1. Introduction

This paper examines an exchange in the pages of American Speech between Eric Partridge, author of the Dictionary of the Underworld (1949a), David Maurer, its reviewer, and Gershon Legman, whose intervention in the debate appears to have been at Maurer’s behest. This remarkably heated public correspondence identifies differences between these lexicographers’ approaches to their work and their attitudes towards intellectual copyright. This insight into the personalities behind the publications highlights broader conflicts in linguistic thought.

Partridge’s approach to lexicography was text-based and historical. He scoured publications from around the world and across the centuries to find examples of the words he was documenting, sometimes without due regard to the reliability of his sources. Maurer was interested in lexis in the context of its use in narrowly defined social sub-groups at a particular moment in time. Maurer felt that any reuse of his painstaking work was an abuse of the relationships of trust he had built up with his informants and of his own intellectual property rights. Partridge argued that as long as due credit was given, no plagiarism and therefore no abuse of copyright had occurred.
2. Lexicographers and Reviewers; Reviews and Responses

**Eric Partridge**

Partridge’s *Songs and Slang of the British Soldier* with John Brophy (1930), his *Dictionary of Forces’ Slang* with Wilfred Granville and Frank Roberts (1948), and his edition of *Grose’s Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue* (1931) would have been enough to establish him as a prominent slang lexicographer, but his *Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* (1937), already in its third edition by the time of his controversy with Maurer, had cemented his pre-eminence in the field. Partridge had also published numerous other dictionaries and books about various aspects of the English language. It was with great confidence, then, that he could acknowledge the flaws of the *Dictionary of the Underworld*:

> No one, except perhaps Joseph F. Fishman, Godfrey Irwin and David W. Maurer, the three leading American authorities upon cant in the United States can be so acutely aware as I am that this dictionary is, for the years since 1940, incomplete on the American side (Partridge 1949a, p.789)

The coverage of American cant in this dictionary represented a new challenge for Partridge: in the *Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* he had included only American terms that had been naturalized in Britain or the Commonwealth. In the *Dictionary of the Underworld*, Partridge could build on material from the earlier dictionary for British and Commonwealth terms; for American cant he had to start from scratch.

By this point in his career, Partridge’s methods for data collection and analysis were well established, though he did adapt them for this work. His was a historical approach based largely on written sources. Partridge (1937) tended to assume that a slang term would be in spoken use for some years before it was written down, and this assumption is built into the date-ranges provided: the earliest date of use given generally antedates the evidence available. Although individual citations are sometimes presented in Partridge
(1937), entries generally summarize evidence from various dictionary and other sources. Partridge (1949a) provides fuller bibliographic evidence, though its function is unclear, and the citations that are provided offer little information about context or usage:


Page references are provided in some citations, but they are often omitted. Publishers’ names and locations are not provided. The most frequently cited sources are progressively abbreviated through the course of the alphabet, and a reader unfamiliar with the source has no means of determining whether it is a book, an article in an academic journal, magazine, or newspaper, or a private letter. No bibliography is provided, so a reader wishing to locate an unknown source must first locate its fullest citation by scanning entries at the beginning of the alphabet.

Partridge aimed to document geographical and social variations as well as changes in meaning and use through time. He provided etymologies wherever he could, though his idiosyncratic methods
were such that his etymologies are often unsound. He wrote later that:

Rather than entrust myself to the quicksands of fanatical phonetics or to the raging seas of parochial philology, I prefer, when I confront a difficulty insoluble by ordinary means, to enlist the aid of history or, if I’m desperate, to resort to imagination; often I combine these two means, either by an imaginative use of history or by a pragmatic use of imagination. (Partridge 1961a, p.39)

Despite his avowed mistrust of philology, much of Partridge’s evidence is derived from earlier dictionaries and glossaries, sometimes without due consideration of their originality or reliability. Excluding his service in two world wars, Partridge’s professional activities were predominantly bookish: he was, at various times, a student, teacher, lecturer, editor, publisher, freelance author and lexicographer.

**David Maurer**

Maurer was nine years younger than Partridge. His publications to date were also impressively extensive, but they undoubtedly weighed less than Partridge’s, consisting as they did of numerous articles in scholarly journals and several shorter pieces in popular publications. Each dealt with the language of a self-contained group of criminals or near-criminals, and most included a glossary. Maurer had also published a book, *The Big Con* (Maurer 1940), revealing the methods and language used by con-men.

