	Standard Italian/ Italian dialects
Trench slang/criminal underclass slang	Standard French/ petit Français/ Occitan/
English/Welsh	Breton
French/Flemish	English/Indian languages
English/Italian/Maltese	German/other languages in the Habsburg armies

In extremis the war provided a catalyst for different degrees and kinds of perceived cultural and/or political suppression (e.g. Czech, Welsh and Flemish). The political results were seen most in the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, splitting along linguistic lines, following a structure proposed post-war by Jerom Leuridan (Marnix Beyen).

The language of the perception of race during the war is touched on in a number of essays in this collection, Marnix Beyen's and Gavin Bowd's essays referring to linguistically ascertained

'racial' groupings within Europe, and Richard Fogarty's highlighting perceptions of race in the encounter between Africans and Europeans. In many cases the terms were ready pre-war for application as propaganda weapons; the perceptions justified by pseudo-science, etymology and outright prejudice took various forms.

The mindset of prejudice, encouraged by propaganda motives, quickly determined that racial stereotypes within Europe, its colonies and the United States, could explain certain motives. An article in the *Birmingham Gazette* 12 October 1915 described 'the mechanical drill system of the Teutonic race'. The Teutonic 'race' was typified in France and Britain as barbaric, naturally militaristic, and highly self-organising.

During the first phase of the war the British press accused the Germans of barbaric cruelty to their prisoners and to wounded opponents. Not for one moment did I believe these reports but for the sake of the Teutonic race I wanted to uproot this calumny and to bring to light the truth.

(Hedin, 1915: 30)

The German High Command's reluctance to use pejorative terms in the prosecution of the war, at least against British soldiers, was guided by article 22 of the Hague Convention of 1907 respecting the Wars and Customs of War on Land; the highest German censorship authority pointed out:

Die Sprache gegenüber den uns feindlichen Staaten kann hart sein. Eine beschimpfende, den Gegner unterschätzende Tonart aber ist kein Zeichen von Kraft. Die Reinheit und Größe der Bewegung, die unser Volk erfaßt hat, erfordert eine würdige Sprache.

*The language we employ towards our enemies may be harsh. However, a tone that insults and underestimates the enemy is not a sign of power. The purity and greatness of the movement that has seized our people requires a dignified language.*ⁱⁱⁱ

Equally, in the early months of the war the German military mission was underlined by attempts to treat the enemy with dignity. A postcard showing a German soldier spanking a Scottish soldier was typical of those discouraged by military censors.^{iv} But this is within a context of the European armies. As regards troops from outside Europe racial discourse was highly evident in the German lexis: On 6 October 1914 the Crown Prince wrote to the Kaiser that 'Britain had set the Japanese and half-wild Indian hordes at our throats.'^v

Germans were widely shown and described as overweight, and wearing glasses (Doyle and Walker, 2012: 26), a character trait supposedly shared with conchies^{vi}. A contributor to *The Grey Brigade* trench journal (20 November 1915) described the taking of a group of German prisoners, 'many with glasses', and the *Daily Express* ran a regular column entitled 'Through German spectacles'. Various racial epithets, some based on physical characteristics, were directed at the Germans by the British, such as 'squarehead', 'Hun' and 'boche'.^{vii}

The term 'squarehead' was being applied to Germans in America before the end of the nineteenth century, and it lasted beyond the end of the war. Fraser and Gibbons give the following for 'squarehead':

“A German. In its origin an old seafarer’s term, suggested probably by the somewhat square shape of the typical Teutonic skull. The close-cropped hair of the German soldier on active service, noticed among prisoners, accentuated the idea of squareness, and gave the term currency at the Front in the War. The Squarehead or Nordic type of skull (*brachy-cephalic*) is a recognised form in anthropology, in contradistinction to the Longhead (*dolicho-cephalic*) type. Says a British authority on the subject: “A very big proportion of the German people are Squareheads. The Saxons are nearly always Nordic, and a quite large proportion of the Prussian aristocracy also. These distinctions as they bear on the habits of the racial types have a bearing also on the callings they choose and the effects of those callings on physique and long life. The great majority of the police are of the Nordic type: so are soldiers and sailors. The Squarehead is almost extinct in these islands. Perhaps, very roughly, one person in 10,000 is an English Squarehead. But it is a very interesting fact that our murderers, in the majority of cases, are square-headed; and in the United States the proportion of murderers of the square-headed type is extraordinarily high.”

