



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA

Grau d'Estudis Anglesos

Treball de Fi de Grau

Curs 2018-2019

**SEMANTIC CHANGE IN SHAKESPEARE'S *OTHELLO*: AN
ANALYSIS OF NEW SENSES UPDATED IN THE OED**

NOM DE L'ESTUDIANT: Daniel Díez Salas

NOM DEL TUTOR: Dra. Isabel Verdaguer Clavera

Barcelona, 11 de juny de 2019



Declaració d'autoria

Amb aquest escrit declaro que sóc l'autor/autora original d'aquest treball i que no he emprat per a la seva elaboració cap altra font, incloses fonts d'Internet i altres mitjans electrònics, a part de les indicades. En el treball he assenyalat com a tals totes les citacions, literals o de contingut, que procedeixen d'altres obres. Tinc coneixement que d'altra manera, i segons el que s'indica a l'article 18, del capítol 5 de les Normes reguladores de l'avaluació i de la qualificació dels aprenentatges de la UB, l'avaluació comporta la qualificació de "Suspens".

Barcelona, a 11 de juny de 2019

Signatura:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Isabel Verdaguer, my end-of-degree paper supervisor, for being so kind and for providing me with guidance every step of the way, especially at the beginning of the writing process, since that led this paper towards a better way that I was satisfied with and where I was able to feel comfortable to fully dedicate myself to it.

I am immensely grateful to Núria Barranco, who accepted a crying 4-year-old me into her language school. From then on, she kindled and kept alive my curiosity for the English language, and inadvertently helped me grow into the person and student I am today.

A heartfelt thank you to Elena Casas, my English language teacher in high school, whose passion for the language and its literature, professionalism and, above all, patience furthered my interest in the English language. Moreover, her guidance and advice during the writing of my *Treball de Recerca* have been extremely useful for the writing of this paper.

I would also like to thank Dr. Sara Pons-Sanz, my 'History of the English Language' lecturer in Cardiff during my Erasmus stay, who showed me the beauty of diachronic linguistics and how they can be applied to the works of Shakespeare.

A special thanks to my friends, whose unconditional and inadvertent support has helped me not only during the writing of this paper, but throughout my whole career and, in sum, my life. Last but not least, I would like to thank my family, especially my sister. They have helped me overcome each obstacle and have supported every decision I have made during my professional career and my life. I appreciate enormously their warm encouragement throughout this project. Maybe one last thanks: thank you Shakespeare, for having written such marvellous plays.

Abstract: Semantic Change in Shakespeare's *Othello*: An Analysis of New Senses Updated in the OED.

The Oxford English Dictionary (OED) is undergoing thorough revisions in its third edition that provide the necessary safety to analyse Shakespeare's coinages. Therefore, by using the OED's third edition, this paper analyses those senses in *Othello* that have Shakespeare as their first evidence. These new senses are analysed in three different aspects: in the first one, the paper finds that narrowing and metaphorical transfer are the two most frequent processes, which create detailed and embellished descriptions, while the remaining processes are less frequent and attempt to cause an effect on the audience. It also finds that each new sense has its own function in the play, but that a vast majority is attributed to Iago to help build and reinforce his cunning and witty personality. Finally, the paper finds that half the new senses in *Othello* have survived, although some of them are rarely used and restricted to certain areas of knowledge.

Keywords: *Othello*, semantic change, neologisms, OED.

Resum: Canvi semàntic en *Othello*. Un anàlisi de nous significats actualitzats en l'OED.

L'*Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) està duent a terme revisions exhaustives en la seva tercera edició que proporcionen la seguretat necessària per analitzar els neologismes de Shakespeare. Així doncs, fent servir la tercera edició de l'OED, aquest treball analitza aquells significats en *Othello* que tenen a Shakespeare com a primera evidència. S'analitzen en tres aspectes diferents: en el primer, el treball mostra que la restricció del significat i la metàfora són els dos processos més freqüents, els quals creen descripcions detallades i embellides, mentre que els processos restants són menys freqüents i intenten provocar un efecte en l'audiència. També mostra que cada nou significat té la seva pròpia funció en el context de l'obra, però hi ha una vasta majoria que s'atribueixen a Iago per ajudar a construir i reforçar la seva personalitat astuta i enginyosa. Finalment, el treball mostra que la meitat dels nous significats a *Othello* ha sobreviscut, però alguns són usats poc freqüentment i estan restringits a certes àrees del coneixement.

Paraules clau: *Othello*, canvi semàntic, neologismes, OED.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2. 1. <i>Shakespeare and the OED.....</i>	3
2. 2. <i>The analysis of Shakespeare’s coinages</i>	7
3. SEMANTIC CHANGE IN <i>OTHELLO</i>	10
3. 1. <i>Methodology.....</i>	10
3. 2. <i>Results and discussion.....</i>	11
4. CONCLUSION	24
5. WORKS CITED.....	26
6. APPENDIX.....	28

1. INTRODUCTION

Determining the etymology of a word has always been a complex task for etymologists. Because oral evidence is not reliable when determining the etymology of a certain word, textual evidence, as well as comparative linguistics, become the only two ways to determine etymologies. However, the appearance of a new text –that is to say, a newly discovered text that dates back to many centuries ago– can change these etymologies, even in a radical manner. Many etymologies, therefore, are provisional, but this is an issue at the heart of diachronic linguistics. The same problem arises when analysing Shakespeare’s coinages, since the appearance of an older text than his plays will invalidate him as the coiner of a certain word or sense. Senses attributed to Shakespeare in the second edition of the dictionary may no longer be coinages of his due to the new textual evidence editors have access to. The revisions of the third edition of the OED are updating these entries with this new evidence, hence becoming a more reliable source to analyse Shakespeare’s coinages.

The aim of this end-of-degree paper (EDP henceforth) is the analysis of the senses introduced by Shakespeare in *Othello*. However, because of the safety that the revisions of the OED offer, the new senses have been restricted to those that have been revised in the third edition of the OED. The paper will analyse the different types of semantic change that these words have undergone in order to determine what are the main processes in *Othello* and how they affect the play. These senses will then be analysed inside the play to determine their function, ending with an analysis of whether they have survived until present day or not to assess their impact on the English language. Narrowing is considered to be one of the most common semantic change processes by many authors, such as Kay & Allan (2015). Therefore, the hypothesis is that narrowing will be one of the most, if not the most frequent semantic change process. The senses will have varied functions due to their being in different contexts, but there may be a pattern where the new senses play a role inside one of the play’s main themes.

This paper is divided into various sections. The section that follows this introduction is literature review, where this paper will provide an outlook and discussion on the difficulties that arise when using the OED to analyse Shakespeare’s coinages, as well as reviewing the works on Shakespeare’s coinages that have inspired this paper. After this, the analysis of the new senses will start, first with a brief description of the methodology that has been followed to collect the senses and their descriptions and how they will be analysed. This is followed by

the analysis itself, which will show its results and a discussion of them. The paper will end with some closing remarks in the conclusion.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2. 1. *Shakespeare and the OED*

Shakespeare has had a dramatic influence on the creation of the Oxford English Dictionary, especially when taking into account that its elaboration started in 1857. At the time this paper is being written, the OED has published its first 2019 update to the dictionary (March), which brings the total number of quotations from Shakespeare's works to an astonishing 32,943. With this amount of quotations, he is the second most quoted source in the OED, only beaten by *The Times* with 42,940 and followed by Walter Scott with 17,126. When it comes to first evidence for a word, he ranks sixth, while he ranks second for first evidence for a particular sense. These numbers, taken from the OED ("Top 1000 sources in the OED," n.d.), may at first sight confirm what many people take as a certainty: Shakespeare was a prolific inventor of words and new senses, maybe even an unprecedented one. However, even the OED acknowledges that this may not be the case: "Did the great authors such as Shakespeare and Chaucer really invent as many new words as they are given credit for, or does new information now show that many of these words have earlier, popular, origins?" ("Rewriting the OED," n.d.). Many authors have discussed this issue at length, as well as the problems this might pose when using the OED to analyse Shakespeare's vocabulary, which is why it is important to review here these authors' different postures and explanations.

Biases of different kinds are the most important issues when using the OED to analyse neologisms. Charlotte Brewer, in a University of Oxford podcast (2011), touches upon the issue of literary bias. She highlights the importance of the period in which the dictionary was founded –the Victorian and Edwardian period–, as biases of all kinds were extremely common then. Firstly, there were many biases "relating to race, class, gender, [and] all sorts of social phenomena" at the time (Brewer, 2011). They were related to assumptions about these phenomena which nowadays would be thought of as prejudices. One example of prejudice Brewer gives in the podcast is that of England, and Western Civilisation overall, being superior to other civilisations, such as the Oriental, African or even American ones. This inevitably influenced the OED's "choice of quotations and their formulation of definitions" (Brewer, 2011); for instance, if we follow Brewer's example, the original editors of the OED would have deliberately favoured texts from England and the Western civilisation to extract quotations from, instead of taking them from texts in English coming from other parts of the world, such as the United States or Africa after its colonisation in the late 19th century. *The Times* being the

first source of quotations in the OED shows that prejudices enshrined in the OED's choice of sources are still strong nowadays, although this may change after the whole dictionary is revised for its third edition. Nevertheless, because this has not been completed yet, it is important to always tread carefully when analysing neologisms that have not been updated, since they may not be neologisms after all, but words already in use in other English-speaking countries other than England that have not been accounted for in the dictionary due to these cultural biases.

Gender, class, race, and in general cultural biases were not the only biases present in the OED. Literary bias is an even more prominent one and crucial to the analysis of Shakespeare's language. Again, going back to the mid-19th century when the dictionary was created, literary bias was a strong one. According to Brewer, there was a predominant view that "literature had an especially formative role in creating and preserving the nation's language" (2011). Consequently, the OED's chief editor at the time (James Murray) decided to make "'all the great English writers of all ages' as his principal quotation sources" (Brewer, 2011). Brewer attributes this bias partly to "the superior availability of literary texts for all periods" (2011). Therefore, editors favoured and turned to literary texts as their main quotation sources due to their easy access and the literary bias, hence leaving out other sources that might have contained earlier evidences for particular words or senses. Unfortunately, Shakespeare was one of the main, if not the main author present in this literary bias: his works were the most easily accessible and abundant ones, and he is clearly inside James Murray's 'all the great English writers of all ages.' According to Brewer, "almost every word attributed to Shakespeare got into the dictionary in quotations one way or another, sometimes several times over" (2011), which is ratified by his ranking second in the main sources of quotations in the OED. This has obvious implications for the analysis of new words and new senses, as Brewer explains:

[...] new words of the late 16th and early 17th centuries, if used by Shakespeare, would have been more likely to have been found by the lexicographers in his writing than in that of other authors. Hence, Shakespeare, other than anyone else, would have been recorded by the OED as their first user. (2011)

Therefore, neologisms attributed to Shakespeare may not be coinages of his, but words already in use before he used them. However, because his works are readily accessible and because of the literary bias at the time, these earlier usages are not attested in the dictionary. This is why this paper is focused on the analysis of the revised entries (of Shakespeare's new senses), and

why the revisions being carried out in the OED's third edition are crucial not only to the analysis of neologisms, but also to inform correctly those that use the dictionary.

The inflation of Shakespeare's status as a word coiner is an immediate effect of the literary bias. Many people –including myself– have been taught that Shakespeare was an unprecedented word coiner, a status that was an inherent part of his fame as the world's greatest dramatist and one of the greatest writers of all time. However, as Brewer questions, “are these numbers and proportions in OED a just reflection of Shakespeare's contribution to the language or do they rather reflect the cultural values of the lexicographers?” (2011). One thing is certain: “the first citation given for a headword” does not represent “evidence on the part of the author using it; rather, it represents the earliest *known* evidence of that word's use” (Shea, 2014, p. 122). This is something that is worth emphasising, since my essay –and those of other authors that have touched upon the same subject– is dependent on it. We can almost never fully talk about a word or sense being introduced by Shakespeare, but it is the best we can do for the time being. Shakespeare's contribution to the language, therefore, is an uncertainty, but if we assume him being the first recorded author means him coining that word or sense, we can have a look at what other authors have discussed regarding Brewer's question.

Brewer, answering her own question, affirms that Shakespeare's high status both in the OED and as a word coiner is due to the lexicographers' cultural values (2011). This inflation has, in turn, influenced many histories of the language and studies on Shakespeare's plays. The OED's revisions for its third edition highlight more clearly the inflation of his status due to the literary bias: “about a third of the words previously attributed by the OED to Shakespeare have been found now in contemporary writers the OED did not previously write or cite properly” (Brewer, 2011). Therefore, the lexicographers' biases made them miss –intentionally or unintentionally– other authors whose works contained earlier evidences for words and senses attributed to Shakespeare, thus inflating his status. These revisions, however, are also bringing to light other neologisms attributed to a certain author that have now become neologisms first introduced by Shakespeare. This means, as Brewer states, that the “neologism rate for plays is changing” (2011), with *Hamlet* and *Love's Labour's Lost* being the ones who have lost more, but others have gained some. This is partly why this paper has focused on those neologisms that appear in *Othello*, since it is one of the most unaffected plays by the revisions at the moment.