Maurer’s glossaries and the commentaries upon them arose from careful and detailed fieldwork, largely by interview.¹ His focus was synchronic and local: typically his articles concentrate on a moment in time among a limited social or professional group, often in a narrowly defined geographical area. Although there are often

¹ Maurer does not document his fieldwork in the body of his papers as a modern sociolinguist would, so it is impossible to evaluate the reliability of his data. Glimpses of his methodology are provided in comments on his work by those around him (Gehman 1955; Flexner 1981; Futrell 1981; McDavid 1982)
overlaps among the wordlists, Maurer never generalizes and rarely alludes to usage by other groups or at other times:

(2) hustler, n. 1. A peddler or pitchman who has no special line, but “hustles” anything that another pitchman will pay him for. 2. A prostitute. (Maurer 1931a)

(3) hustler, n. A loose term meaning: 1. A prostitute. 2. A specialist in some unlawful enterprise. (Maurer 1931b)

(4) HUSTLER. A prostitute. (Maurer 1935)

(5) HUSTLER. n. Anyone with a racket, as a prostitute, dice hustler, etc. (Maurer 1981b)

It is consistent with Maurer’s lack of interest in the history or development of words that he rarely offers etymologies. Instead, each of his glossaries has a lengthy introduction offering information about the educational levels, intelligence, methods and morals of the group he is studying and about the social and professional functions played by cant within that group.

Maurer’s purpose was to explore the use of language within a tightly specified social network and context. He was interested in language as a social tool, and his collaborations with police and drug agencies indicate that the connection between words and the world was more forceful and instrumental for Maurer than for Partridge. Maurer’s lack of interest in the history of words put him on safer ground than Partridge: it meant that there was no need for him to engage in the notoriously problematic task of slang etymology.

**Maurer’s Review**

Maurer’s review of Partridge (1949a) in *American Speech* begins in what appears to be a positive tone:

> Once in about every generation a book is published which dominates its field. Such a book is Partridge’s *Dictionary of the Underworld* … It is truly a monumental work … it will undoubtedly be cited and quoted for years to come. It has about it the Air of Authority. Let us look inside. (Maurer 1951)
This laudatory tone is quickly undercut by what follows, and on second reading it becomes apparent that the first paragraph actually implies that that any praise the dictionary receives will be undeserved.

Maurer’s criticisms are numerous and detailed: Partridge does not define what he means by terms such as cant or slang; his definitions and etymologies are inaccurate; he depends upon unreliable written sources rather than fieldwork; he has inadequate knowledge of the relevant social contexts; he is too ready to categorize, making misleadingly precise judgements based more on intuition than evidence; and his coverage of American usage is particularly weak. Maurer was studying drugs slang at the time, and selects terms from this field to illustrate Partridge’s failings.

Partridge’s First Response

What must have been a swiftly written response appeared in the next issue of American Speech. Partridge was apparently unconcerned about Maurer’s corrections, acknowledging later that “the book contains errors … So, in point of fact, does every other book.” (Partridge 1951b). Although he did not address Maurer’s corrections in his response, Partridge incorporated them wholesale into the addenda in a later edition of the Dictionary of the Underworld, as the progression from (7) to (9) illustrates:

(7) *gee yen. ‘Residue of opium in stem (of pipe),’ Convict, 1934: not c., but j. Chinese phrase. (Partridge 1949a)
(8) How could the ‘residue’ of an opium pellet get into the stem? Partridge probably confuses gee-yen with yen-shee, which is a residue, but which collects in the eye of the pipe … gee-yen is a precipitate, not a residue. … gee is from Hindustani ghee, not French guy (Maurer, 1951, pp. 40-1)
(9) *gee yen. Not a residue but a precipitate; eye, not stem, of pipe. Moreover, the gee is Hindi ghī (pronounced ghee), butter. (D.W. Maurer.) (Partridge 1961b)

Having never presented himself as omniscient or infallible, Partridge continued to treat Maurer as an expert source, and was happy to defer to him on matters of detail.
Maurer’s general criticisms were harder to avoid, however, and his tone provocatively dismissive:

Mr. Partridge, with the deftness of a philological postal clerk, pigeonholes his terms with little regard for the social structure of the underworld … He includes, excludes, and questions the authenticity of words with a highhandedness characteristic of the arm-chair editor (Maurer 1951, p. 39)