(Fraser & Gibbons, 1925:268)

Fraser and Gibbons do not name their source, but this is typical of much racial anthropometry of the time. It is worth noting that Fraser and Gibbons’ definition makes no mention of the shape of the German *stahlhelm*, whose square outline was thought by many to be the origin of the term. There may have been a reinforcement of the term once the steel helmet came into use.

The term 'Hun' came into use in Britain only gradually through 1914 after the declaration of war, developing from the clumsy pun 'Germ-Hun'. It was there waiting to be used, thanks to Kaiser Wilhelm's injunction to his troops in 1900: 'Just as a thousand years ago the Huns under their King Attila made a name for themselves, one that even today makes them seem mighty in history and legend, may the name German be affirmed by you in such a way in China that no Chinese will ever

again dare to look cross-eyed at a German'. But there are indications that its use as a racial epithet was questioned: 'Are the Germans really Huns?' Asked a contributor to the *Pow-Wow trench journal* on 9 December 1914.

Less questioned among the British was the term 'Boche', picked up from the French; debate continues as to the origin of this word, but clearly it was deeply disliked by the Germans. Much has been written about the term 'boche'; at this stage it seems likely that a combination of sources led to a strong sound, combining aggression and contempt.^{viii} Possibly these sound qualities assisted its application in the phrase 'les Boches du Nord', used within France to describe refugees from the invaded territories and the war zone. The use of the word 'boche' by French people towards French refugees within France is documented from the autumn of 1915 (Nivet, 2004: 377) and was strenuously protested against by those responsible for the care of refugees. Nivet points out that use of the term 'Boches du Nord' was not limited to areas far from the fighting, and was, unsurprisingly, used by children against refugee children in school (Nivet, 2004: 379); partially it may have been indicative of North/South antagonism in France – Nivet quotes a letter that states 'Nous entendons dire fréquemment: dans le Nord, c'était tous Boches' (Nivet, 2004: 379). Nivet finds various interpretations of the phrase unsatisfactory (Nivet, 2004: 385); the prime consideration, that there was a linguistic difference between the North and the South (Winter (1996: 233) points out that many French soldiers spoke Occitan rather than standard French), but the term 'Boche du Nord' was used in areas closer to the Front, where there was no linguistic difference between residents and French refugees. The refugees concerned French internally displaced persons, which is problematic because there were also Francophone or bilingual Belgian refugees, who were clearly not looked at in the same way.

Ne doit-on pas alors prendre l'expression de "Boches du Nord" au pied de la lettre? Elle renverrait alors à la conviction d'une "impureté" biologique de certains réfugiés, alors que la guerre est conçue comme une lutte entre deux "races" opposées. [footnote supplied in the text: Voir notamment le texte du docteur Edgar Bérillon, "La Psychologie de la race allemande d'après ses caractères objectifs et spécifiques", conférence du 4 février 1917, *Association française pour l'avancement des sciences*, Masson, 1917].

Must we not then take the expression 'Boches du Nord' literally? It reflects thus the conviction that there was a biological 'impurity' in some refugees, and that the war was basically a fight between two opposing races.

His proposal is that there was an underlying prejudice that the invasion had taken over not just the lands and culture of the French refugees but their bodies too, altering more than the culture

and the land. The implication of this reading is that the racial identity of the people themselves had been altered, and the refugees had become racially 'tainted'. The term 'Bosche' equally was hated by the German soldiers and the German people in general. **Dauzat (1918: 53)** quotes Der Feldgraue Büchmann:

... le vocable boche désigne un être aux penchants les plus bas et les plus méprisables qui puissent s'imaginer, un être bien au-dessous des nègres et même inférieur aux bêtes.

The word 'boche' described a being of instincts more base and contemptible than you can imagine, a creature below the blacks and even inferior to beasts.

For Dauzat 'Boche' described 'ne ... pas une nationalité, mais un peuple, une race, avec le nuance péjorative sous laquelle la foule voit l'étranger, ennemi ou non' (**Dauzat 1918: 59**) ('not just a people, a race, with the pejorative nuance with which the mob views 'the other', enemy or not'). Dauzat sees the word as the perfect response to the German term 'Welsch', meaning 'foreigner, generally from Southern Europe', applied contemptuously to 'les gens de race latine. La guerre actuelle est la lutte des Welsches contre les Boches.' (**Dauzat 1918: 59**). 'Welsch', cognate with the English 'Welsh', combines generalised and specific descriptions of 'foreigner' and 'Romance language-speaking': *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (Grimm, J & Grimm, W, Leipzig, 1922) gives 'romanisch, italienisch, französisch'.