There are other authors who have come to the conclusion that Shakespeare's status has been inflated. Hugh Craig set out to find out the rate at which Shakespeare introduced “fresh words” –words never used before by Shakespeare– in order to “dispel the myth of his

exceptional vocabulary” (2011, p. 58). One of the results of his analysis was that this myth partly originated due to the Bard’s large canon when compared to his contemporaries; he uses more words simply because he produced more works in a larger variety of topics. In Craig’s analysis, his findings were that Shakespeare did not use new words in an exceptional rate, but that he was “unusually close to the norm of his time” (2011, p. 68); he was very finely attuned to the state of the language at the time and used it to his advantage to create new words. However, this was not a practice exclusive to Shakespeare: other contemporaries of Shakespeare also seized the opportunity to play with the language –Shakespeare ranks seventh in Craig’s analysis of “fresh” words introduced–, but OED’s biases may have prevented these authors from being credited in the dictionary. Alysia Kolentis places special emphasis on the state of the English language at the time: quoting Crystal, Kolentis states that “the linguistic climate of Shakespeare’s time was one of the most lexically inventive periods in the history of the language” (2014, p. 259). Because the English language was in a state of flux due to the tension between English and Latin, “invention was simply a matter of course for early modern English poets and playwrights” (Kolentis, 2014, p. 259), but again, biases in the OED may have prevented these authors from being credited. Nevertheless, Shakespeare stands out from the rest of his contemporaries in that he was able to “elevate the average” (Kolentis, 2014, p. 265), to make the unimportant important and give unexpected meanings to everyday words. In short, semantic change. This is the reason why this paper is focused on the analysis of the Bard’s semantic change in *Othello*.

It is clear, then, that cultural and literary biases are a critical issue when it comes to the analysis of Shakespeare’s neologisms. Because they are deeply enshrined in the OED, they are extremely difficult to avoid. The OED’s third edition, however, provides a certain degree of safety that the revised entries have been stripped of these biases, now accounting for all the available evidence and therefore providing a more accurate description of the different words and their senses. Hence this paper’s focusing only on the revised entries. Despite this, there are still some issues that cannot be avoided when using the OED to analyse any kind of vocabulary, such as the fact that being the first recorded user of a particular word or sense does not imply that that author is its coiner. Nevertheless, this is an issue present at the core of diachronic linguistics. Consequently, assumptions have to be made, as well as acknowledging the constant provisional status of textual evidence in order to analyse the language and further our knowledge of it.

2. 2. *The analysis of Shakespeare's coinages*

The recent OED revisions have provided the opportunity to 'modernise' the extensive volume of work on Shakespeare's language –since a big part of the work was done before OED's third edition–. Despite this, previous work can be used as a model or source of inspiration. This section will discuss this previous work to see what other authors have done, and how this paper follows on their footsteps to create a more updated analysis of the Bard's semantic change. Nevertheless, not all work on Shakespeare was focused on semantic change. In fact, most of the work has been aimed at analysing the processes through which Shakespeare created new word forms or at assessing the extent of Shakespeare's vocabulary. It is only recently that scholars have turned to semantic change, which is rather surprising when considering that Shakespeare created more new senses than new words –he provides first evidence for 1470 words, while he is the first evidence for 7419 senses (“Top 1000 sources in the OED,” n.d.) –. Work on word coinages, however, can be extremely useful when analysing new senses, which is why it will be briefly discussed here.

One of the first notorious attempts is that of Alfred Hart, whose work began appearing around the 1930s. Of special interest are two articles he published in 1943, which are one of the first noteworthy attempts of English scholarship to endeavour to analyse and assess the extent of Shakespeare's language. In *The Growth of Shakespeare's Vocabulary* (1943a), Hart attempts to assess the size of Shakespeare's vocabulary by counting the amount of “fresh” words used by Shakespeare. He found that Shakespeare's vocabulary was and is “large and comprehensive,” but the rate at which he introduced “fresh words” declined over time and his vocabulary consequently became more in tune with that of his contemporaries. His second article, *Vocabularies of Shakespeare's Plays* (1943b), carried out a similar research as the first one, but this time focusing on Shakespeare's plays and how they differ from one another in terms of the introduction of fresh words. Even though Hart's calculations represent a hallmark in the study of Shakespeare's language, they are not particularly useful to the analysis of Shakespeare's neologisms. Moreover, his work quickly became outdated when electronic resources became available to a wider public, thus triggering a new wave of researchers that carried out a more updated research. Garner (1982), for example, used Hart's “fresh” words measure to carry out a similar research, which is why his research is not extremely useful to the analysis of neologisms either, but extremely useful to examine how Shakespeare's vocabulary has been exaggerated. Therefore, it is precise we continue by reviewing articles that have dealt with neologisms.

Even though work done in word formation might not seem useful to analyse semantic change, it is in fact quite useful; not only can a paper such as this take inspiration from it to create a methodology to analyse semantic change –after all, both processes create neologisms– but also because of the fact that a word changing its meaning sometimes involves a certain degree of word-formation. The main problem with word-formation analyses is what Garner explains by quoting W. S. Mackie: “a careful examination of Shakespeare’s words, their origins, their relationships, and their uses [is lacking]” (1982, p. 149). The study of Shakespeare’s neologisms has tended and still tends to some extent to list the Shakespearean coinages that have become neologisms through word-formation or semantic change processes without any examination of these processes. Garner, even though he acknowledges this, still elaborates a “tentative list of Shakespeare’s Latinate neologisms” (1982, p. 155). Nevertheless, Garner devotes some pages to analyse the words in this list: he analyses the roots of the words, whether they have survived until present day or not, and the word-derivation processes by which they were created. Despite this, Garner’s analysis resembles more some conclusions than an in-depth analysis of the words, i.e. words are put into groups rather than being treated as separate entities that occur in different contexts and that therefore deserve a separate and individualised examination. Sometimes not even all the words in a group are mentioned: for example, Garner mentions that “many of the words in the list are hybrids, containing Classical and native morphemes,” which is followed by six examples and a final “among many others” (1982, p. 157), instead of listing all words that are hybrids and explaining why each of them is a hybrid. Notwithstanding this fact, Garner’s examination of Latinate neologisms is a fairly in-depth and comprehensive one, which has informed this paper to analyse each word individually.

Eiko Kawagoe (1998) is another author that resembles Garner in that he provides an analysis of the different processes through which the neologisms were created –in this case both word-formation and semantic change processes– but fails to examine every word in his analysis. For example, Kawagoe identifies 271 instances of words that have undergone semantic transfer, but only provides the original sense and the Shakespearean sense for five of these words. Therefore, the reader can only understand the semantic change that has happened in these five words, since the other 266 instances are left in a list called ‘Others’ with only the verse in which they appear in the play. And even when the senses are provided, it is the reader who has to make out the relationship between the two senses in the instances where they are provided, since there is no explanation as to why these words are considered to have undergone semantic transfer, or what type of transfer they have undergone. Despite these flaws,

Kawagoe's analysis has some positive points that have inspired this paper's methodology. His classification of semantic change is quite helpful to understand the different processes, especially what Kawagoe calls "special phrases" (1998, p. 22) (words that change meaning by being used as an expression). However, his classification is not complete, which is why other sources will be used to classify the semantic changes in this paper. Also, Kawagoe considers the new meaning of the words inside the play they appear in, which is something I believe is important to do and therefore has been incorporated into this paper's methodology.

There have been other noteworthy works that have dealt with Shakespeare's neologisms, such as Vivian Salmon's *Some Functions of Shakespearean Word-Formation* (1970), who performed a very in-depth analysis of all the word-formation processes Shakespeare used to create new words, and she does so by avoiding the listing of these words without any examination of them. However, one of the most extensive and exhaustive works on Shakespeare's coinages is McQuain and Malless' *Coined by Shakespeare: Words and Meanings First Penned by the Bard* (1998). This 273-page-long book thoroughly examines around 470 words considered to have been coined by Shakespeare, both through word-formation processes and semantic change ones. The book analyses each word individually, by sometimes devoting a whole page to a word alone. This has inspired this paper to follow the same methodology and treat each sense separately.

The analysis McQuain and Malless carried out is extremely complete and comprehensive: the analysis starts by tracing the etymology of the word being discussed, followed by an analysis of the word and the processes by which it was created, and ending with examples of the word being used. Moreover, the book also discusses whether the word is currently in use, and if that is the case, examples of the word used nowadays are provided. This looking at whether the word has survived or not will also be borrowed by this paper to examine if the Shakespearean senses in *Othello* are still in use. The main issue with this book, as well as with most of the works discussed here and others that have not, is that they have been written and published before the OED's revisions. Therefore, this paper's focusing on updated entries will mean an important addition to the already existing literature on Shakespeare's neologisms, both the one done before and the one done after the revisions.

3. SEMANTIC CHANGE IN *OTHELLO*

3. 1. Methodology

In order to analyse semantic change, there has been a necessary stage of collection of senses for each word. The aim of this paper is not to trace the development of a word's senses until the Shakespearean sense, but to analyse the change that has occurred between the Shakespearean sense and its most immediate previous sense from which it developed. In order to do this, senses were collected from the OED between the 11th and the 17th of March of 2019. The main criterion used to determine the most immediate sense has been to interpret the data available in the various entries in order to see how the different senses shade into others, and therefore pinpoint which sense shades into the Shakespearean one. Nevertheless, a more clearly defined methodology to collect senses has also been created:

- If the Shakespearean sense is a main sense (e.g. sense number 4 in a headword in the OED), its original sense is the earliest one, i.e. sense number 1 (or 1a if 1 does not have a description). The same applies to entries classified with letters (A, B, C, etc.).
- If the Shakespearean sense is a subsense (e.g. sense number 4c), its original sense is 4 (or 4a if 4 does not have a description). If the Shakespearean sense's subentry is *a*, it will follow the methodology in the first point.
- For further subclassifications, the original sense is the first one in the leftmost classification. For instance, if the Shakespearean sense is II. 7c, its original sense is II. 5a (not II. 7a), since 5a is the first sense with description inside II. (4a and above are inside I.). This still applies for even more complex classifications, such as II. 4c (a) (i).
- If the Shakespearean sense is a phrase, compound or similar, the original sense is the first, earliest and upmost (in the entry) one. For example, a Shakespearean sense that is a phrasal verb classified as P2c has as its original sense the first one in the page, however classified (i.e. I, or A, or 1).
- Where a more immediate sense to the Shakespearean sense is identified, this is used instead of the one that would have been used by following the points described above.

Each sense will be examined individually. This analysis consists of several parts. First, the descriptions for both the Shakespearean sense and the one it evolved from will be presented, so that the semantic change process(es) can be assessed straightforwardly. This assessment will follow immediately, where the semantic change will be categorised, explained and discussed, with the categorisation taken from Kay & Allan (2015) and Lyle Campbell (2013). After this,

the sense will be contextualised in the play to examine what effect or function its introduction has. The edition of the play that will be used to localise the senses is the third edition of Cambridge University Press' *Othello*, edited by Norman Sanders (2018). In this localisation, III. ii. 200, for instance, means that the new sense is localised in Act 3, scene 2, verse 200. The analysis will end with an examination of the Shakespearean sense's survivability, and some instances of its usage nowadays in those cases where it has survived. All headwords, sense descriptions and examples of the new sense in use, both in the following discussion and in the appendix, are taken from the OED.

3. 2. Results and discussion

Table 1: Semantic change processes in order of frequency.

Process	No. of instances¹
Narrowing	30
Metaphor	18
Pejoration	7
Generalisation	5
Amelioration	4
Metonymy	3
Synecdoche	2
Hyperbole	2
Litotes	0

Table 2: Survivability of the Shakespearean senses.

Have not survived		Have survived	
Used by others	Only used by Shak.	Rare and restricted	Evidence 2000s
17	14	19	11

As predicted, the semantic change process that has been the most frequent is that of narrowing. Specifically, 30 senses have undergone narrowing. This is in line with Campbell's claim that narrowing is the most common semantic change process (2013). If we look at the senses from

¹ The total does not amount to 62 instances, since there are senses that have undergone more than one process.

which the Shakespearean sense evolved, it becomes clear that Shakespeare had plenty of room for narrowing, since the original meanings are usually quite general and sometimes vague. The sense ‘repeal, *v.*¹’ is a perfect example of this: the original sense is defined as “to recall to a proper state or course,” which is general and can refer to multiple ‘states’ or ‘courses.’ Shakespeare narrows this sense down by specifying what is recalled and to which state or course: “to try to get (a person) restored.” If Shakespeare had used the original sense, there may have been confusion as to what was recalled to a proper state, but by introducing this new sense it becomes clear that it is Cassio, and more specifically his rank, what is restored. There are other instances that show the importance of narrowing the meaning, such as in ‘labouring, *adj.*’ In this case, it is referring to a ship “that rolls or pitches heavily.” If Shakespeare had used the original sense –summarising, “that strives against a difficulty or obstacle; struggling”–, there would be confusion and the adjective, together with the sentence it appears in, would have lost its poignancy: a ship that pitches or rolls heavily is not the same as a ship that is struggling. What is the degree of struggle? What is struggling against what? By narrowing down the sense, Shakespeare can refer more accurately to what he intends to say, thus creating a more detailed image. This is particularly important in theatre, especially in Elizabethan theatre, since decorations were scarce and simplistic, and spectators relied on the words spoken by the characters to imagine the decoration or the time of the day the scene was set in. Due to the number of instances of narrowing, it is impossible to discuss each of them here –reason why they are included in the appendix–, but, in general, all narrowed senses follow these two examples. Moreover, senses have narrowed by specifying a certain element inside the original sense’s definition. This has very often created doubts when analysing, since it closely resembles the process of synecdoche. However, in the case of narrowing, the resulting sense does not refer to the whole –which would be the original one–, as in a synecdoche, but functions as a separate one that refers to a specific element inside a wider definition.