Partridge addressed Maurer’s general criticisms by emphasizing his long experience and established reputation. Arguing that criminals are not the best authorities on their own language, he nevertheless insisted that he had undertaken “what is called field work” (Partridge 1951a, p. 126), acknowledging that a scholar can never know as much about language use in a specific context as a first-hand observer. However, many reliable criminals, police officers, and prison doctors from around the English-speaking world had documented their observations, and this allowed Partridge to adopt a more general and historical approach. Oddly, because it was not an issue fore-grounded by Maurer, Partridge also discussed copyright in some detail, arguing that the person who documents a word does not own it, but that a lexicographer quoting another’s definition or using their glossary in its entirety should give due acknowledgement. For Partridge, acknowledgement was the key: it justified detailed, extensive, and even exhaustive use of his sources.

Not content with defending his own methodology, Partridge attacked Maurer’s, commenting that he was too ready to separate out specialized uses of general terms; to propose separate and self-contained sub-cultures; and to believe his informants. He had a parochial perspective, an easy life as an academic, and thought that he owned the language he documented.

**Gershon Legman and his Intervention**

Maurer did not answer Partridge’s comments himself. Instead, a response was written by Gershon Legman, who appears to have known Maurer personally and corresponded with him. Given Partridge’s insinuation that Maurer’s academic security gave him an unfair advantage, Legman’s status made him a suitable
respondent: he was an independent scholar publishing largely in the fields of erotica and censorship. He had also had a little experience of slang lexicography in the form of Legman (1941), part of a larger work on the psychology of homosexuality written by various authors. It provides careful definitions of terms used by and about homosexuals, paying particular attention to fine shades of meaning:

(6) **hustler** A male prostitute to homosexuals, especially so called if he is himself heterosexual. A common slang term for an accosting female prostitute. (Legman 1941)

Legman indicates carefully where different groups use terms with dissimilar connotations, and often comments on etymology and semantic development. His purpose appears to have been to help those involved in treating homosexuals to identify and understand their patients better, though he does not explain what function he anticipated for his glossary.

Legman’s language is less measured than Maurer’s; his criticisms less carefully couched. He concedes that Partridge:

> does useful work, but it should be clearly understood that compiling from other dictionaries is the largest part of what he has done … Partridge’s treatment of his sources is, in general, not in conformity with twentieth-century scholarly practice (Legman 1951, pp. 130, 131)

Legman does not restrict his criticisms to the *Dictionary of the Underworld*, and ranges across a variety of Partridge’s publications to demonstrate his lack of independence and scholarship. Legman observes that although Partridge has a tendency to quote from his sources at length, sometimes acknowledging them only obliquely, he does not select them well. The contents of Berrey and Van den Bark (1942, 1947) were taken on trust, for example, but Partridge failed to refer to other works (including some of Maurer’s) that were more central to his area of interest. Moreover, Partridge’s reliance on information from correspondents rendered him “an easy mark for the most outlandish of leg-pulls on the part of anyone who
cares to write him a letter” (Legman 1951, p. 131).² Legman concluded by providing a list of dubious etymologies and datings.

**Partridge’s Second Response**

In his reply to Legman, Partridge again emphasized his experience and reputation:

> When either [Maurer or Legman] has achieved a work comparable to *Underworld* or to *A Dictionary of Slang*, his animadversions will perhaps carry more weight. (Partridge 1951b, pp. 201-2)

Although “almost temperate” (Partridge 1951b, p. 202) in his criticisms, Maurer was swayed by “the present craze for ‘culture patterns’” (ibid.), and failed to acknowledge or address the broader scope of Partridge’s work. At least “he does not throw mud” (ibid.). Legman, on the other hand, bespattered himself more than his target “for whereas several of his statements are grossly, demonstrably, and, indeed, rather obviously inaccurate, one or two are risible” (Partridge 1951b, pp. 202-3). Perhaps in an attempt to bring the discussion to an end, Partridge did not provide specific examples, though he criticized Legman for the same failing. Although censuring Partridge for his over-reliance on written sources, Legman had complained that he made insufficient use of Maurer’s glossaries. In response, Partridge observed archly that “Mr. Legman must spend an interesting and amazing life; he likes to have things both ways.”³

### 3. Motives and Issues

² Legman provides neither example nor evidence for this assertion. Unless he or an associate had seen their own faked data published by Partridge, the assertion can only be based upon the type of “snap judgment” that Maurer (1951a, p. 39) objected to in Partridge’s work.

