The second edition of *Woordeboek fan ’t Bildts* (‘A Dictionary of Bildts’ — no. 11 in the Frisian dialect studies series of the *Fryske Akademy*) came out in November last year, after the first and second print run of the 1996 edition (a total of 750 copies) had sold out quite quickly. The basis for the first edition of this bilingual, partly bidirectional, dictionary was laid by means of a lengthy collection process that the late Hotze Sytse Buwalda and his wife had started before 1940 and was completed by their son Sytse Buwalda together with, among others, K.F. van der Veen and A.C.B. van der Burg. It became a sizeable dictionary, of which the main matter consists of the Bildts-Dutch dictionary proper, a Dutch-Bildts lemma index, and a toponymical list. After a period of both praise and constructive criticism and especially after it became clear that the dictionary had sold out more quickly than anticipated, it was decided that a second edition should follow at some point. Seventeen years after the first edition, this goal was finally realised. The product is a dictionary that is richer and more user-friendly than its predecessor in many ways: an improved lay-out, more entries, an increase in information, and an updated Dutch–Bildts index. Also, the toponymical list has been taken out for economical reasons, and has been replaced with a condensed version of the writing guide *Hoe skrive wy ’t in ’t Bildts* (Buwalda, H.S., 1980). This concise review intends to highlight its merits as well as point out a number of missed opportunities.
First of all, about 3,000 new words have been added to the dictionary proper, such as IT-related concepts (the verb *internette*, for example) or words related to art (e.g. *euritmy*) or chemistry (e.g. *osmoase*). As with the first edition, the level of detail with regard to idioms and expressions is both interesting and entertaining at times. The entry *súp* (‘buttermilk’) gives the expression “ik ferdom ’t soa wit as súp” to indicate someone’s total refusal to do something. The logical link between the colour of the buttermilk and the concept of refusal completely escapes me, but this example very nicely illustrates the wealth of idiomatic information to be found in this dictionary.

It is also richer in morphological information; at least, it provides it more consistently. For instance, the user does not need to look up the verb *treffe* anymore in order to find out that *betrof* and *betroffen* are the past simple and past participle forms of *betreffe* (‘concern’).

Sometimes, however, the dictionary seems to lack contextual information that would have made the meaning or use of certain words clearer. Particularly helpful would have been the addition of quotations to illustrate particular usage. In addition to that, source referencing of said quotations, especially in combination with the dictionary’s source list, would have been useful in case the user (read: writer, reader, learner, teacher) would like to have had some context. Knowing that certain terms or expressions were used in Waling Dykstra’s *Gesprek fan twee erbaijers over ’t jeneverzupen* (1855) or were taken from Boelens & Van der Woude’s *Dialect-Atlas van Friesland* (1955) would have added a layer of depth, making the dictionary more accessible for secondary research as well. At other instances, illustrations could have provided clarity. An entry like *pipegaal* (merely explained as ‘a type of wheelbarrow’, traditionally considered to have been used in the 16th-century land reclamation process) could have been more clearly explained with an illustration, for instance, thereby clarifying how the device is different from a *kroiwagen* or a *berry*. Other areas where this could have been useful are Bildts fishing or agricultural jargon, for example: the floor plan of a typically Bildts *winkelhaakplaats* (type of farmhouse), with the names of its various components, would be an excellent way of illustrating and thereby clarifying that word—a picture is worth a thousand words, after all.

The Dutch–Bildts index appears to have been thoroughly revised. The new vocabulary has been added to the index, of course, but existing words have also been given more cross-references. To give just one example: where neither Dutch (near-)synonym *klap* nor *slag* (a ‘hit’ or ‘beat’) give us the Bildts translation ‘terwinkel’ in the first edition, the second edition does. In the first edition, however, several separate entries *slag* were given, each with its own separate translation, an arrangement where more definition-specific information was given in each entry. In the second edition, the lemma *slag* simply heads a single entry containing an extensive list of cross-references: “bats, bòd, büttenslag, feeg, ferliezer, foorslag, gooi, kweaslag, slag, slâg, terwinkel.” Users will now need to look up the distinctions themselves.
The cross-referencing works with most of the Dutch keywords, but it appears to be missing in others. For example, the Bildts–Dutch dictionary does have an entry *fos* referring to a specific type of horse (i.e. sorrel), but the Dutch–Bildts index does not equally contain a reference to *fos* after the Dutch entry *paard*. To fully proficient speakers of Bildts – especially those familiar with agricultural jargon – this might not be a problem, but to Bildts speakers who want to extend their vocabulary range, this option will not present itself when they search for synonyms. Buwalda has partly pre-empted this criticism by announcing in the introduction that only in such cases where the Dutch translation constitutes a long description, the information could not be included in the index (xii). With respect to some of these cases, one could argue whether or not the translation is lengthy; with others, the alternative equivalents are (too) hard to find unless one already knows them or has read them. Compare:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch lemma</th>
<th>expected, but missing Bildts word or phrase in Dutch-Bildts index list</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>menigte</em> ('crowd')</td>
<td><em>berg</em> (lit. ‘mountain’ – ‘heap’, ‘mass’, - noun can only be found under berg)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>vergelding</em> ('retribution')</td>
<td><em>je's meester thásfine</em> (lit. ‘finding one’s master at home’) - idiom can only be found under meester in the dictionary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>klutschen</em> ('to whisk')</td>
<td><em>aaikloppie</em> ('to whisk eggs') - verb can only be found under aaikloppie in the dictionary this idiom can only be found under krús in the dictionary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>luukken</em> ('to succeed')</td>
<td><em>'t sit foro 't krús</em> (lit. ‘it’s stuck behind the pelvis’ ‘it’s not working, it won’t succeed’) - this idiom can only be found under krús in the dictionary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>vertellen</em> ('to tell')</td>
<td><em>'wat na forenen bringe</em> (lit. ‘bring something to the fore’) - idiom can only be found under forenen in the dictionary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ferdomme</em> ('refuse to do sth' (emph.) - lemma not in dictionary)</td>
<td><em>'ik ferdom 't soa wit as súp</em> (lit. ‘I refuse to [do sth] as white as buttermilk’). ‘I absolutely refuse to do that’ - idiom can only be found under súp in the dictionary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Especially language learners would benefit from an approach where unusual and contextually restrictive synonyms or near-synonymous idioms are more easily found than they are now.