Metaphor ranks second in the most frequent semantic change process, having appeared 18 times. When considering that these new senses appear in a play, and what is more, a play from Shakespeare, it is not surprising that metaphorical transfer is the second most frequent process. Even though everyday speech is already filled with metaphors, literature tends to make abundant use of them –especially poetry–. As in narrowing, the number of instances of metaphor is too high to analyse each of them here, but some examples can be discussed to obtain an overall picture. For instance, ‘master exercise, *n.*’ provides a clear example of the main way senses have evolved through metaphor, that is, the mapping of the source onto the target due to the similarity between the two. ‘Master exercise’ means ‘main exercise’ or

‘principal exercise’ because of masters being at the top of the pyramid, thus them being the main or principal authority. Because of the similarity between both, the exercise becomes, metaphorically, a master one. This is also the case of, for example, ‘puddle, *v.*’, where the Shakespearean sense’s “to muddle, confuse, or corrupt (a person or his or her outlook, imagination, understanding, etc.)” has evolved from “to pollute or contaminate (water).” The strong similarity between polluting and corrupting or muddling creates a metaphor, thus a person’s understanding is polluted. The other senses follow the same evolutive pattern, although some are clearer than others due to the sometimes obscure nature of metaphor. Moreover, metaphors involving body parts seem to be quite abundant in *Othello*: ‘to throw out one’s eyes, *v.*’; ‘green-eyed monster, *v.*’; ‘head and front, *n.*’; ‘heart, *v.*’; ‘hearted, *adj.*’; ‘to point the finger’; ‘to look in, *v.*’; ‘to look after, *v.*’; and ‘to run through’ (these last three are more implicit, but still involve the human body).

It is pertinent to shortly discuss the expression ‘green-eyed monster’ due to its somewhat complex analysis, its importance inside the play, and its status as one of Shakespeare’s hallmark expressions. Because of these factors, this expression not only has survived until nowadays, but it has influenced the English language to the point where it has caused the coinage of new expressions, such as ‘being green with envy.’ The sense’s entry (‘green-eyed’) has only two senses, sense 2 being the Shakespearean one. However, the first sense’s description does not provide enough information to work out the process it has undergone. Consequently, the senses for the headword ‘green, *adj.*’ have been examined, with sense 3 being the one that provided information with its description: “having a pale, sickly, or bilious hue, indicative of fear, envy, ill humour, or sickness.” In the light of this, the semantic change process becomes clear: it is a metaphor that has evolved from a metonymy, where ‘green-eyed’ is used in a metaphorical sense to refer to ‘jealousy.’ There are other senses in the analysis that have required the examination of related headwords, such as ‘heart, *v.*’, partly due to the often complex nature of these metaphors.

Continuing with metaphors, there are three senses that have evolved slightly differently from the examples above: ‘labouring, *adj.*’; ‘pelt, *v.*’ and ‘ruffian, *v.*’ This is because they have acquired a metaphorical sense through personification. In ‘labouring, *adj.*’, the ship is pitching and rolling heavily because it is struggling against the wind and waves. The action of labouring against something, or struggling against something, is usually performed by animate objects, but in this case, it is performed by an inanimate one, thus personifying the ship. The same happens in ‘pelt, *v.*’, where the action of ‘striking’ something is attributed to the sea waves, and in ‘ruffian, *v.*’, where the wind ‘plays’ the ruffian due to its raging and blustering. Even

though personification represents a slightly different evolution from the metaphorical transfer described above, it is still englobed inside metaphor and can be considered a subcategory of metaphor; not only do they refer to the same evolutive process –only with a slight variation–, but also have a similar effect inside the play. Metaphor allows Shakespeare to create images that were otherwise not present in the original sense. The narrowing of a sense also allows Shakespeare to define and refer to things more accurately, thus creating a more detailed image than that present in the original sense. However, the image metaphors create is different from the ones created through narrowing in that the former imbue the new senses with a poetic tone, a certain flowery and refined tone. In short, they embellish the new senses. Taking the same example from the ‘narrowing’ part, ‘labouring, *adj.*’ not only has evolved through narrowing, which already creates a more detailed picture, but also through metaphor –more specifically, personification–, which creates a more embellished picture. If we look at the sense inside the play and substitute it with a synonym of the original sense’s definition, the embellishment of the Shakespearean sense becomes more evident: “[a]nd let the [struggling] bark climb hills of seas” creates a more vague and blander picture than “[a]nd let the labouring bark climb hills of seas” (II. i. 179), which is more detailed and embellished, consequently more in line with the overall tone of the passage, a grandiloquent description by Othello of the state of the sea and his consequent bad trip, which ends in the marvellous sight of Desdemona.

This embellishment can also be seen in other Shakespearean senses, such as in the other two that have evolved through personification, or in ‘puddle *v.*’, where the corruption or confusion of a person’s understanding is beautifully likened to the pollution of the water. Obviously, not all senses that have undergone metaphorical transfer present the same level of embellishment: ‘to run through, *v.*’, for instance, has acquired a metaphorical meaning, yet the image it creates is not as grandiloquent as that of the previous two examples. But even so, it still creates a beautiful image. Nevertheless, in those cases where the Shakespearean sense has survived (such as in ‘to run through, *v.*’), the metaphorical image has lost its poignancy over time, to the point where it has become part of everyday speech, thus being used in a normal register and without regard to its metaphorical nature. However, this has occurred to many other senses that are not from Shakespeare, with everyday speech being filled with metaphors that still embellish, in a much unadorned way, the English language.

Ranking third is pejoration, with seven instances of it. Its ranking is quite surprising, since other processes such as metonymy were expected to be at this position. Even then, there is a notorious disparity between the number of instances for pejoration and those for metaphor. The first instance is ‘even, *v.*¹’, where the sense of “to make equal” narrows and acquires the

negative connotation of 'revenge' (an eye for an eye). 'Green-eyed monster' is another instance, which clearly acquires the negative connotation of jealousy after the metaphorical transfer. Also, 'night-brawler, *n.*', where the narrowing specifies the type of person active at night, which prompts the pejoration into "one who creates tumult at night." Fourth, 'to point the finger, *v.*', with metaphorical transfer that prompts the worsening into 'accusing someone.' Fifth, 'public commoner, *n.*', which narrows by specifying the person that works publicly, and prompts the pejoration into 'prostitute.' Sixth, 'to the sense,' where the pain is narrowed to that which is extreme, therefore provoking pejoration. Lastly, 'puny, *adj.*', where the metaphorical transfer into "weak, feeble" leads into pejoration. By looking at all these instances, it becomes clear that they all occur in senses that have undergone another process at the same time, i.e. narrowing or metaphor. Not only this, but pejoration seems to be a process that is dependent on others in *Othello*. For instance, 'public commoner, *n.*' has evolved from "of a person: that acts or performs in public." Its narrowing specifies who performs in public, i.e. a woman, which then causes the worsening into 'prostitute.' Consequently, the sense would not have worsened without narrowing, as 'woman' would not have been specified.

Taking this into account, amelioration should present a similar pattern, since it is the opposite of 'pejoration.' This is true for 'in terms' and 'redeemed, *adj.*', but it does not apply for 'perdition, *n.*', where amelioration is the only process it has undergone. In any case, this is because this sense has undergone semantic bleaching. Semantic bleaching is the complete or partial loss of meaning in a certain word due to semantic change. The word's sense becomes bleached out as a consequence of the reduction of its semantic content and the increase of its grammatical content. This is the case for intensifiers used in everyday speech, such as 'awfully' or 'terribly,' where the 'awe' and the 'terror' implicit in these words have become bleached out. The same process has occurred in 'perdition, *n.*', as its original meaning of "the fate of those in hell; eternal death" has ameliorated, which has caused its being bleached out, thus only being used in "imprecations and expressions of irritation or impatience." Its semantic bleaching may also have been prompted by its overuse in such imprecations. There is another instance of semantic bleaching through amelioration in *Othello*: 'pestilent, *adv.*' This sense has been bleached out and has become an intensifier with the meaning of "confoundedly, utterly." Therefore, it has followed the same evolution as 'awfully' and 'terribly,' as its original meaning of "carrying, producing, or tending to produce pestilence or epidemic disease; unhealthy" has bleached out to become an intensifier.

Generalisation ranks between pejoration and amelioration with five instances. Considering that narrowing allowed Shakespeare to create more detailed descriptions, it is not

surprising that generalisation has a low number of instances. Moreover, the original senses for most Shakespearean senses were very broad, especially those that narrowed, so it is only natural that generalisation could not occur easily. This is also why these four instances of generalisation are not completely clear-cut. For instance, in ‘permission, *n.*’, is a consent more general than the act of giving a consent? Or is this just an instance of zero derivation? The same doubt appears in ‘woman, *v.*’, where it is unclear whether the cause for being womanly is more general than the consequence. Furthermore, in ‘discourse, *v.*’, both original sense and Shakespearean sense are so similar, in terms of semantic content, that the distinction between general and specific cannot be distinctively drawn, which is what has happened in the remaining instances of generalisation. The only sense that can be considered an exception is ‘recommend, *v.*’, which seems to have a clearer process of generalisation. Even then, the distinction between ‘to inform’ and ‘to communicate’ is too thin to state assertively that it is an instance of generalisation. Again, this is due to the fact that the original senses refer to general concepts, hence generalisation being extremely difficult to occur and to detect. Consequently, the reasons for Shakespeare to introduce new senses by making their meaning broader remains obscure.

Generalisation may be present in two other senses, although in a more subtle way: ‘perdition, *n.*’ and ‘pestilent, *v.*’, the two bleached out senses. Semantic bleaching usually occurs when a sense becomes broader because of their being used in contexts they were not being used before. For instance, ‘terribly’ being used in cases that were not terrible or did not contain any terror. Consequently, not only does the sense become more general, but it becomes too general and therefore becomes grammaticalised. It can also occur as a consequence of hyperbole, where overstatement causes a loss in poignancy and therefore a loss of connection with their origins (i.e. ‘terribly’ from ‘terror’). In the light of this, ‘perdition, *n.*’ and ‘pestilent, *v.*’ may contain an underlying generalisation or hyperbole not reflected in the senses’ descriptions, but we can only speculate about this.

Metonymy ranks after amelioration with three instances. These are ‘footing, *n.*’, ‘to wear one’s heart on one’s sleeve, *v.*’ and ‘nightcap, *n.*’ They have all undergone metonymy due to the strong association between the original sense and the Shakespearean one. For instance, in ‘footing, *n.*’, the “act of positioning the feet” has been extended to refer to a ship arriving at its destination due to the close association between the two (setting foot on land). The same process happens in ‘nightcap, *n.*’, where nightcaps were usually worn by women – although they could also be worn by men–, therefore creating a close association between women and nightcaps that prompts the use of the latter to refer to the former. ‘To wear one’s

heart on one's sleeve, *v.*' undergoes a very common metonymy, that of the heart as the seat of emotions and feelings. This metonymy appears various times in the analysis contained inside some original senses: for example, 'heart, *v.*' and 'hearted, *adj.*' both evolve from metonymies involving the heart as the seat of emotions. The same occurs with 'soul, *v.*' and 'at soul,' whose original senses contain the metonymy of 'soul' as the seat of emotions. Like in generalisation, this explains the low number of instances of metonymy: because original senses already contain metonymies, it is very difficult for the Shakespearean sense to evolve through another metonymy. Regarding function, metonymies can be used to create surprising associations. Even though most metonymies in the analysis, both in original senses and in Shakespearean senses, contain fairly usual associations –especially 'heart' and 'soul'–, 'nightcap, *n.*' stands out as a sense that has evolved through a quite unusual association. The uncommon linking of two concepts would have created a reaction of surprise in the audience, which in turn would have prompted spectators to see 'nightcap' in a different light. Even 'footing, *n.*' and 'to wear one's heart on one's sleeve, *v.*' would have had an effect on the audience, not of surprise, but of thinking about the possible variation on the image that these metonymies have traditionally created.

Synecdoche is closely linked to metonymy in that it also refers to two concepts having a strong association, but in this case these concepts are 'the part' and 'the whole,' with one being used to refer to the latter. Because of this similarity, it has been problematic to distinguish between metonymy and synecdoche. For example, in 'footing, *n.*', the question of whether setting foot is part of a ship arriving at its destination made complex the distinction between metonymy and synecdoche. Despite this, there are two instances of synecdoche in the analysis, which, even though they are not extremely clear, they show hints that point to an instance of synecdoche. The first one is 'prime, *adj.*', which, apart from narrowing, has also undergone synecdoche, as sexual activity can be considered a part of youth, thus the part referring to the whole. This, however, could also be considered not a part of, but a strong association, which would be a metonymy. This illustrates the problematic distinction between metonymies and synecdoches. 'Raised, *adj.*¹' is the other instance of synecdoche, where the action of getting up (part) is extended to refer to the state of being roused up (whole). This may be a clearer instance than the previous one, but it still leaves some room for doubt. Because synecdoche and metonymy are so closely related, their functions are the same; the usage of the part to refer to the whole can create an effect of surprise and an engagement by the audience to work out the new sense's meaning.