³ This appears to refer either to Legman’s interest in oral sex (Legman 1940) or to his sexuality. Legman’s work on homosexual slang still leads scholars to assume that he was homosexual himself, although his marriages and children provide more concrete evidence to the contrary (Cornog & Pepper 1999; Landesman 1999).
The *American Speech* exchange operates on a number of levels, with implied and explicit condemnation of methodological disparities intertwined with professional rivalries. Partridge was not a trained linguist. He had learnt his trade by imitation, trial and error, and considered himself a successor to nineteenth-century philologers in the Oxford tradition. Maurer was trained in structural linguistics, and was undoubtedly influenced by Saussure’s doubts about the validity of diachronic linguistics. This was a debate about principles as much as methodology. From Partridge’s perspective, Maurer operated with such a painfully narrow focus that combing through all of his published glossaries for useable data would have been an insufficiently rewarding task. From Maurer’s perspective, Partridge’s uncontextualized and derivative data was rendered worse than unreliable by its pretence to authority.

Another motive underlying this exchange is the question of Maurer’s intellectual property rights:

> no one resented more than he did the high-handed misappropriation of his (or any other’s) research … he felt that scholars worked too hard for too little pecuniary compensation to let themselves be exploited as they often are. (McDavid 1982, p. 282)

These proprietorial tendencies are apparent in Maurer’s response to the use of his glossaries, among many others from *American Speech*, in the compilation of Berrey and Van den Bark (1942). Although many of the original authors could have made the same complaint about this appropriation of their work, it is evident that Maurer alone did. The second edition contains a “grateful acknowledgement … for permission to use unique definitions first collated by him after extensive original research” (Berrey and Van den Bark 1954, p. xii).

Moreover, in 1974 Maurer filed a $10 million lawsuit against the makers of the film *The Sting* (1973), starring Paul Newman and Robert Redford. The film is broken into segments representing different stages in a ‘long con’: one designed to empty not only the victim’s pockets, but also his bank account. Maurer’s claim was based on the similarity of these stages and their processes to sections of his book (Maurer 1940). The case was settled out of
court, and Maurer is now credited as an expert consultant despite having had no direct involvement in the production of the film.

Although Maurer (1951) barely mentioned the question of copyright, Partridge (1951a) addressed it in some detail, causing Legman (1951, p. 130) to comment that he “is clearly defending himself against some accusation, but what it is, or where or by whom it was made, is difficult to discover”. There are several possible explanations. First, Partridge knew of Maurer’s litigious inclinations by report, and was adopting a position of pre-emptive defiance. Second, Maurer had already corresponded with Partridge with respect to this or earlier publications, leading him to identify an acknowledged agenda behind the review. Third, Partridge’s speculations about the cause of Maurer’s vituperative tone led him to reflect guiltily upon his own editorial practices.

Another possible explanation for the heated tone of this debate, impossible to prove or disprove, is that Maurer resented Partridge’s success and envied his ability to move beyond the detailed and specific level on which Maurer typically worked. Maurer’s establishment of clear boundaries between criminal groups relied on slight differences in usage: the importance of these slight differences is what justifies Maurer’s work. This must have made it difficult for Maurer to summarize and generalize in the dictionary of criminal language that he ultimately failed to complete (McDavid 1982, p. 283). Partridge’s completion of a dictionary of cant would have been maddening even without regard to its quality, and Maurer was never an effusive reviewer.

4. Partridge’s Use of Glossaries by Maurer and Legman

In order to determine whether Maurer and Legman had any reason to believe that Partridge had infringed their intellectual property rights, it is necessary to compare the contents of Partridge (1949a) with Legman (1941), and with a selection of Maurer’s glossaries published by that date (1931b, 1935, 1939, 1941, 1943, 1947). Of these, Partridge (1949a) cites only ‘The Argot of the Underworld’ (1931b) and ‘The Argot of Forgery’ (1941) in his main alphabetical listing. ‘The Argot of the Three-Shell Game’ (1947) is cited in the addenda.
**Partridge’s Use of ‘The Argot of the Underworld’**