The lay-out and typography of the second edition most definitely surpasses that of the ’96 edition; in comparison to the latter, the book looks significantly cleaner (read: more professional). Some aspects of its lay-out are not entirely satisfactory, though. Even though the page header of the first edition did not contain any lemmas at all (cf. Reker, 1998), browsing would have been made easier if the header had included the first as well as the last lemma of a spread or page rather than just the last lemma of the verso and the first lemma of the recto page of each spread.
It is especially the treatment of the phonetic representations of each keyword that has made a significant leap forward. Whereas the first edition made use of a seemingly creative mix of several different fonts in order to convey the exact pronunciation, the editors have now clearly decided on a single typeface. Only exception here seems to be the inconsistency between the front matter section ‘Klanken’ (‘Sounds’), where a Greek alpha (Unicode U+03B1) is used for a low-back-unrounded vowel, and the dictionary section itself, where Unicode symbol U+0251 is used. It is perhaps a minor difference (admittedly, in some fonts, like Georgia/Georgia Ref, they are given the same glyph), and both can be used for the same sound, but the two clearly different glyphs in the dictionary might confuse users who have an eye for detail. In addition, why the dictionary—like many other publications on Frisian and related language varieties—still consistently uses a colon and full stop rather than the official IPA symbols for long and half-long vowels - IPA numbers 503 and 504 (Unicode U+02D0 and U+02D1), respectively - is beyond me, as these symbols are incorporated in many fonts these days. I would raise a similar question over the dictionary’s consistent use of a normal capital I (i.e. Unicode U+0049) for [I] (IPA no. 319; Unicode U+026A); technological limitations cannot be the reason. One may assume that the vowels [ü], [ö], and [œy] (rather than [y], [ø], and [ay], resp.) have been used to facilitate understanding of the phonetic transcriptions in analogy with certain traditional orthographical conventions and, like an argumentum ad antiquitatem, to be consistent with previous related publications (cf. Buwalda et al., 1996; Koldijk, 2005), but also in this case, the IPA conventions are different (cf. Unicode, 2013; IPA, 1999). As the above-mentioned symbol usage can be found in other publications in this field as well, and more could be said about, say, the phonetic transcription of the Bildts vowel system, further discussion outside this review may be warranted.

The addition of (primary) stress symbols to all the lemmas (rather than just a selection) is to be applauded. From a language production viewpoint, though, it might have been helpful to indicate the stress pattern in the phonetic transcription following each lemma (adding secondary stress as well) so that the lemmas themselves would have had space to include hyphenation symbols (U+2027) in the right places:

\textit{e.g. po\textsuperscript{-}lo\textsuperscript{-}n\textsuperscript{-}ze}, s. de [‘po:lo:’nɛzə] – s. Polonaise. Fries: polon\textsuperscript{e}ze.

The stress patterns would have made some of the realisations clearer, especially in the case of syllables receiving secondary stress, and the hyphenation symbols would have indicated word division more clearly and thereby facilitated written syllabification in the work of writers and text editors. Also, keeping orthographical information separate from phonetic information might simply be a neater form of arrangement.

Last but not least, a digital version of this dictionary would have been a very convenient user tool in this day and age, especially with regard to search tools. The
very practical software that accompanied the Frysk Hânwurdboek (Duijff et al., 2008) springs to mind. Undoubtedly and understandably, this has been omitted because of practical and/or financial reasons, but it would have been very beneficial to writers and language learners alike. Who knows? A financial injection for such a project through revived cooperation with Stichting Ons Bildt (who were originally going to co-publish this second edition) might even make that a possibility at some point in the future.

All in all, though, despite the above-mentioned shortcomings, the Woordeboek fan ’t Bildts has made a significant stride forward with this second edition, and Buwalda and co-editors are to be lauded for this. The addition of about 3,000 entries plus their translations or definitions as well as the improvements in lay-out and general usability have made it a welcome addition to the material currently available to users, learners, and scholars of Bildts alike. Although Buwalda himself may think it unlikely that a third edition will ever become a reality (Fierant, 2013), it might be useful to approach the Bildts lexicon more from a learners’ perspective as well. The introduction to the dictionary clearly gives its intended audience as native speakers and regional-language enthusiasts; however, given the current state of the language, the users of the dictionary might actually benefit from clearer guidance—through the use of illustrations and improved internal referencing within and between the two parts—in addition to the descriptive side, which both editions seem to embrace mostly. Such an element would make it easier for learners to find typically Bildts vocabulary and idiom and help them learn to distinguish such language from literally translated Dutch or Frisian, thereby helping this minority language maintain its distinctive character.
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