Hyperboles rank tied with synecdoches with two instances. In general, hyperbole is not a common semantic change process, so its low number of instances is not surprising. The first instance is ‘pottle-deep, *adj.* and *adv.*’, whose only semantic change process is hyperbole. In this sense, the capacity to which the original sense refers (that of a pottle) is exaggerated to refer to a drink that is copious, or to drinking copiously and heavily. The second one is ‘raging, *adj.*’, where the violence of a person or of a natural force is exaggerated to refer to a tooth that is “aching furiously.” These hyperboles can help create an impression on the audience –similar to that of metonymies– thanks to the exaggeration of common things such as a pottle or an aching tooth. Furthermore, like narrowing and metaphors, they can help create a more vivid picture for spectators; ‘a raging tooth’ conveys more meaning than ‘an aching tooth,’ thus painting a more accurate and effective picture.

Opposite to hyperboles are litotes, which do not have any instance in the analysis. One sense that may present an instance of litotes is ‘perdition, *n.*’, since its original meaning of “the fate of those in hell; eternal death” has been attenuated and thus become an imprecation. Therefore, there could be exaggeration by understatement, but litotes are usually linked to irony, where understatement is achieved by negating the opposite: for instance, “it is not the best food I have tasted” is a litotes, since the speaker thinks the food is terrible, thus performing an understatement by negating the opposite. This ironical component is not present in ‘perdition, *n.*’, and even though litotes can be used to diminish the harshness of an expression or statement, it still needs to be an understatement. Moreover, the diminishment of the original sense’s harshness is not achieved through understatement, but through amelioration and semantic bleaching. Consequently, litotes remains with zero instances.

To conclude the discussion on semantic change processes, there will be a discussion on those new senses that present a divergent analysis. There are some that have already been discussed above, such as those senses that have undergone semantic bleaching. There is another sense that is somewhat connected to semantic bleaching: ‘nothing if not,’ since it presents a content that is mainly grammatical. However, it is not due to a loss in semantic content, but due to its already being grammatical *per se*. ‘Nothing if not’ seems to be an expression that has been created with ‘nothing’ followed by a limiting particle and a negative particle. This syntax creates a complex expression that not only proves difficult to analyse in terms of semantic change, but also intricate to decipher in terms of meaning: taken from the analysis, this sense can be paraphrased as “Iago is nothing but ‘critical,’ which means that if ‘critical’ does not describe Iago properly, then nothing could. Therefore, ‘critical’ is the best possible description,

i.e. he is above all critical.” In sum, its complex grammatical structure points to a mainly grammatical content.

‘Affined, *adj.*¹’ also presents a divergent analysis because there does not seem to be a definite semantic change process between the two senses of the headword. The Shakespearean sense is “bound to pursue a certain course of action,” which is sense 2. Therefore, the only sense from which it could have evolved is sense 1: “connected by affinity of some type; related, linked.” However, the only connection between both senses is that of “bound to” and “linked,” but this does not provide a clear enough picture to assess the semantic change process it has undergone. Furthermore, this sense drags some controversy among editors, since this sense, which appears in the First Folio of *Othello*, is substituted by ‘assigned, *adj.*’, the reading of the First Quarto. Some editors prefer the First Quarto, thus using ‘affined,’ while others prefer the ‘assigned’ in the First Quarto. Norman Sanders, the editor of *Othello* in the New Cambridge Shakespeare series, follows the First Quarto reading. Because this paper has used Norman Sanders’ edition of the play to contextualise the new senses, ‘affined, *adj.*¹’ has not been analysed further.

There are more senses in the analysis that present a chiefly grammatical content: ‘out-sport, *v.*’, ‘out-tongue, *v.*’, ‘self-charity, *n.*’, ‘unproper, *adj.*’ In this case, these senses are included inside entries of prefixes in the OED, meaning that they have undergone derivation through prefixation. In these senses, it is worth analysing the bases to which these prefixes are attached. Shakespeare has attached these prefixes to bases that are unusual to them, or vice versa, bases with unusual prefixes. This is especially true of ‘unproper, *adj.*’, since the usual prefix that would be attached to ‘proper, *adj.*’ would be ‘im-’ in order to create ‘improper, *adj.*’ However, Shakespeare took sense II. 3b in ‘proper, *adj.*’ (“belonging or relating to a specified person or thing distinctively or exclusively; characteristic; particular”) and attached ‘un-’ in order to create its opposite: “not belonging to an individual; common, general.” Because antonymy is a process that is closely linked to derivation, ‘unproper, *adj.*’ does not have a semantic change process and is instead classified as a sense undergoing prefixation with an unusual prefix. This is true for the other three senses, with the difference that these three are classified as having undergone prefixation with unusual bases. For instance, the prefix ‘out-’, traditionally, would not be attached to the word ‘tongue.’ What is more, the etymon ‘tongue’ in ‘out-tongue, *v.*’ is a verb, which makes the base even more unusual. There are other senses that have also undergone derivation, such as ‘hearted, *adj.*’, ‘procreant, *n.*’ and ‘Propontic, *n.*’, the last two having undergone zero derivation. Nonetheless, the derivation in these senses does not mean a chiefly grammatical content, which leaves room for semantic change.

‘At a time’ and ‘aim, v.’ are the last two senses that also have a high grammatical content. In this case, they present a grammatical variation in relation to their previous sense. In ‘aim, v.’, the variation that it undergoes is that of being used as a transitive verb. Its previous sense is used as an intransitive verb, usually with the preposition ‘to’ (for instance, ‘I aim to be the very best’), while the Shakespearean sense is used transitively (“My speech should fall into such vile success as my thoughts aimed not at” (III. iii. 224-5)). ‘At a time’ shows a similar pattern, but in this case, the grammatical variation it presents is just a wording difference: the Shakespearean sense is ‘at a time,’ which is a spelling variation from the sense it has evolved from, ‘at times.’ Their semantic content, however, is the same, hence this being another instance of grammatical variation. This concludes the discussion on semantic change processes, but there are still two more elements of the analysis to be discussed: the function of the new senses inside *Othello* and the senses’ survivability.

Each sense has a different function depending on the context it appears in. For this reason, it is impossible to discuss all functions here (for the analysis of each of them, see the appendix). Despite this, there are some general conclusions that can be drawn. One of the functions in the play is puns. Even though there are only two instances of puns, they show that Shakespeare may have chosen to introduce a new sense in order to create a pun. The first one is in ‘raised, *adj.*’, a headword that has two instances of Shakespearean senses, but both serve as a pun with “angered” (sense 3b, “agitated, upset, frenzied, angry”). They both appear at the beginning of the play, where Brabantio is woken up by Iago and Roderigo to warn him about his daughter’s elopement with Othello, which angers him. Hence, the first ‘raised’ is a play on ‘woken up’ and ‘angered.’ After this, Brabantio decides to ‘raise a search’ with his family and friends to go to Othello’s and Desdemona’s lodgings. The group of people in the ‘search’ go with torches, hence it being another play on ‘angered.’ ‘Unproper, *adj.*’ may contain another pun that plays on “lack of modesty or decorum,” which is sense 2b in ‘unproper, *adj.*’. However, as the OED explains, sense 2b is not recorded until the 18th century (‘unproper, *adj.*’, OED, 2000), so Shakespeare may not have created this sense with this pun in mind.

Euphemisms is another function present in the analysis. Before continuing, it must be noted that euphemism is considered a semantic change process by some authors, such as Lyle Campbell (2013), so the reader may think that this should have been dealt in the semantic change processes section. Nonetheless, the euphemisms that appear in the senses analysed are closely linked and dependent on the play; their definitions do not signal any semantic change through taboo replacement and avoidance of obscenity, since the euphemism they contain can only be detected by analysing the sense inside the play. For example, the definitions of the

original sense and the Shakespearean one for ‘master exercise, *n.*’ do not signal taboo replacement, but only metaphorical transfer. It is only when the sense is analysed inside the play that it goes beyond the literal sense of ‘main exercise:’ it acquires the meaning of ‘sexual intercourse,’ hence becoming a euphemism to refer to this taboo. This is also true for the other senses, such as ‘unproper, *adj.*’, where husbands who think their beds are “peculiar” are in fact unproper –i.e. “not belonging to an individual; common, general”– because they are shared by their wives’ lovers, hence becoming a euphemism for ‘cuckold.’ “Green-eyed monster” can also be considered a euphemism for ‘jealousy,’ which only becomes meaningful when looking at the play, since jealousy is one of its main themes. ‘Nightcap, *n.*’ also contains a euphemism, but in this case, it is not inside the play. This word seems to have recently evolved into ‘a drink before bed,’ which can be used as a euphemism to refer to ‘sexual intercourse.’ It is quite clear that it has evolved thus because the meaning of the Shakespearean sense is ‘wife.’ Also, it is worth mentioning that these euphemisms are all linked to the two main themes of *Othello*: love (or sexual intercourse) and jealousy.

Finally, irony is another function, which appears six times in the analysis: ‘aim, *v.*’, ‘green-eyed monster’, ‘to wear one’s heart on one’s sleeve, *v.*’, ‘issue, *n.*’, ‘out-sport, *v.*’, ‘procreant, *n.*’ These six senses contain an ironic tone that becomes visible when analysing them inside the play. For instance, ‘green-eyed monster’ contains irony because it is a new sense used by Iago to warn Othello about jealousy, but Iago is the one who suffers from that which he is trying to warn Othello about, thus creating irony; or ‘to wear one’s heart on one’s sleeve, *v.*’, as it is Iago, who hides his feelings or makes them up to achieve his purpose, says that he will wear his heart upon his sleeve, thus showing his feelings.

These two senses, as well as ‘aim, *v.*’ and ‘issue, *n.*’, are used by Iago. Not only are these four senses first used by Iago, but 24 more, making a total of 28 senses out of 62.² One of Iago’s defining traits is that of being cunning and intelligent, since without it he would not be able to craft and conceal his plan as masterfully as he does. Almost half the new senses being attributed to Iago shows that he is indeed cunning, using language to his advantage to advance his plan of making Othello jealous so that him and Desdemona split up, with irony being one of the devices Iago employs to further his plan. For instance, he exaggerates the meaning of ‘raging, *adj.*’ to create a sufficiently plausible explanation for his being awake in

² ‘aim, *v.*’, ‘even, *v.*¹’, ‘green-eyed monster’, ‘to wear one’s heart on one’s sleeve, *v.*’, ‘heart, *v.*’, ‘issue, *n.*’, ‘to look after, *v.*’, ‘master exercise, *n.*’, ‘medicine, *v.*’, ‘mutuality, *n.*’, ‘nightcap, *n.*’, ‘nothing if not’, ‘permission, *n.*’, ‘pestilent, *adv.*’, ‘pottle-deep, *adj.* and *adv.*’, ‘prime, *adj.*’, ‘profit, *n.*’, ‘raging, *adj.*’, ‘raised, *adj.*¹’ (both), ‘redeemed, *v.*’, ‘remorse, *n.*’, ‘repeal, *v.*¹’, ‘to the sense’, ‘soul, *n.*’, ‘in terms’, ‘at a time’ and ‘unproper, *adj.*’

his made-up story; he describes to Roderigo the attributes that women such as Desdemona ‘look after,’ thus making Roderigo believe Desdemona is unfaithful and therefore may fall in love with him; or warning Othello about the ‘green-eyed monster’ to plant the seed of jealousy and at the same time affirming he is not a jealous person. Indeed, Shakespeare would have placed these many new senses in Iago’s speech to reinforce Iago’s cunningness. Otherwise, he would not have carried out his plan successfully without the elements of persuasion and seduction, elements that are dependent on wit and linguistic prowess. Nonetheless, not all senses attributed to him are related to his plan; some of them show other traits of Iago’s personality or his thoughts about something or someone. For example, ‘permission, *n.*’ helps Iago describe his idea of love –“a lust of the blood and a permission of the will” (I. iii. 326)–, a crucial theme in the play; or ‘soul, *n.*’, the new sense Iago chooses to describe those servants that seem to serve their master but in fact look out for themselves (therefore being cunning). Iago describes himself as this type of servant, as he is cunning. Moreover, he is confessing his intentions to Roderigo, which shows that Roderigo is someone he trusts.

The final section is that of survivability. Out of the 62 senses analysed, 30 have survived to the present day, whereas 31 have not survived (‘affined, *adj.*¹’ has been excluded due to its odd analysis), a surprising result. At first glance, then, this tied result demonstrates that *Othello* has had a notable impact on the English language; it is not the play that has contributed the most, since *Hamlet* is famously known for its inventive language, but it still contributes with these 30 new senses. However, out of 30, 14 senses are rarely used, with ‘Propontic, *n.*’ on the verge of obsolescence and ‘perdition, *n.*’ having become archaic. Moreover, there are six senses that have become restricted to a certain area of knowledge: ‘accommodation, *n.*’ has been restricted to the hotel industry, ‘labouring, *adj.*’ has been restricted to navigation, ‘permission, *n.*’ to the publishing industry, ‘procreant, *n.*’ to biology, and ‘raised, *adj.*¹’ and ‘redeemed, *adj.*’ to religion.

