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**A Frame-based Latin Lexicon**

In "A Frame-Based Latin Lexicon" (FBLL) Short (WS) proposes a "proof of concept" effort to create a cognitively oriented online Latin dictionary. The proposal critically notes that extant on-line Latin lexicons are "committed to nineteenth-century historical semantics, which both adheres to a linear alphabetical ordering of words and, at the level of word sense, emphasizes etymological over contextual meaning and chronological development over usage patterns". To break out of the limitations of these dictionaries, Short proposes a frame semantic lexicography that will reveal "the structure of the conceptual system encapsulated by this language".

The inspriration for this project is clearly both the Berkeley approach to semantics exemplified by Fillmore, Lakoff, Berlin, Kay, and Sweetser and, more generally, cognitive linguistics (Langacker) and historical semantics (Geeraerts). The incorporation of the insights of these scholars as well as Short's own work on Latin semantics provide a very promising line of development for research on Latin philology and, more generally, Latin "world views" in the sense of Idealized Cognitive Models. This term, applicable to Lakoff's work seems to capture at least some of Short's work on Latin, which I think is more influenced by Lakoff than by Fillmore, particularly in the latter's development into FrameNet. My question about this project therefore is not about the utility of a cognitive approach to Latin lexicography/philology but rather whether the PI has selected in frame semantics and, particularly, FrameNet, the most useful way of representing the cognitive foundation of the Latin lexicon online. Thus while I am not convinced that this project is fundable at present, I do feel that a cognitive grammar approach to Latin is extremely useful and could significantly impact the interpretation of Latin texts and society.

Short effectively notes that the deficiencies of online dictionaries that continue a 19th-century lexicographic tradition: they are semasiological, focused on polysemy and etymological development. To break out of the limitations of these dictionaries, Short proposes a frame semantic lexicography that will reveal "the structure of the conceptual system encapsulated by this language". A frame-based Latin lexicon would be onomasiological, focused on synonymy (or, better said, near-synonymy) and usage or context. However, Geeraerts ("Lexicographical treatment of prototypical polysemy") once commented that Wierzbicka "tends to underestimate the distinction between practical lexicography and theoretical semantics" and I think that in this project there is a similar problem: how to effectively operationalize the many insights that Short presents in his work into an online lexical resource. I do not think that FrameNet is a good model.

In proposing a project such as the present a good initial question is whether the resource is an online presentation of a research project or a lexicosemantic resource for other scholars, such as those who are trying to interpret (decode) received Latin texts. This is not to say that an online presentation of the metaphors used in a particular domain (e.g., "alimentary metaphors of communication") can/will not have a significant impact on future impretations of Latin texts but only that it is not easy to envision how these types of metaphors would be presented in an online dictionary.

My own experience with frame semantics is that classic "paper-published" discussions such as those on the "risk frame" or the "transaction frame" are more edifying than the online version in FrameNet. This relates to two previous comments: (a) the difference between Idealized Cognitive Models and Frame semantics (> FrameNet) and (b) the difference between practical lexicography and theoretical semantics. This points also relate to the need for a clearer expression of precisely on who would use the online Frame-based Latin lexicon and what for: to interpret and decoded, or to read and learn.

Finally, in terms of practical lexicography and a cognitive approach to there are three facets of this that might be interesting to explore. The first stems from Atkins influence on a corpus-based approach in her collaborations with Fillmore. Certainly in regards to Latin a study of usage through a corpus could provide an important tool, within the realm of cognitive semantics, for study of Latin literature and society. (Indeed, Atkins discussion of verbs of seeing and her sample "usage" entry at the end seems perhaps a more effective approach than that outlined by Ruppenhofer and colleagues. The second stems from Geeraerts focus on diachronic lexicosemantics. Latin usage changed over time and though I am not familiar with the extent of diachronic shift it would seem that a cognitive approach should take this into account. Finally, developing a Frame Semantics set of entries is an extremely time-consuming process and, at least in some cases, requires a corpus-based approach to lexicography (cf. the articles in the 2003 issue of International Journal of Lexicography; I believe somewhere Atkins and/or Fillmore commented on the effort to establish the "risk frame"). The FBLL project seems to rely on the introspection of WS and his colleagues to develop and populate the frames that will be displayed online and given the specificity of the approach and the high level of commitment to developing a frame, I am not sure that crowd sourcing would work so I am unsure where this project would lead beyond the interesting and erudite contributions of the project members listed in the proposal.

Thus, while the goal of recreating the cognitive framework of Latin speakers is laudable and the project members are the ones to do this, it is not clear whether a Latin FrameNet resource is the best and most efficient mechanism for online presentation nor a framework that will pull in other contributors.

**Overview**

Intellectual significance: A cognitive approach to the Latin lexicon would be interesting and a significant contribution.

Impact on research and technology: A question that remains with this project is whether the FrameNet structure as outlined is the most efficient and user-friendly approach to online presentation. It is not clear that crowdsourcing will work.

Innovation: While innovative in a theoretical sphere in terms of an online resource the project is not convincing.

Proposal development: The project is could focus more on the way in which users would experience the Frame-based Latin lexicon.

Feasibility: The architecture and software of FrameNet is established and should be able to handle new languages. The question is how much substantive content will be contributed and how user-friendly the result will be.

Qualifications: The team is well qualified for developing cognitively oriented lexicography of Latin.