Of a sample of the first 100 senses in Maurer (1931b), Partridge (1949a) listed 86. Some of Maurer’s senses had been in use for centuries, and it is not surprising that Partridge had already located sufficient examples of use in other (often earlier) sources: of the 66 senses included without reference to Maurer’s glossary, only 17 could have been antedated. These antedatings are all relatively small, stretching to a maximum of only 6 years, but in later editions of this and other dictionaries, Partridge regularly noted antedatings less significant than this. The first citations in these cases are largely from Rose (1934), who had constructed his *Thesaurus* by working through *American Speech* glossaries, including those by Maurer (see Coleman 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partridge (1949)</th>
<th>Maurer (1931a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earlier citation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same date</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>later citation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sole citation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no citation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Partridge’s treatment of senses listed in Maurer (1931b)

Partridge excluded 15 of Maurer’s senses, usually for clearly identifiable reasons: Maurer defines a phrasal headword whose constituent words Partridge treats separately (6 instances); Maurer’s definition represents a specific usage treated by Partridge under a
more general sense (2 instances); or Maurer’s sense does not satisfy Partridge’s understanding of his remit (i.e. Partridge does not consider Maurer’s usage to be cant) (2 instances).

**Partridge’s Use of ‘The Argot of Forgery’**

Partridge (1949a) made rather different use of Maurer (1941). As Table 2 indicates, he omitted a similar proportion of Maurer’s senses (for a similar range of reasons), but he had fewer other citations for this glossary’s contents. Although he had earlier citations for 38 of Maurer’s senses, Partridge included 47 solely on Maurer’s authority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maurer (1941)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earlier citation</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same date</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>later citation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sole citation</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no citation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Partridge’s treatment of senses listed in Maurer (1941)

Partridge’s failure to find later citations for Maurer’s senses exposes his poor coverage of recent American cant. In response to Legman’s (1951) criticisms, he acknowledged that he had not been able to access as many modern American sources as he would have liked, and observed that the dictionary’s coverage looked even worse in this respect because of delays in publication after the completion of the text (Partridge 1951b, p. 130). In his defence,
Partridge also observed that he had already drawn attention to these weaknesses (Partridge 1949a, p.789).

**Partridge’s Use of ‘The Argot of the Three-Shell Game’**

Partridge did not have access to Maurer (1947) when he compiled his main alphabetical listing of approximately 26,000 headwords. Consequently, it is not cited in the main listing, as shown in Table 3. Only 20 of its 92 senses are presented on the basis of evidence from other sources, all antedating Maurer; 72 are omitted from the main wordlist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maurer (1947)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earlier citation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same date</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>later citation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sole citation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no citation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Partridge’s treatment of senses listed in Maurer (1947) in the main alphabetical listing

However, Maurer (1947) was one of only three new sources cited by Partridge in the addenda of approximately 400 headwords. Maurer is cited as additional evidence for 9 of the 20 senses for which Partridge had earlier citations in the main list. 24 senses were omitted for reasons consistent with Partridge’s treatment of Maurer’s earlier glossaries. 48 of Maurer’s senses are included in Partridge’s appendix on the sole evidence of their inclusion in
Maurer (1947). These senses represent 12% of the headwords in the addenda, and are thus particularly striking in this context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partridge (1944) addenda</th>
<th>Maurer (1947)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cited</td>
<td>not cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earlier citation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>later citation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sole citation</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no citation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Partridge’s treatment of senses listed in Maurer (1947) in his addenda

**Glossaries That Partridge Overlooked**

We have already seen that although Partridge claimed to have “used Dr Maurer’s numerous valuable glossaries very sparingly” (1949a, p. ix), he had found a great deal of useful material in those he had examined closely. Similarly extensive new material would undoubtedly have been provided by the glossaries Partridge did not consult. Of the first 100 headwords in Maurer (1935), Partridge missed 38 of Maurer’s senses. He listed 62 from other sources, and could have used Maurer (1935) to antedate 2 existing first citations, both from Berrey and Van den Bark (1942), who derived their information from Maurer. Of the 77 senses in Maurer (1939), Partridge omitted 63. He listed only 14 from other sources, of which he could have antedated only one, by one year.