Even though this undermines *Othello*’s impact on the English language, there is a positive side. Out of the 30 senses, 11 have recorded evidence in the 21st century (2000s onwards), and while the other senses are restricted or rarely used, they generally have recorded evidence that dates back no further than the 1980s. Therefore, these senses are still alive nowadays but occurring with varying frequency. Moreover, there are three senses that are used with specific allusion to Shakespeare – ‘green-eyed monster,’ ‘head and front, *n.*’, ‘pottle-deep, *adj.* and *adv.*’ –, and some senses that are highly used nowadays, such as ‘to point the finger, *v.*’ or ‘soul, *n.*’. What is more, ‘green-eyed monster’ has influenced, or even caused, the creation of other expressions related to jealousy, such as ‘to be green with envy.’ This shows

the impact that Shakespeare and *Othello* have had on the English language. Despite the fact that the other 31 senses have not survived until present day, there are only 14 out of those 31 that have Shakespeare as the sole recorded evidence. Consequently, the remaining 17 senses still have had an impact –with varying degrees– on the language, even if they have not perdured until nowadays.

Even though all these new senses have differences, be it the semantic change process they have undergone, their function inside the play or whether they have survived or not, they all work towards the same aim: to surprise. Undoubtedly, the creation of a new sense would have surprised spectators, who then would be engaged with the play in order to decipher the new sense's meaning, encouraging them to see that sense from a different perspective. Even nowadays, when half the new senses in *Othello* are still used and hence become more common, spectators would still be surprised by the new meanings Shakespeare has given to words that might seem overused or common. This is what Kolentis is referring to when she stated that Shakespeare was able to “elevate the average” (2014, p. 265), creating new meanings that are able to surprise audiences more than 500 years after he wrote the play. In turn, these new senses elevated the play, imbuing it with freshness, wit and brilliance, which is, in my humble opinion, what makes people still fall in love with his work, generation after generation.

4. CONCLUSION

This paper has analysed those new senses in *Othello* that have undergone semantic change. The two most frequent semantic change processes have been narrowing and metaphor. The high number of narrowing instances is due to most previous senses referring to wide and vague concepts, hence being able to create a more detailed description and picture by referring to a specific concept inside the wide definition. The high number of metaphor instances is due to the poetic nature of the play, which in turn creates a more poetic picture, an embellished and flowery one. The other semantic change processes have been less common. Pejoration and amelioration have appeared linked to another process; generalisation has a low number of instances because the previous senses already refer to general concepts; metonymy and synecdoche have occurred with even less frequency due to the previous senses already containing metonymies, but still causing an effect on the audience because of the uncommon associations they create; and hyperboles, which has only occurred twice, but still retaining its function of creating an impression on the audience thanks to its exaggeration. Litotes have not had any instance.

The analysis of semantic change is not a clear-cut one. This has become salient in this paper, since it has found many instances where senses have not followed a traditional semantic change analysis. ‘Perdition, *n.*’ and ‘pestilent, *v.*’ have undergone semantic bleaching, thus becoming intensifiers; ‘affined, *adj.*’¹ has not been fully analysed due to its controversial status among editors, since it is replaced by ‘assigned, *adj.*’ in the First Quarto of *Othello*; and many senses contain a high grammatical content, namely ‘nothing if not,’ those that have undergone derivation through prefixation with unusual bases or prefixes, those that have undergone zero derivation, and those that present a variation in their grammar or spelling, such as being used as a transitive verb.

The function of the senses is dependent on the context they appear in, since different contexts call for different functions. However, the paper has found some patterns in the functions: there are senses that function as euphemisms, usually related to the themes of love (sexual intercourse) and jealousy, which are two of the play’s main themes; others create puns with other senses of the same word; others create irony that is only detectable when looking closely at their context; and most importantly, there are 28 senses attributed to Iago, which work towards the advancement of his plan or showing his thoughts or feelings towards something or somebody. In turn, this helps build Iago’s personality as a cunning and witty

character, one who uses the English language to his advantage to conceal and carry out his master plan.

Finally, the outcome of survivability has been a tied result: 30 senses have survived, whereas 31 have not survived. Out of those that have survived, 14 are rarely used, and the remaining 6 have become restricted to certain areas of knowledge. Even though this may show that *Othello* has not had an impact on the English language, it has nevertheless had an impact, though not lasting, on it. Moreover, there are 11 senses that have recorded evidence in the 21st century, which means they are used nowadays with varying frequencies. What is more, there are some senses that have become highly used nowadays, and some that have been highly influential, causing the coinage of other related senses.

Most of the works on Shakespeare's neologisms reviewed in this paper have become outdated, since they use the second edition of the Oxford English Dictionary. By using the third edition of the OED, this paper represents a modernisation or updating of only a small part of the tradition on Shakespeare's neologisms. The OED still has a long road ahead, since a big part of the dictionary is not updated yet. These revisions, when complete, will mean a great improvement to this tradition, since the biases still present in the dictionary will have disappeared and the entries will have been updated with all the textual evidence and resources available to editors nowadays. Therefore, it is crucial to keep updating this tradition as the OED is being updated in order to expand our knowledge of two fields as marvellous, beautiful and fascinating as diachronic linguistic and Shakespeare studies.

5. WORKS CITED

- Brewer, C. (Speaker). (2011, November 8). *Shakespeare and the Oxford English Dictionary (OED)* [Audio podcast]. Retrieved from <https://podcasts.ox.ac.uk>
- Campbell, L. (2013). *Historical Linguistics: An Introduction* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Edinburgh University Press.
- Craig, H. (2011). Shakespeare's Vocabulary: Myth and Reality. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 62(1), 53–74. doi:10.1353/shq.2011.0002
- Garner, B. A. (1982). Shakespeare's Latinate Neologisms. *Shakespeare Studies*, 15, 149–170. doi:10.1075/sihols.35.21gar
- Hart, A. (1943a). The Growth of Shakespeare's Vocabulary. *The Review of English Studies*, 19(75), 242-254. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.sire.ub.edu/stable/509486>
- Hart, A. (1943b). Vocabularies of Shakespeare's Plays. *The Review of English Studies*, 19(74), 128-140. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.sire.ub.edu/stable/509022>
- Kay, C. & Allan, K. (2015). *English Historical Semantics*. Edinburgh: University Press.
- Kawagoe, E. (1998). A Study of Neologisms in Shakespeare's Hamlet. *Bulletin of Kobe City College of Nursing*, 2, 15–28. Retrieved from <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/110000032682/en>
- Kolentsis, A. (2014). Shakespeare's Linguistic Creativity: A Reappraisal. *Literature Compass*, 11(4), 258–266. doi:10.1111/lic3.12136
- McQuain, J., & Malless, S. (1998). *Coined by Shakespeare: Words and Meanings First Penned by the Bard*. Merriam-Webster.
- Rewriting the OED*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://public.oed.com/history/rewriting-the-oed/>
- Salmon, V. (1970). Some Functions of Shakespearian Word-formation. In K. Muir (Ed.), *Shakespeare Survey* (Shakespeare Survey, pp. 13-26). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CCOL0521079039.002
- Schäfer, J. (1973). *Shakespeares Stil: Germanisches und romanisches Vokabular*. (Athenäum, Ed.). Frankfurt: Athenäum.
- Shakespeare, W. (2018). *Othello*. Sanders, N. (Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Original work published in 1603).

Shea, A. (2014). A Sure Uncertainty: On Some Difficulties Using OED Online Data to Establish Shakespearian Coinages. *Dictionaries: Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America*, 35(1), 121–145. doi:10.1353/dic.2014.0000

The Oxford English Dictionary (3rd ed.). (2000). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Top 1000 sources in the OED. (n.d.). Retrieved from www.oed.com/sources

6. APPENDIX

Ability, *n.*

The Shakespearean sense is “an action within one's power,” which evolved from “the quality in a person or thing which makes an action possible; capability, capacity *to do*, or *of doing* something.” Therefore, it has undergone narrowing, as the original sense refers to the capacity to do something, while the Shakespearean sense refers to an action inside that capacity. It appears in III. iii. 2, where Desdemona is promising Cassio that she will do everything she can (“all my abilities”) to get Othello to restore Cassio's rank as his lieutenant. Thus, the new sense shows Desdemona's kind-heartedness, as well as her limitations when compared to Othello. It has become obsolete, Shakespeare being the only evidence for this sense.

Accommodation, *n.*

The Shakespearean sense is “room and provision for the reception of people, esp. with regard to sleeping, seating, or entertainment; living premises, lodgings. Also: the action of supplying such room and provision.” It evolved from “provision of what is suitable, necessary, or convenient.” Therefore, this is an instance of narrowing, where the original sense refers to a general concept of “providing what is suitable” that becomes narrower by specifying what is provided, why and for whom. This sense appears in I. iii. 234, when Othello is asking the senate to provide accommodation for Desdemona that matches her high social status. Thanks to its introduction, Shakespeare can convey what Desdemona will be given and how this matches her status (the more commodities, the higher the status). In terms of survivability, it seems to have survived until nowadays, especially in the area of hotels: “A range of accommodation from the swanky if impersonal Sails In The Desert Hotel [...]” (*The Sun*, 27 Jan. 2001, 57/3).

Affined, *adj.*¹

The Shakespearean sense is “bound to pursue a certain course of action,” which evolved from “connected by affinity of some type; related, linked.” The Shakespearean sense may not have evolved from this sense, as it is a sense that is in extended use and that is not paralleled in the French etymology of ‘affine.’ Indeed, the only link between both senses is that of “bound to” and “linked,” but this does not provide a clear enough picture to assess the semantic change process it has undergone. Moreover, this new sense disappears in *Othello*'s First Quarto, which

is the version used by Norman Sanders. Therefore, this sense will not be analysed further due to its uncertain and confusing status.

Aim, v.

This sense is included inside the definition “to have (something) as an object, intention, or desired outcome; to be determined upon; to seek to achieve or obtain.” However, it is a coinage because it is first used by Shakespeare as a transitive verb, not because it presents a change in meaning from a previous sense. Therefore, it only presents grammatical variation. In the play, Iago is planting the seed of jealousy in Othello by making up a possible affair between Desdemona and Cassio, which makes Othello upset. Iago states that he did not intend this to have such an effect (“my thoughts aimed not at”, III. iii. 225), which serves the purpose of irony because it is indeed the effect he was “aiming at” all along. This sense only has Shakespeare as evidence, which means it has become obsolete.

Discourse, v.

The Shakespearean sense is “to utter, say (words, text, etc.),” which has evolved from “to discuss, talk over; to talk or converse about.” Therefore, it has undergone generalisation, as to discuss or converse is, in broader terms, to say words. It appears in II. iii. 257 said by Cassio, who says he is not the lieutenant Othello thinks he is due to his being drunk. This causes him to “discourse fustian with one’s own shadow,” thus the new sense depicting Cassio’s actions while being drunk. It is a rare sense, as ‘say’ or ‘tell’ are the most widely used: “Everybody expects him to discourse words of praise [...]” (*Sunday Chronicle*, 26 Nov. 1916, 8/1).

Even, v.¹

The Shakespearean sense is “to be or get even *with* a person,” which developed from “to match, to make equal, to equal.” Therefore, the meaning has been narrowed to include with whom there is equality, and even some pejoration, as can be seen in the play. It appears in the play in II. i. 280 with a negative connotation, since Iago wants to take revenge against Othello for supposedly having had sexual intercourse with Desdemona, who Iago sees as his rightful property. Thus, he wants to be “evened with him, wife for wife.” It has become rare and chiefly colloquial: “[...] he would not allow her to get away before he had evened with her.” (Hardy, C. (1997). *Far from Home*, p. 214).

To throw out one's eyes, v. (in eye, *n.*¹)

The Shakespearean sense is “to cast one's gaze, look *for* (also *upon*, etc.),” which derived from the main definition of ‘eye:’ “the organ of sight. Either of the paired globular organs of sight in the head of humans and other vertebrates.” Therefore, it has obtained a metaphorical sense, since sight is the primary sense used to search for something. It appears in II. i. 38, where Montano and some gentlemen decide to go to the docks “to throw out our eyes for brave Othello.” This new sense adds a certain layer of emphasis or emotion that ‘to look for’ does not convey, since they will look for Othello with eagerness and great expectancy. This expression has become obsolete nowadays, being ‘to look for’ and other variants the most used.

Footing, *n.*

The Shakespearean sense is “the action of setting foot upon land,” which evolved from “the action or an act of positioning the feet so as not to slip or stumble; stable positioning of the feet.” Therefore, the meaning has been narrowed to refer to the act of landing, i.e. docking a ship and setting foot on land. Moreover, it has also undergone metonymy, where the “act of positioning the feet” has been extended to refer to a ship arriving at its destination due to the close association between the two (setting foot on land). In the play (II. i. 76.) it does not have any special function other than describing that Iago has arrived in Cyprus a week earlier than expected. Shakespeare is the only evidence for this sense, so it has become obsolete.