Usage of the term 'L'Union Latine' awaits more research. There is perhaps an echo from the 'Union Latine' of the previous century, a monetary contract between France, Italy, Greece, Switzerland and Belgium, based on equal ratios of gold and silver in the currency (1865-1914); but there is little evidence for successful attempts to transfer this into a racial grouping that would embrace the Sicilian conscript and the Belgian refugee.^{ix}

<IMAGE Intro.4- POSTCARD UNION LATINE>

Examination of the linguistic changes among smaller communities can show parallels or differences in comparison to better-known situations; political and military developments and meetings between languages resulting in language change occurred throughout the war. Hillary Briffa's essay on Malta explores how the war acted as a catalyst in the striving to define national identity through language, and invites comparison with Milos Damjanovic's essay on the striving to

maintain community identity and language among the Jews of Kosovo-Metohija (see *Languages and the First World War: Memory and Representation*).

Divisions through language in many cases highlight social divisions within a single nation or empire. For ap Glyn's paper links particularly to papers by Karen Shelby and Hilary Footitt. As Welsh was perceived rightly or wrongly to be a suppressed language, its status echoed that of Flemish. Both Flemish and Welsh were seen as 'inferior' languages within a status relationship, respectively with French and English. A quoted letter began 'If Welsh blood is good enough to be spilt ...', which corresponded uncannily with the Flemish 'Here is our blood, where are our rights?' (see Karen Shelby, *Languages and the First World War: Memory and Representation*).

In many cases splits in language occur along class lines, the officer class using a standard form, either as regards choice of language, or register; this was more the case at the beginning of the war, the vulnerability of junior officers leading to a wider social mix later on, and the development of such accommodations as 'temporary gentlemen' in the British army. It is clearly present in the language division in the Belgian army, and in the general use of German for officers across the Austro-Hungarian armies. The status difference between soldiers and officers is seen in English in the rather dismissive term 'other ranks' for non-commissioned officers and men. Jay Winter notes (Winter 1996: 212) that while other ranks in the British army suffered from 'shell-shock', officers were diagnosed as having 'neurosthenia'. Robert Hampson points out the use of French and Latin as markers of class in *Parade's End* (see Volume Two). The theme of the relationships between languages leads strongly into, and has common themes with, the third section, *The Home Front*.

The Home front

'The Home Front' brings together a consideration of how the war was mediated through managed language. This management happened as both micro- and macro-management, the self-censorship applied by soldiers in the field, but also the management of language in the procedures and developments of imposing or encouraging one language over another. Gavin Bowd points to the use of 'ils' by French speakers in occupied France. As a cledonistic refusal to mention the occupier, it matches the British soldiers' use of 'they', confounding the enemy by avoiding the use of a realising name. In the first case there is a semantic disjuncture - the same sentence cannot patriotically state the name of the enemy and the statement 'they are not always bad men'. Complex relationships between languages are seen also in Hillary Briffa's essay where there are class, colonial and nationalist issues involved; uncomfortably one language is set against another within the same geopolitical camp, while the language of aspirant political self-representation is marginalised in the larger question of the prosecution of the war.

In the case of the German occupation of Flanders the idea of a 'patron language/culture' emerged, as shown in essays by Gavin Bowd and Marnix Beyen, where political Germanisation involved the drawing of Flemish closer to German, through education and publishing, and through the manipulation of racial tension. The process of cultural enforcement included the declarations of dubious etymologies linking French with German, and here we see declarations of race being made through linguistic manipulation. The enforcement of Flemish in occupied Belgium was a pragmatic choice, with the unlikely goal of replacing French with German. Ulrich Tiedau points out the tools used to achieve this, as small, and yet very important, as spelling the name 'Vlaanderen' as VL (German) or FL (French). As a political football Flemish was a victim on both sides of no man's land. (Ulrich Tiedau 2014) Such cultural and political pressure was described by ... as 'boching', using the root word described above.

In prisoner-of-war camps in Germany, people from Flanders were separated from people from Wallonia. Enforced separation of communities happened in occupied Belgium as well, where Moritz von Bissing, the Prussian governor-general of occupied Belgium, established the *Flamenpolitik*, a true pro-Flemish policy that "sought to engender pro-German feelings by addressing Flemish linguistic grievances" (De Schaepdryver, 2012: 392). In 1916, the German occupation authority in Belgium transformed the University of Ghent from a Francophone one into a Flemish University, where only Dutch was used. This earned the institution the nickname 'the von Bissing University'. However, the Flemish support for this was not what the Germans had anticipated. Most members of the faculty did not join the German-driven University, only a few pro-German professors did. In fact, some of those who resisted the 'Flemishisation' of the University were deported to Germany (Shelby, 2014: 89). The Germans also established a consultative *Raad van Vlaanderen* (Council of Flanders), which was met by a lot of adversity in occupied Belgium, and administratively separated Flanders from Wallonia (Schmitt, 1988: 207). This protest resounded in Belgian exile communities as well. On 14 November, an event in honour of King Albert's name day was held by Belgians in exile in the Netherlands, whereby the speakers 'vehemently condemned the deportations in Belgium and the institution of the so-called Flemish University of Ghent' (*Sheffield Evening Telegraph*, 15 November 1916).