Partridge did not provide any explanation for his under-use of Maurer’s glossaries, but there are several possible reasons. First,
Partridge had several extensive American sources providing earlier citations for many of the widely used terms listed by Maurer. Maurer thus provided relatively few relatively small antedatings. Second, much of Maurer’s material, and much else, was more conveniently available in Berrey and van den Bark (1942). Third, the task of combing through Maurer’s glossaries and comparing them with existing evidence would have been time-consuming and frustrating, exposing considerable gaps in Partridge’s coverage that could only be filled by extensive additional research. While it is easy to justify reference to a modern source providing only a handful of new senses, including so many otherwise undocumented terms from Maurer would have forced Partridge to confront the quality of his evidence and his relationship with his sources. Preferring to emphasize that his was a historical dictionary, Partridge (1949a, p. ix) chose instead to concede that “I have not strained myself to present a work that is ‘up to the minute’”.

Legman’s glossary listed approximately 330 headwords. He did not explain his methodology, but he appears to have compiled it independently. There is no evidence that Partridge knew Legman’s work, but the *Dictionary of the Underworld* includes 24 of Legman’s first 100 senses from other sources. Reference to the third edition of the *Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* (Partridge 1949b) confirms that Partridge was aware of many more of Legman’s terms, most of which were slang rather than cant. This explanation does not exclude the possibility that Partridge inadvertently injured Legman’s *amour propre* by overlooking his glossary.

5. Conclusions

Maurer and Legman’s underlying motivations for criticizing Partridge were somewhat different. Maurer was making the case for sociolinguistics before that discipline was fully developed and setting out the reasons why Partridge’s diachronic approach had little scholarly value. Legman was not opposed to diachronic linguistics *per se*: the fact that he criticized Partridge’s inaccurate etymologies implies that he considered Partridge’s historical approach viable but inadequately performed.
Although there is only circumstantial evidence, it is not unlikely that Maurer resented Partridge’s derivative use of some of his own glossaries. It must have been particularly galling to see Partridge’s dependence on Berrey and Van den Bark (1942) and Rose (1934). This type of secondary dependence proved how vital it was for Maurer to maintain credit for and claim to his own work. Legman appears to have been motivated by loyalty to Maurer. As an apparently impartial contributor, he could be more direct in alleging that Partridge had made improper use of Maurer’s glossaries. The apparently incompatible complaint that Partridge failed to make use of the best sources may be partially motivated by the omission of Legman’s own glossary.

Partridge was a free-lance writer with a family to support. Accepting the justice of his critics’ comments would have undermined his livelihood, his pride, his status, and the value of most of his published works to date. Clearly this was not an option, and Partridge did not change his methodology in later editions of any of his dictionaries. He continued to make thorough use of previously published dictionaries and to admit his own limitations with cheerful frankness.

Partridge was not guilty of plagiarism in this instance: citing sources is fundamental to his methodology. Copyright is a more difficult issue, not least because the United States had not yet achieved an internationally binding compromise with European conventions on intellectual property. Since Partridge had not republished Maurer’s work in its original format, the issue is actually one of fair use under copyright law. Fair use is a concept under continuous review by case law in Britain and the United States, and its application to dictionary citations is particularly unclear. Partridge and Maurer could probably both have found lawyers prepared to argue their case, and uncertainty as to the outcome may explain why the case was never brought. Arguing today, Partridge’s lawyer would undoubtedly emphasize that:

Copyright protects the particular way an author has expressed himself. It does not extend to any ideas, systems, or factual

4 The Universal Copyright Convention was signed in 1952.
However, even if Partridge’s use of information found in his sources does not represent an infringement of copyright, the reliance of the appendix on a small number of sources laid bare significant methodological limitations that are better hidden in the main body of the dictionary.

Many of Maurer and Legman’s criticisms of Partridge were true, but not necessarily entirely just. It is clear from Partridge’s Foreword that compiling from other dictionaries was central to his approach. He also confessed the limitations of his etymologies and of his coverage of modern American cant. The flaws of the *Dictionary of the Underworld* are beyond question: Partridge himself did not attempt to conceal them. Partridge’s position was that he had done the job as well as he could, and that this was better than nothing; Legman’s that it should have been done better. Maurer, in contrast, argued that it should not have been attempted at all. If we believe historical lexicography to be a feasible and worthwhile activity, we have to side with Legman: a reliable historical dictionary of the language of criminals and beggars would be a useful tool, but Partridge’s falls short of this ideal in many respects.
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