Green-eyed monster (in green-eyed, *adj.*)

The Shakespearean sense is “jealousy,” which developed from “having green eyes.” Thus, it has acquired a metaphorical sense due to the strong similarity of the colour green with being sick or jealous. It has also undergone pejoration, as can be clearly seen with the inclusion of ‘monster,’ and could also be viewed as a euphemism to refer to ‘jealousy.’ It is the most important sense in the play, as it describes the play’s main theme. It appears in III. iii. 168, said by Iago, which is relevant because it serves the purpose of irony (Iago is warning Othello about jealousy, when Iago is jealous himself). It is a chiefly Shakespearean expression. Even though it is not used in everyday speech, it has become so famous it has influenced the coinage of related expressions, such as “being green with envy.”

Head and front, n. (in head, n.¹)

The Shakespearean sense is “the highest extent or pitch of something; the principal and foremost part of something; the core, the essence.” It evolved from the main definition of ‘head:’ “the uppermost part of the body of a human, or the front or uppermost part of the body of an animal, typically separated from the rest of the body by a more or less distinct neck, and containing the brain, mouth, eyes, nose, and ears.” Therefore, it has acquired a metaphorical sense because of the head being the “uppermost part” of the human body. In the play (I. iii. 80), Othello is defending himself from Brabantio’s accusations by describing the whole extent (“highest extent”) of his offense. Thus, the new sense helps Othello show the senate that this is his main and only offense towards Desdemona’s father. It has survived, but its use usually echoes that of Shakespeare: “The head and front of the offense is the transformation of the palpable and natural [...]” (Doody, M. A. (1997). *The True Story of the Novel*, p. 428).

To wear one’s heart on one’s sleeve, v. (in heart, n., int., adv.)

The Shakespearean sense is “to show one's feelings, wishes, intentions, etc., openly; to be unable or unwilling to disguise one's feelings,” which developed from the main sense of ‘heart:’ “the hollow muscular organ which performs the function of a pump in the circulatory system, receiving blood from the veins and contracting to propel it into the arteries.” Therefore, the Shakespearean expression has undergone metonymy due to the common association of the heart with human feelings. If this heart is worn on the sleeve, these feelings are visible to others and cannot be hidden. In the play (I. i. 65) it has an obvious dramatic effect, but it also relevant because it is said by Iago, who hides his feelings or makes them up to achieve his purpose (therefore ironic). This expression is still used nowadays: “Even if you do find a bloke who's happy to wear his heart on his sleeve [...]” (*Elle Girl*, Feb. 2005, 95/2).

Heart, v.

The Shakespearean sense is “to establish or fix in the heart; to take to heart.” It seems to have evolved from ‘heart, n.:’ “the bodily organ considered or imagined as the seat of feeling, understanding, and thought.” It has acquired a metaphorical sense, where something (a cause in the play) is figuratively fixed in the heart. It appears in I. iii. 351 said by Iago, who states that his cause, i.e. hating the Moor, is hearted, meaning it is deeply felt (as it is fixed in the seat of feeling). The new sense thus helps justify Iago’s actions and show the extent of his hatred towards Othello. It has become rare: “Unity, not duality, is hearted in the universal breast.” (Knight, G. W. (1931). *The Imperial Theme*, p. 318).

Hearted, *adj.*

This sense has had the same evolution as the previous one ('heart, *v.*'), with the difference that this one is used as an adjective, thus having undergone derivation. However, the meaning it acquires in the play (III. iii. 449) is not that of "deeply felt," but that of "being at the centre of emotions," as Othello is talking about his love to Desdemona being "hearted" (nevertheless, the sense is still metaphorical), which at that moment is gone, as he now has proof that Desdemona has been unfaithful. The new sense thus has a similar function to the previous one, in this case showing the extent of Othello's love towards Desdemona. It has become obsolete, the last evidence for this sense being from 1850.

Of his inclining (in inclining, *n.*)

Shakespearean sense is "of that (my, your, etc.) faction, party, or following," which derived from "a tendency to behave, think, feel, etc., in a particular way; a preference for something." Therefore, generalisation may be the process involved here, but it is not clear-cut; people that think in a particular way or have a preference for something tend to form groups with other people that share the same preferences or mindsets, which is what the Shakespearean sense is referring to. It is relevant in the play (I. ii. 82) because it shows there are two sides in the senate dispute: those with Othello and those with Brabantio. It has become obsolete, the last evidence for this sense being from 1903.

Issue, *n.*

The Shakespearean sense is "the conclusion of a person's argument, a chain of evidence, etc.," which developed from "the outcome of an action or event; a result or consequence." Thus, there has been narrowing, where the outcome of an action or a result becomes the conclusion in a speech. In the play (III. iii. 221) it appears close to 'aim, *v.*,' where Iago prays Othello not to take what he said more seriously than it deserves to be taken ("strain my speech to grosser issues"), but of course this is what Iago wants so that Othello becomes jealous (irony). It is relevant because this is where Othello's jealousy starts, which is helped by Iago's speech with the two coinages. It has become obsolete, the last evidence being from 1898.

To do justice to, *v.* (a person or thing) (in justice, *n.*)

The Shakespearean sense is "to drink with or to (a person) as a gesture of fidelity, goodwill, etc.: to give assurance or promise of friendship or allegiance by the act of drinking together; to drink to the health of, drink a toast to; to toast." It evolved from "maintenance of what is just

or right by the exercise of authority or power; assignment of deserved reward or punishment; giving of due deserts.” Therefore, the sense has undergone narrowing and metaphorical transfer, since toasting to the health of someone or assuring friendship is a way of giving due deserts or rewards, thus maintaining what is right. In short, doing justice to the person. It appears in the play in II. iii. 74, where Cassio, Montano and Iago are drinking to the health of Othello. By toasting to Othello, Iago can get Cassio drunk so that he fights with Roderigo and thus falls out of favour with Othello. It has become obsolete, the last evidence being from 1748.

Labouring, *adj.*

The Shakespearean sense is “of a ship: that rolls or pitches heavily,” which developed from “that strives against a difficulty or obstacle; that performs a task or action with great physical or psychological effort; acting or functioning with difficulty; struggling.” Therefore, it has undergone narrowing (and a degree of metaphor due to the ship’s personification), as it specifies what is struggling and against what. It appears in II. i. 179, where Othello is describing the bad trip he has had due to bad weather. This is a perfect example of Shakespeare elevating the common: by introducing this sense, the spectator can picture clearly the ship pitching and rolling heavily, creating a very powerful poetic image (“let the labouring bark climb hills of seas”). It is a sense that has survived, but it is not commonly used outside the area of navigation: “[...] the depths of the hold below him like some excretion of the labouring ship.” (Unsworth, B. (1992). *Sacred Hunger*, p. 112).

To look in, *v.* (in look, *v.*)

Shakespearean sense is “to enter a room, building, etc., for the purpose of seeing someone or something; to make a short visit or call (*on* or *upon* a person).” It evolved from “to direct one’s sight; to use one’s ability to see. Hence (contextually): to conduct a visual inspection, examination, or search.” Thus, it has undergone narrowing and metaphorical transfer, since it specifies what examination is being done (visiting someone), which is used in a metaphorical sense (to visit as a visual examination). It appears near the end of the play (V. ii. 255) after Othello has murdered Desdemona, and he is asking Gratiano to enter the room (“look in upon me”). Its connotations give the idea that Gratiano is checking in on Othello to make sure he does not commit suicide after finding out the truth from Emilia. It has survived until nowadays, usually used as ‘look in on someone:’ “I walked by our ‘afternoon hotel’ on the way here and looked in for old time’s sake.” (Wyatt, R. (2010). *Letters to Omar*, p. 135).

To look after, v. (in look, v.)

The Shakespearean sense is “to require, demand (a quality or attribute),” which evolved from the same sense as ‘to look in, v.’ above. It has undergone a process of narrowing and metaphorical transfer, as the sense in *Othello* specifies what is being sought (a quality or attribute), which is used in a metaphorical sense (it is not a literal ‘looking’). It may also have developed from “to seek, search for,” in which case it has only undergone narrowing. It appears in II. i. 233, where Iago is describing the attributes Cassio has that makes him a perfect candidate for Desdemona (“all those requisites in him that folly and green minds look after”). Thus, it is a new sense that again serves Iago’s master plan. It has not survived, as the more general sense has taken over (‘to look after’ meaning “to seek, search for”).

Master exercise, n. (in master, adj.)

The word ‘master’ in the Shakespearean sense is applied “in extended use to immaterial things, with the sense ‘main’, ‘principal’, ‘controlling’, ‘originating’,” which evolved from “a person (predominantly, a man) having authority, direction or control over the action of another or others; a director, leader, chief, commander; a ruler, governor.” Thus, it has undergone metaphorical transfer, where ‘master’ acquires a sense of ‘principal’ or ‘controlling’ because masters were at the top of the pyramid, and therefore were leaders with authority. Analysing the whole expression, it appears in the play in II. i. 247 as a euphemism to refer to having sexual intercourse, which is said by Iago to further his jealousy plan. It seems to have survived, but it is very rarely used, the OED only having one other instance for this sense being used: “Reproducible master exercises and profiles [...]” (www.personalitytype.com. 11 May 2004).

Medicine, v.

The Shakespearean sense is “to bring *to* a certain state by medicinal means,” which developed from “to treat or cure (a person, condition, etc.) by means of medicine; to give medicine to.” The process here is quite unclear, but there seems to have been narrowing, with the Shakespearean sense referring to a state brought about through medicine, while the previous one refers to the giving of medicine to cure. It appears in III. iii. 333., where Iago exaggerates the good night’s sleep Othello has had. This cheerfulness, however, is Iago’s way of hiding his plan and at the same time executing it, since Othello is irritated by it and prompts his return to the conversation of Desdemona cheating on him. This sense has become obsolete, the last evidence for it being around 1822, and it is used in allusion to Shakespeare’s use.

Mutuality, n.

The Shakespearean sense is “in *plural*: reciprocal acts of goodwill; intimacies.” It developed from “the quality or state of being mutual; the sharing of or in an emotion, desire, aim, etc.; fellow feeling, community; interdependence; an instance of this.” Therefore, it has undergone narrowing, where ‘mutualities’ are reciprocal intimacies, which are an instance of “the sharing of an emotion.” In the play (II. i. 246) it is said by Iago when he is describing the ‘mutualities’ between Desdemona and Cassio. Therefore, it is another new sense that serves Iago’s scheme. It seems to have survived: “Stepan and ‘I’, his young friend, are locked in such mutualities throughout.” (Jones, J. (1983). *Dostoevsky*, p. 291).

Night-brawler, n. (in night, int.)

Shakespearean sense is “one who creates a tumult at night,” which evolved from “designating people, etc., who are active, at work, or on duty during the night.” Therefore, it has undergone narrowing, since the Shakespearean sense specifies what activity is performed by a certain person at night, and pejoration. This sense is somewhat special, in that word-formation (compounding) is the main process through which this sense was created, which becomes clear when examining the main senses for ‘night’ and ‘brawler.’ It appears said by Othello to describe Cassio, who has created a tumult due to his being drunk (II. iii. 177). Its introduction helps give a very detailed description of the sort of person Cassio is behaving as (with its negative connotations), as well as pointing out that the action is taking place at night. It has become obsolete, the last evidence for this sense being from 1855.

Nightcap, n.

This sense is a special case, in that the Shakespearean sense retains the same description as the original one: “a cap worn in bed or with nightclothes.” However, the Shakespearean sense has acquired a figurative use, so it has a secondary meaning that can only be deciphered in context. This sense appears in II. i. 288 inside Iago’s speech, specifically where he voices his concerns that his wife might have cheated on him with Cassio, using ‘nightcap’ to refer to his wife (“for I fear Cassio with my night-cap too”). Therefore, the Shakespearean meaning is that of ‘wife,’ thus having undergone a process of metonymy because of the strong association between nightcap and wife (although nightcaps were also worn by men in bed), which prompts the usage of ‘nightcap’ to refer to ‘wife.’ The sense has not survived, since the word ‘nightcap’ as a whole has acquired a new and more used meaning: “a drink before bed,” which can be used as a euphemism for sexual intercourse.

Nothing if not (in nothing, pron., n., adv., int.)

This sense is a complex one to analyse, since it does not seem to have undergone semantic change. Rather, it is an expression that has been created with ‘nothing’ followed by a limiting particle, thus its grammatical content being prominent and its semantic content almost null. This sense can be paraphrased to explain the meaning lying behind its complex grammar: Iago is nothing but ‘critical,’ which means that if ‘critical’ does not describe Iago properly, then nothing could. Therefore, ‘critical’ is the best possible description, i.e. he is above all critical. As can be seen, it appears in II. i. 118 said by Iago, who describes himself as above all critical when asked by Desdemona to say something positive about her. The new sense serves as an excuse for Iago not to praise, since he describes himself as critical by nature and consequently not inclined to praise anyone. Thus, the new sense shows Iago’s opinion about women. It has survived, but it is not commonly used in informal speech due to its complexity: “Mailer is nothing if not the supreme liberal.” (*San Francisco Review of Books*. (1991)).

Observe, v.