And yet shared basic cultures were cemented by language. As Doyle and Schäfer point out, the same economic and social backgrounds on either side of the Western Front were highlighted by slang: the shell that produced clouds of smoke was a 'coalbox' and a 'Kohlekasten', and soldiers called margarine 'Wagonschmere' and 'axle-grease'. Above and behind this lies the assumption that manipulation of language implies deceit, an assumption questioned by Nick Milne in the field of propaganda: how have we arrived at the position where fiction and poetry as representations of the war have acquired the mantle of 'truth' at the expense of a system of propaganda which was intended to persuade rather than mislead?

Collecting conflict words

The fourth section of this volume looks at the collecting of new terms in the language of the British army and the British home front, and how the development of army slang was appreciated, manipulated and ultimately rejected. Lynda Mugglestone shows that for one collector of words the war, Clark, far from making language a casualty, provided an unparalleled opportunity for language development. Awareness of the possibility of language change was expressed at the beginning of the conflict and continued throughout. On 20 March 1915, the *Birmingham Daily Mail* explored this question:

‘The War and Slang

One wonders what influence, if any, the present war will have on the formation of an international language – what sort of jargon will emerge from the intercourse of the varied troops of the Allies in France and Flanders, and their relations, present and future, with the enemy. [...] Certainly it seems that with Territorials in Egypt and India the contact of men of all classes with the soldiers of the Regular Army, Eastern phrases – which are easily acquired – will after the war for some time at least be familiar in the mouth as household words. The wars of the past have invariably coloured the language of returned soldiers, and this worldwide war will be no exception to the rule.’

On 2 September 1918 the *Manchester Guardian* reckoned that ‘as a result of Allied friendship in France and elsewhere, and the popularity of slang and technical terms, the [English] language is increasing by 5,000 words annually’. In 1915, however, Clark doubted that the acquisition of these words would lead to their having a permanent place in the English lexis. Above all, Clark's work enables us to see the process and timing of change, dismantling the monolithic qualities of war terms - even 'trench warfare' being a replacement for an earlier term.

Collecting language also involved a methodology, intentional or coincidental that involved ‘writing the war’ through words, a relationship between time and glossaries emerges. The idea that a glossary - not necessarily organised alphabetically - might be derived from words not just collected but also arranged in a linear/chronological fashion during the passing of time. Andrew Clark's diary, as well as his collection of war words, is a major source of lexical growth and change during the war; his diary directly cites the spoken word, as his collection of words cites journalism, advertisements, speeches, primarily evidenced through writing.

Julie Coleman, like Hillary Briffa, shows the corpus of newspapers also operating as a chronological glossary. Coleman's essay on how army slang was presented in the press shows this being manipulated for propaganda purposes, and how its representation mirrored the progress of the war. It is a view that contrasts strongly with the idea of the nation being brought together linguistically through adversity.

Towards the end of the war, in particular in Britain, with the threat to society seeming to be averted and the catalyst of social unity no longer required, old structures were re-asserted, along with their linguistic markers. Wartime terminology was no longer needed, and could be left to the academics and veterans; indeed it could be even something of an embarrassment. It was largely replaced by the inability and reluctance of combatants to talk meaningfully about combat: the negative space, what was left unsaid, a phenomenon which occurred either because it did not need to be said, or because it could not be said. Lacking the words that were adequate to describe the experience of trench warfare, soldiers had recourse to words like 'hell', or to silence.

The study in this volume and its companion, *Languages and the First World War: Memory and Representation*, of necessity reflect the subject areas discussed during the conference. Even in the main theatres of war many more studies await development; we have barely touched on naval language, the linguistic experiences of the United States, Japan, New Zealand, Canada, Scotland, Poland, Scandinavia, China, Russia, Turkey, or the various theatres of war of the Middle East and Africa. Specific subjects invite enquiry: what may be learned by investigating the differences in contact in different kinds of French (Senegalese, standard French from different regions, French-Canadian French)? Did Australian and New Zealand adoptions of French and Arabic differ? Did United States adoptions of French follow the model of Canadian adoptions? What was the linguistic experience of the war for European soldiers in East and South-West Africa, for German sailors in the South Atlantic, for Japanese sailors in the Mediterranean? Having delineated the subject area, we hope for its further development.