The Shakespearean sense is “to make observations,” which derived from “to heed, pay attention to, watch, or notice.” Thus, it has undergone narrowing, as making observations is a more careful and specific examination than ‘to pay attention to’ or ‘to watch.’ It appears in III. iii. 242, where Othello prays Iago to tell her wife (Emilia) to ‘observe’ Desdemona in order to assert whether she is faithful to him or not. It is an important new sense, since its connotations of careful observation denote Othello’s doubts about Desdemona’s faithfulness. It has become obsolete, since the wider sense is more commonly used.

Out-sport, v. (in ‘out-’ prefix)

This sense has not undergone any semantic change process due to its being inside the ‘out-’ prefix –it has undergone prefixation, not semantic change–. Because of this, this sense will be classified as a sense that has undergone prefixation with an unusual basis, since ‘sport, v.’ is not usually paired with ‘out-’. Moreover, the prefix ‘out-’ seems to have originally been used to form nouns by prefixing to ordinary nouns, while in this sense it is forming a transitive verb by prefixing to a verb. It appears in II. iii. 3, where Othello is warning Cassio against celebrating to excess (“to out-sport discretion”). It creates a poetic image of exceeding discretion, it embellishes it. Discretion is personified, and those that out-sport it are celebrating (‘sporting’) more than it. It also serves an ironic purpose, since Cassio ends up getting drunk. It has become obsolete, Shakespeare being the only evidence for the sense.

Out-tongue, v. (in 'out-' prefix)

It has undergone the same prefixation as the previous sense (out-sport, v.), so prefixation with unusual basis. It is defined as “to outdo in use of the tongue; to speak more loudly or more eloquently than; to surpass in expressive power.” It appears in I. ii. 19 with the sense of “speak[ing] more loudly,” where Othello is confident that the services he has done for the Venetian oligarchy will ‘out-tongue’ Brabantio’s complaints. Again, the new sense embellishes the action of ‘crying louder,’ and ‘complaints’ is also personified. It having a separate entry shows that it has survived longer than the previous sense, but it has nevertheless become obsolete and chiefly poetic, with the last evidence being from 1849.

Paragon, v.

The Shakespearean sense is “to excel, surpass,” which developed from “to compare or equate *with* or *to*.” It is another instance of narrowing, where the sense in *Othello* refers to only one result of the comparison the first sense refers to. It appears in II. i. 62, where Cassio is praising and elevating Desdemona’s attributes. It seems to be used as a synonym of ‘excel,’ as it appears in the next verse, but it also helps elevate Cassio’s description. All the senses from this word, including the Shakespearean one, have become obsolete.

Passage, n.

The Shakespearean sense is “the passing by of people; passers-by collectively,” which evolved from “the action of going or moving onward, across, or past; movement from one place or point to another, or over or through a space or medium; transit.” Therefore, it has undergone narrowing, where the Shakespearean sense specifies what is moving, in this case people, and in what general direction (passing by). It appears in the play (V. i. 37) in the final confrontation, where Iago wounds Cassio in the leg and leaves him in the floor asking for help, who becomes desperate because there are no passers-by to help him. It may have been introduced for metrical reasons. It has become obsolete, ‘passers-by’ being the word that prevailed.

Pelt, v.¹

The Shakespearean sense is “of a number of small objects (as raindrops, etc.): to strike repeatedly or in a shower,” which evolved from “to deliver repeated blows to a person or thing; to go on striking vigorously. Therefore, it has undergone narrowing and metaphorical transfer, as the Shakespearean sense specifies what is striking what (“the chidden billow seems to pelt the clouds”), and the waves are personified because they strike. It appears in II. i. 12., when a

second gentleman is describing the dangerous state of the sea due to bad weather, a description that is elevated and gives a vivid picture of that state. This new sense elevates the common ('to strike') to help create this clear picture. It seems to have survived, although it is not commonly used: "When marble-size chunks of hail begin pelting the lawn, she becomes positively giddy." (*People*, 11 Jan. 1993, 96/2).

Perdition, *n.*

The Shakespearean sense is used "in imprecations and expressions of irritation or impatience," which evolved from "the state of final spiritual ruin or damnation; the consignment of the unredeemed or wicked and impenitent soul to hell; the fate of those in hell; eternal death." Therefore, there has been a process of amelioration: this sense still retains some of the bad connotations of the original sense, since it is used as an expression of irritation or impatience, but it has ameliorated and become softer. It is said by Othello (III. iii. 90) when exclaiming that he loves Desdemona, yet there is jealousy in him. This new sense represents clearly this conflict in him. Even though this sense has survived, it has become archaic: "'They say they not coming up, sir.' 'Why in perdition not?'" (Unsworth, B. (1992). *Sacred Hunger*, p. 276).

Permission, *n.*

The Shakespearean sense is "a licence or freedom to do something," which developed from "the action of permitting, allowing, or giving consent." The process here is not very clear, but there seems to have been generalisation, as the original sense refers to the action of giving consent, whereas the Shakespearean one refers to the consent itself. It appears in I. iii. 326 inside Iago's description of love: "a lust of the blood and a permission of the will," meaning 'no willpower.' Therefore, it is an important new sense so that Iago can describe his idea of love, a crucial theme in the play. It has survived, but it is mainly used in the area of publishing: "The Freud Copyright gives all permissions, worldwide, for the publication of any work by Freud [...]" (Masson, J. (1991). *Final Analysis: The Making and Unmaking of a Psychoanalyst*, p. 159).

Pestilent, *adv.*

The Shakespearean sense is "confoundedly, utterly," which evolved from "carrying, producing, or tending to produce pestilence or epidemic disease; unhealthy." Therefore, it has undergone amelioration, as it has acquired the meaning of 'confounded,' a softer yet still negative sense. It appears in II. i. 234 said by Iago, who is explaining that Desdemona is in love with Cassio

because of the attributes he has, which are lacking in Othello. The new sense helps with Iago's description of Cassio, which at the same time gives information about Iago's opinion of Cassio. It has become obsolete, the last evidence being from 1699.

To point the finger, v. (in point, v.¹)

The Shakespearean sense is "to make an accusation or allegation about a person; to put under contempt, suspicion, etc.," which developed from "to direct, or give direction." Therefore, it has undergone metaphorical transfer, where the pointing of a finger becomes metaphorical, meaning 'to accuse someone,' and pejoration, as it refers to the act of accusing someone. It appears in IV. i. 54., where Othello sees himself pointed at forever, "an eternal object of derision" (p. 181 play). It is then a crucial new sense to depict how racism works against Othello. It is a sense that has survived until nowadays and is widely used: "This, of course, leads many to point the finger at schools." (*The Guardian*, 31 Aug. 2004, ii. 7/5).

Pottle-deep, adj. and adv. (in pottle, n.¹)

The Shakespearean sense is "(a) *adj.* (of a drink) that would fill a pottle, generous; (of a bout of drinking) copious, heavy; (b) *adv.* (of drinking) copiously, heavily." It evolved from "a pot, tankard, or similar container, (usually) *spec.* one having the capacity of a pottle." The main process here is that of compounding, but when looking at the new sense inside the play it is clear that it has undergone a hyperbole, as Iago exaggerates the drinks Roderigo has had because he is in love with Desdemona (II. iii. 46). Therefore, the new sense also serves the purpose of depicting, through exaggeration, Roderigo's desperation because of his unrequited love towards Desdemona. It has survived, but it is quite rare and often used with specific allusion to Shakespeare's usage: "Potations, pottle-deep, we have in stock." (*Mountain Democrat* (advertisement), 24 Nov. 1949).

Prime, adj.

The Shakespearean sense is "sexually excited, lustful." It is a special sense in that it does not seem to have another sense from which it developed. The only one that seems plausible is sense number 2: "first in order of time or occurrence; early, young, youthful." Therefore, it would have undergone narrowing, as sexual activity can be considered a part of youth, in which case it would have also undergone synecdoche. It appears in III. iii. 404 said by Iago, who pitches Othello the idea of catching Cassio and Desdemona having sexual intercourse so that Othello gets evidence he is being cheated on. However, Iago says this would be impossible even if they

were “as prime as goats, as hot as monkeys.” Therefore, the new sense serves Iago’s plan, as it provides an excuse for not getting evidence. It has become obsolete, Shakespeare being the only evidence for this sense.

Procreant, *n.*

The Shakespearean sense is “a person who or thing which procreates,” which evolved from “*adj.* That procreates, that begets offspring; generative; producing.” The main process here is zero derivation, an adjective becoming a noun, but may also have undergone narrowing, where the Shakespearean sense specifies that what procreates is a person or an animal. This, however, is not clear-cut. It appears in IV. ii. 27., when Othello calls for Desdemona to interrogate her about her unfaithfulness. Othello, angry, tells Emilia to leave them alone, referring to himself and Desdemona as ‘procreants.’ It is ironic, as the play does not specify if they have had sexual intercourse, and they will not have it there and then because of Othello’s suspicions about Desdemona’s unfaithfulness. It has survived until nowadays, usually used in biology and related areas: “A discussion of a change in aged females’ roles as procreants.” (Walker, B. L. (1997). *Sexuality & Elderly*, p. 95).

Profit, *n.*

The Shakespearean sense “that which provides advantage or benefit,” which evolved from “a favourable circumstance or condition; advantage, gain; a person's benefit or good.” Therefore, it has undergone narrowing, as the Shakespearean sense is referring to the cause of the benefit, whereas the original one refers to the benefit itself. It appears in III. iii. 380 with the meaning of ‘profitable lesson,’ as Iago thanks the world for teaching him that “to be direct and honest is not safe” (v. 379). In this case, Iago using this new sense to play the victim to keep Othello jealous, as Othello is starting to suspect he is lying. It has become obsolete, as Shakespeare is the only evidence for this sense.

Propontic, *n.*

The Shakespearean sense is “*n.* With *the*. The Sea of Marmara,” which developed from “*adj.* Of, relating to, designating, or situated in the region of the Sea of Marmara, between the Black Sea and the Aegean Sea.” Therefore, it has undergone zero derivation, but also narrowing, as the original sense refers to the region of the Sea of Marmara, while the Shakespearean one refers to the Sea itself. It appears in III. iii. 457, where Othello is determined to get revenge on Desdemona for having allegedly cheated on him. He voices his determination by alluding to

the Pontic Sea, whose ebb never retreats but always goes forwards towards the Propontic and the Hellespont. Therefore, the new sense serves a poetic purpose to create a vivid picture of Othello's determination. It is very rarely used: the last evidence is from 1905, and 'Propontic' as an adjective seems to be the one used.

Public commoner, *n.* (in public, *adj.*)

The Shakespearean sense is "public woman, a prostitute," which evolved from 'public:' "open to general observation, view, or knowledge; existing, performed, or carried out without concealment, so that all may see or hear. Of a person: that acts or performs in public." Therefore, it has undergone narrowing, as it has narrowed down to a woman that performs in public, and also pejoration, since it acquired negative connotations to become 'prostitute.' It appears in IV. ii. 72 said by Othello to describe, and therefore insult Desdemona. Because Othello believes she has cheated on him, he sees her as a prostitute who would go out with any man. It is an important new sense, as it is one of the main themes of the play. It has become obsolete, as Shakespeare is the only evidence, and it has been substituted by 'public woman.'

Puddle, *v.*

The Shakespearean sense is "to muddle, confuse, or corrupt (a person or his or her outlook, imagination, understanding, etc)." It developed from "to pollute or contaminate (water)." Therefore, it has acquired a metaphorical sense, where a person's outlook or understanding is confused or corrupted the same way water is contaminated. Consequently, the person's understanding is contaminated, metaphorically. It appears in III. iv. 137 said by Desdemona, who is worried that state matters or something in Cyprus has "puddled [Othello's] clear spirit." It is a relevant new sense, as the contamination of Othello's spirit has been carried out by Iago, which gives a perfect image of Iago making Othello jealous progressively, his judgment becoming more clouded. It seems to have survived, being in extended use: "I'd not puddle me mind with it." (Howker, J. (1985). *Nature of Beast*, v. 76).

Puny, *adj.*

The Shakespearean sense is "of a person, animal, or plant: undersized, slight; lacking in strength, weak, feeble." It evolved from "junior; inferior in rank, subordinate." Therefore, it has acquired a metaphorical sense, as 'inferior in rank, subordinate' has been extended to talk figuratively about a person, animal or plant that is weak, and therefore inferior. Consequently, it has also undergone pejoration. It appears in V. ii. 242, when Othello refuses to give his sword

after learning the truth of Iago's plan. With this new sense, Othello looks down on Montano and the others there, showing he no longer cares about his reputation. It has survived, but it is somewhat rare: "I felt mildly insulted at the idea that I was too puny to carry a bag of shopping." (Bentley, U. (1983). *Natural Order*, p. 128).

Quest, n.²

The Shakespearean sense is "a person or group of people engaged in searching," which developed from "a search or pursuit in order to find something; the action of searching." It seems to have undergone narrowing, as the Shakespearean sense specifies who is carrying out the search, while the original one is referring to the search itself. It appears said by Cassio (I. ii. 46), who informs Othello that the senate sent for "three several quests" to find him. Therefore, this new sense helps paint a picture of the extent of the senate's search (three groups of people), which consequently shows Othello's importance and his implication in the matter the senate is discussing. It has become obsolete, the last evidence being from 1638.

Raging, adj.

The Shakespearean sense is "of a tooth: aching furiously," which derived from "of a person or animal: raving in madness or fury, acting violently. Also: (of a natural force, a passion, etc.) violent, intense." Therefore, it has undergone hyperbole and narrowing, where the violence is narrowed down to the pain created by a tooth, and this pain is exaggerated. It appears in III. iii. 415, where Iago is making up a story about Cassio talking in his sleep, which he hears because of a "raging tooth" that does not let him sleep. In his sleep, Cassio is talking to Desdemona, telling her they must hide their love and kissing her ferociously afterwards. Therefore, the new sense serves Iago's plan to make Othello jealous. It has survived: "And knowing Chris, who has an ego like a raging tooth, it is over." (*Africa News* (Nexis), 15 Feb. 2006).

Raised, adj.¹

The Shakespearean sense is "roused up," which evolved from "lifted up, moved to a higher position." Therefore, it has undergone synecdoche, where the action of getting up (part) is extended to refer to the state of being roused up (whole). It appears in I. ii. 29, where Brabantio (the "raised father") and the servants go out to the streets with torches to search for Othello after Desdemona's elopement with him becomes known. Therefore, the new sense serves as a pun with "angered" (sense 3b, "agitated, upset, frenzied, angry"). It is rarely used, with the last

evidence being from 1911 and mostly used in religious terms: “It is real, but spiritual; not connected with a raised body, which is an absurd idea.” (*Biblical World*. (1911). 38, 161).

Raised, *adj.*¹

The Shakespearean sense is “instituted; embarked upon,” which evolved from the same sense as the previous ‘raised, *adj.*¹.’ The process it has undergone is not very clear, but it seems to have undergone metaphorical transfer, as it functions in a similar manner as ‘to raise an issue.’ In this case, a search is raised, with the metaphorical meaning of being ‘lifted up.’ It appears in I. i. 157, where the raised search is led to the lodgings of Othello and Desdemona. It has the same function as the previous sense (‘raised, *adj.*¹’), since the “raised search” is that one of Brabantio and the servants, who go to the lodgings of Othello and Desdemona with torches. It has become obsolete, Shakespeare being the only evidence for this sense.

Recommend, *v.*¹

The Shakespearean sense is “to inform (a person),” which evolved from “to communicate or report (a thing) to a person.” Therefore, it has undergone generalisation, where the sense it evolved from specifies that there is “a thing” that is ‘communicated’ or ‘reported’ to a person, whereas the Shakespearean uses ‘to inform,’ a wider sense than ‘communicate’ or ‘report.’ It appears in I. iii. 41, where a messenger is informing the Duke and the senators of the movement of the Turks, who are heading for Cyprus. The messenger is using a formal register that is in line with the formal language of the state. The new sense, therefore, adds to this register. It has become obsolete, since Shakespeare is the only evidence for this sense.

Redeemed, *adj.*

The Shakespearean sense is “of a sin, error, or failing: atoned for, compensated for; made good.” It evolved from “of a person, a soul, etc.: saved or delivered from sin, damnation, or criminality.” Therefore, it has acquired a metaphorical sense, where an error is “saved” by being atoned for or made good, as well as having ameliorated. It appears said by Iago (II. iii. 311), who is justifying he is not playing the villain because, if it were not for his counselling, Othello would renounce to his Christianity and “all seals and symbols of redeemed sin.” Therefore, this new sense is issued by Iago to justify himself and advance his plan this way. It has survived, but it is somewhat rare and seems to be quite restricted to religion: “The radical discontinuity of the eschatological Kingdom —namely, that the kingdom contains good that is redeemed evil.” (Black, R. (2000). *Christian Moral Realism*, p. 164).

Remorse, *n.*

The Shakespearean sense is “a solemn obligation,” which evolved from “regard for or understanding of whether something is right or wrong; moral sense.” The semantic change process is unclear, but there seems to have been narrowing, as one undertakes an obligation because one feels it is right. It is said by Iago (III. iii. 469), who is swearing loyalty and service to Othello, thus becoming his lieutenant. His oath contains the new sense, thus giving solemnity to his promise. It has become obsolete, Shakespeare being the only evidence for this sense.

Repeal, *v.*¹

The Shakespearean sense is “to try to get (a person) restored,” which developed from “to recall to a proper state or course.” Therefore, this is a clear instance of narrowing, as the Shakespearean sense specifies what will be recalled to a proper state, in this case the restoration of a person. In the play (II. iii. 324), it refers to the restoration of Cassio’s rank as Othello’s lieutenant, which shows even more narrowing (restoration of a rank). The new sense again serves Iago’s plan, as he will tell Othello that Desdemona is trying to “repeal” Cassio “for her body’s lust.” Moreover, the new sense describes with precision what Cassio wants. It has become obsolete, Shakespeare being the only evidence for this sense.

Ruffian, *v.*

The Shakespearean sense is “of wind, etc.: to rage, bluster,” which evolved from “to act as a ruffian, to play the ruffian.” Thus, it has undergone metaphorical transfer, where the wind is personified: the wind plays the ruffian because it rages and blusters, which also are actions performed by a person. It appears in II. i. 7, when Montano is describing the bad weather at sea. This new sense creates a poetic image of the wind raging against the sea and creating huge waves. It has become obsolete and chiefly poetic.

To run through, *v.* (in run, *v.*)

The Shakespearean sense is “to relate, rehearse (a tale, list, sequence of events, etc.),” which evolved from “to go with quick steps on alternate feet, never having both or (in the case of many animals) all feet on the ground at the same time; to make one’s way or cover the ground in this manner.” Therefore, it has acquired a metaphorical sense, where one ‘runs through’ a story figuratively. It appears in I. iii. 131, where Othello tells the Duke that he used to “to run through” the story of his life, i.e. relating it to Brabantio. It is important to note that Shakespeare uses it as “run it through,” with the object between the two part of the phrasal verb, as it has

different connotations than “to run through it.” The latter gives the idea that the story has been told quickly or summarily., while the Shakespearean one only refers to the telling of the story. Moreover, the play suggests that Othello told his story in detail: “from my boyish days to the very moment he bade me tell it” (v. 131-132). It has survived until nowadays, but the other sense of ‘to run through’ is more widely used.

Self-charity, *n.* (in “self-” prefix)

Like ‘out-sport, *v.*’ and ‘out-tongue, *v.*’, this sense has undergone prefixation with an unusual basis, ‘charity, *n.*’. Nevertheless, its meaning is clear: charity towards oneself. In the play (II. iii. 183.), however, it is used in the sense of self-defence, where Montano tells Othello he has done nothing wrong, unless “self-charity be sometimes a vice, and to defend ourselves be sometimes a sin when violence assails us” (II. iii. 183-5). Its function is not evident, but it seems to be used as a synonym for ‘self-defence’ or “to defend ourselves.” It may also denote Montano’s sorrow when defending his innocence, indirectly asking Othello’s charity. It has survived: “These lines seem to me a casting out for comfort, a prayer for self-forgiveness, self-charity.” (*American Poetry Review*. (1997). 37/1).

Sense, *n.*

The Shakespearean sense is “capacity for perception and appreciation of an abstract quality or concept, esp. one that is highly regarded or valued.” It evolved from “a faculty, esp. of an intuitive nature, of accurately perceiving, discerning, or evaluating”. Therefore, it has undergone narrowing, as the Shakespearean sense specifies what is evaluated or appreciated (an abstract quality). It appears in II. i. 71, where the “tempests themselves, high seas, and howling winds” (v.68) have a “sense of beauty” and therefore provide safe passage for Desdemona. By personifying them, this new sense helps elevate Desdemona’s beauty, and consequently also Cassio’s description of her beauty. It is a highly used sense nowadays: “She has a highly developed sense of the ridiculous.” (Hoey, B. (2002). *Her Majesty*, p. 350).

To the sense (in sense, *n.*)

The Shakespearean sense is “to a point of extreme or unbearable pain or sensitivity,” which developed from “any of the faculties by which external or internal stimuli are perceived, involving the transmission of nerve impulses from specialized neurons (receptors) to the brain.” Therefore, it has undergone narrowing, as the stimuli is narrowed to pain and that which is extreme or unbearable, as well as pejoration, since it is extreme pain. It appears in V. i. 11

said by Iago, who says he has “rubbed this young quat almost to the sense,” talking about Roderigo. This new sense shows Iago’s manipulative ability, as he has rubbed Roderigo so much, he has manipulated his behaviour and made him angry, which goes in favour of his plan. It has become obsolete, Shakespeare being the only evidence for this sense.

Soul, *n.*

The Shakespearean sense is “strength of character; strongly developed intellectual, moral, or aesthetic qualities.” It evolved from “the seat of a person's emotions, feelings, or thoughts; the moral or emotional part of a person's nature.” It therefore has undergone narrowing, as the Shakespearean sense specifies that these emotions or thoughts have been strongly developed, resulting in a strength of character. It is said by Iago (I. i. 54) when describing the type of servants that seem to serve their master but in fact look out for themselves, i.e. a cunning knave. They are cunning because they “have some soul.” This new sense is important, because Iago describes himself as this type of servant, outwardly expressing his intentions. It is a widely used sense, frequently associated with art: “It's fine to dissect how Mr. Heifetz plays, but the plain fact is, the man's got soul.” (Elias, G. (2009). *Devil's Trill*, p. 71).

At soul (in soul, *n.*)

The Shakespearean sense is “sincerely; deeply,” which developed from the same sense as the previous one (‘soul, *n.*’). Thus, its sense has narrowed to refer to that feeling or emotion (in the seat of emotions) that is deep or sincere. It appears in I. iii. 194 said by Brabantio, who is “glad at soul” that he has no more children, as Desdemona’s escape would teach him to keep them close to prevent their escape. The new sense helps quantify how upset Brabantio is at Desdemona’s behaviour. It has survived: “Arthur Macdougall was at soul a poet.” (Macdougall, W. M. in A. Macdougall. (2001). *Remembering Dud Dean*, p. 237).

In terms (in term, *n.*)

The Shakespearean sense is “on good terms; on a friendly or amicable footing,” which developed from “a condition under which something may be done, settled, agreed, or granted, a stipulated requirement or limitation.” Therefore, it has undergone narrowing and amelioration, as the Shakespearean sense specifies the terms, which are good. It appears in I. iii. 85 said by Iago, who is telling Othello that he was startled by the fight, as everyone was “on good terms.” Once again, the new sense serves Iago’s purpose, this time to create an alibi

that excludes him from having caused the fight. It has become obsolete, the only other evidence for this sense being from 1653.

At a time (in time, *n*, *int. conj.*)

This sense is included inside the definition “at one time and another, at various times; occasionally, on occasion.” However, it is a coinage because it was first used by Shakespeare in the form of ‘at a time’ instead of ‘at times,’ the form of the definition the Shakespearean sense is included in. Therefore, there is no change in meaning, but only in grammar. It appears in II. iii. 285, where Iago is telling Cassio that men can sometimes get drunk, so it should not worry him that he got drunk that night. By doing this, Iago gives hope to Cassio that he can get his rank back and tells him that he should do so by asking Othello’s wife, Desdemona. Thus, Iago is again using a new sense to advance his plan. It has become obsolete, as Shakespeare is the only evidence for this sense.

Unproper, *adj.* (and *adv.*)

The Shakespearean sense is “not belonging to an individual; common, general.” Its original sense does not seem to be inside the headword ‘unproper,’ but because it has undergone prefixation, it is sense II. 3b in ‘proper, *adj.*’: “belonging or relating to a specified person or thing distinctively or exclusively; characteristic; particular.” Therefore, it has undergone prefixation with an unusual prefix (since the usual would be ‘im-’ to create ‘improper’), which creates an antonym for ‘proper, *adj.*’ It appears in IV. i. 66 said by Iago, who is comforting Othello by explaining to him that there are many men that are cheated on by their wives, i.e. men who lie in beds they swear are their own (“peculiar”) but are in fact “unproper,” as they are shared by their wives’ lovers. The new sense may be a pun on “lack of modesty or decorum,” which is sense 2b in ‘unproper, *adj.*’, but as the OED explains, sense 2b is not recorded until the 18th century. Therefore, the sense may serve as a euphemism for ‘cuckold.’ It has become obsolete, since Shakespeare is the only recorded evidence for this sense.

Woman, *v.*

The Shakespearean sense is “to be accompanied by a woman or women,” which evolved from “to make womanly; to cause to be or behave as a woman.” The process here is quite unclear, but it seems that it has evolved in the sense that to be in the company of women would make one womanly, the Shakespearean sense being the cause for becoming womanly. Considering this, it would have undergone generalisation, as the Shakespearean sense refers to the cause. It

appears in III. iv. 192 said by Cassio, who tells Bianca, his lover, to go away because he does not want Othello to see him with her (“womaned”). The new sense serves the purpose of showing that Cassio does not want Othello to think he is not taking his job seriously by being accompanied by a woman. It has survived, but it is quite rare: “He was in the mood to settle down. Or, as the mountain men liked to say, it was time for him to be ‘womaned’.” (Sides, H. (2006). *Blood & Thunder*, p. 26).