References

Anonymous (1918) *Automatic-Interpreter 1918, English French German, for the use of the British soldier in France with the allies, in Germany in case of captivity*. Paris, Editions Nationales.

Coleman, Julie (2008). 'Humour in Dictionaries', introductory essay in *Chambers Gigglossary*. Edinburgh: Chambers, p.11.

Dauzat, Albert (1918) *L'Argot de la Guerre*. Paris, Librairie Armand Colin.

De Schaepdryver, Sophie (2012) 'Belgium'. *A Companion to World War I* (John Horne ed.). Chichester, John Wiley & Sons.

Dundee Courier, 29 April 1919.

Fussell, Paul (1977) *The Great War and Modern Memory*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Fraser, Edward, and Gibbons, John (1925) *Soldier and Sailor Words and Phrases*. Routledge, London.

Hedin, Sven (1915) *With the German Armies in the West*. New York.

Heimbürger, Franziska (2014). "Tommy French" and other modes of communication – the British Army faces the Civilians on the Western Front", conference paper *Languages and the First World War*, Antwerp / London.

Schmitt, Hans A. (1988) *Neutral Europe Between War and Revolution, 1917-23*. University of Virginia Press.

Shelby, Karen (2014) *Flemish Nationalism and the Great War: The Politics of Memory, Visual Culture and Commemoration*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

The Times, 29 April 1919.

Tiedau, Ulrich (2014). 'German language policy in Belgium 1914–1918', conference paper *Languages and the First World War*, Antwerp / London.

Winter, Jay (1966) *1914-18: The Great War and the Shaping of the 20th Century*, London, BBC Books.

ⁱ For an example of the perils of language mismanagement see the end of Jaroslav Hasek's *The Good Soldier Svejk* (1921-3) (Has inverted circumflex above S); a more chilling real-life example is that of the Breton soldier, France Laurent, executed for not obeying a command in French that he could not understand.

ii It should be remembered here that the publication of the Bible in Welsh in the late 16th/early 17th centuries was largely responsible for the survival of the Welsh language into the modern era, the text remaining central to the Welsh language in the following centuries.

iii Richtlinien der Zensur (censorship guidelines), 1914.

(Letter of the Prussian War Ministry to the Army commanders) Übermittlung und Erläuterung der Ergänzungen des Merkblattes für die Presse, 9. November 1914, Bundesarchiv/Militärarchiv, Freiburg i. Br., MA/RMA, Nr. 2049, XVII. 1. Mai 1933, Bd. 1, Abschrift.

iv See German Soldiers in the Great War, Ulrich B & Ziemann B, Pen & Sword 2010 facing p 85

v Rohl, J Wilhelm II, 2014, Cambridge p 1146

vi 'Even the half-mad cranks whose absurd consciences prevent them from barring the way to the devil seemed to me to be turning into men under the prevailing influence. I saw a batch of them, neurotic and largely bespectacled, but working with a will by the roadside' Arthur Conan Doyle, *The Liverpool Post*, 13 June 1916

vii One racial epithet was found on both sides of no-man's-land. Eric Partridge, himself an infantryman in Gallipoli and France, notes the use of 'Indianer' by German soldiers in the description of themselves as 'Schweissfussindianer' (Indians with sweaty feet); while Karl Bergmann documents the term 'Fussballindianer' (football-playing Indians) for British soldiers. Partridge, E, *Words, Words, Words!* 1933, Methuen, London p 156. Bergmann, K, *Wie der Feldgraue Spricht*, 1916, Töpelmann, Leipzig, p27.

viii There was also a possible influence from 'bosch', a 19th-century slang term for cheap margarine. Statistics from the British Newspaper Archive show the term to have been massively popular during the war, but newspapers employed the term 'Hun' five times as often.

ix This is not to say that such racial connections were not made in the rhetoric of race during the war. On 26 June 1916 the *Huddersfield Daily Examiner* printed an article quoting the *Manchester Guardian* article concerning the fighting in Galicia where 'the Slavs first became a distinctive race. ... the two opposite ends of the same Alpine race the Frenchman and the Russian, are cousins, with an alien northern Teutonic race coming between them to disturb the family unity. Of course, Europe is a hotchpotch of races, and none of us are very pure in our stock, but there is much more than idle fancy in believing that the religious peasant of Brittany is of blood kin with the devout villager of Russia.'