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Dear Helka, I am delighted to contribute this paper to your 50th birthday Festschrift. In this paper, I will focus on a somewhat underresearched topic in corpus linguistics and I hope that it will pique your interest – dogs. One of the few authors who wrote about the role of dogs in linguistic corpora is Lindquist (2009: 75), although mainly for illustrative purposes in order to discuss collocational searches in resources such as the British National Corpus (BNC). He analysed common collocates of *dog* in the BNC. Apparently, *cat, man* and *food* are the most frequent noun collocates of this word in this resource; and verbs describing typical activities of dogs like *wagging* or *barking* are, unsurprisingly, found among the most frequent verb collocates. Nowadays, dogs are most typically talked about as pets, as far as one can conclude from current general language corpora, but it would also be worth studying how dogs are referred to in specialized contexts where they play a vital role in various functions, e.g. in the criminal justice system and police work where dogs can be very useful for preventing or detecting crimes. Particularly in the past, when dogs were generally kept outdoors in the yard, one of their main functions was to deter burglars. I have chosen the Old Bailey Corpus (OBC, cf. Huber et al. 2012, Degaetano-Ortlieb, et al. 2017), a diachronic English corpus consisting of historical trial proceedings from the Late Modern English period, in order to present a brief discussion on different types of contexts in which dogs appear in a historical dataset of English proceedings in criminal matters. I will discuss some frequencies and examples I found particularly surprising or noteworthy. The corpus with the proceedings of London’s central criminal court, the Old Bailey, contains over 200,000 trials and is a valuable resource for studying spoken English from the 18th and 19th centuries, as it was taken down by scribes. The linguistically annotated corpus, which has also been enriched with metadata on social information (e.g., gender and social class of the speaker based on the Historical International Standard Classification of Occupations, documented in Van Leeuwen & Miles, 2002), can be queried, for instance, via the Saarbrücken CQPweb interface.¹

Now let us look at some frequencies of the use of the word *dog* itself and of some word forms, compounds and variants such as inflectional and derivational forms. A wildcard search in the CQPweb version OBC 2.0 for *dog* and other words starting with the same sequence of letters returns 1,238 matches in 843 different corpus texts within around 35 million words, of which around 1000 hits are actual usages of the noun *dog* or its plural. A few words can be deleted from the results as they begin with this sequence of letter without any etymological relationship with the word *dog*, e.g. *dogmatic*.

Around 40 hits are hyphenated compounds. They point to some interesting regular activities in England in the past, such as *dog-fighting*, a popular source of entertainment where several people accused of crimes or offences regularly went and lost a great deal of money. Shoes and other items made of *dog-skin* are mentioned, although I do hope these were not actually made of real dogskin, but rather in imitation of this material. However, a *dog Skinner* also occurs in the texts. Another occupation that no longer exists and that we find in the OBC is a *dog-whipper*, a church official whose function was to keep dogs out of church during services.

Non-hyphenated nominal compounds of the structure *dog + noun* are less frequent than hyphenated ones. *Dog wigs* is one of these non-hyphenated compounds, probably a slang term for the curled bob-wig often worn by coachmen (1), also referred to as *cauliflower wigs* in the 18th century.

¹ http://corpora.clarin-d.uni-saarland.de/cqpweb/ – Access for research purposes can be granted upon request, cf. also https://fedora.clarin-d.uni-saarland.de/oldbailey/ for a description.
(1) [...] he said that was the man, pointing to the prisoner, he was very remarkable, having got a dog wig on, that is such as some coachmen wear. (151317, 1755)²

In the case of Joseph Sparrow, who was accused of stealing five live turkeys, a dog helped to catch the thief (2):

(2) A dog catch’d at Sparrow’s heels, as he stood at the door: he threw a live turkey at him, as he was jumping and making a noise about him; the dog bit him very much. (242018, 1765)

Several dog owners reported to have been alarmed by the “prodigious noise” their dogs made when strangers entered the house. In the following case, the burglars were chased away by a tiny dog, but they could escape with several items before being arrested later (3).

(3) Between one and two in the night my little dog made a prodigious noise. I opened my room door and came out and listened upon the stairs; I can not say I heard any thing but my dog. [...]. After that the dog made more noise; then I came down. They had broke in at the window and broke my bureau open and taken several things away; the windows were unbolted and left open; they had taken away a counterpane, three tablecloths, a gun, and other things. (264251, 1770)

The 18th century was the era of the so-called ‘Bloody Code’, which imposed capital punishment for a vast range of property crimes. When the three burglars were finally caught, all were found guilty and sentenced to death. In many cases, such sentences for burglary offences were commuted to lifelong transportation “beyond the seas”.

Nowadays, a classic example of an excuse made by schoolchildren is “The dog ate my homework”. In these historical records of trials, we see that thieves and even murderers tried out similar flimsy excuses and put all the blame on dogs in order to get off the hook. In the case of theft, quite often the accused reported to have seen a dog with something in his mouth. Typically, while he pretends to be “as innocent as the child unborn”, the dog was blamed for having run away with the meat from the butcher, a live duck or another stolen item in the first place. One quite remarkable case is the trial of a man sentenced to death for murder in 1770 who said he was so annoyed at a dog that he accidently killed his wife. When he was offered the opportunity to give his version of the crime, he explained:

(4) This woman had this dog six or seven years before we came together; I did not care to destroy it, because she had a regard for it; it is very apt to be on the bed, and very often upon my legs, and it snores three times lower than a christian; I beat the dog off the bed once or twice in the night; in the morning when I awak’d [...], I bid her turn the dog out; [...] she did not turn the dog out, so I got out of bed; I opened my door and the street door, and then fell a punching the dog in order to get him out; I stood by the door; the dog not seeming ready to come out, this unfortunate knife happening to lie upon my dresser, I took hold of it; I throw’d it with all the force I had in the world at the dog; my wife at this time was stooping, with her head down close to the ground, I believe for her shoes and stockings; she fell down immediately as the knife was thrown out of my hand. (268292, 1770)

Despite a high number of cases where dogs indeed played an important role in crime scenes, we find numerous examples in this dataset where the word dog is used as an insult, cf. (5) – another case, by the way, in which a thief was sentenced to transportation (for stealing a silk handkerchief).

(5) I laid hold of his collar, saying, you dog, you have got the gentleman's handkerchief. (116853, 1750)

Witnesses also used the word dog to describe people in vivid language and comparisons (6).

² OBC text identification codes and the year of the trial are given in brackets.
The man with the water-board jumped into my boat and made a stroke at me, and broke his board, then he, like a spaniel dog, jumped over-board. (147100, 1755)

In around 40 passages in the corpus, the lemma dog is used as a verb in a metaphorical sense:

I could see his face distinctly: the moment I saw him, the next morning, I knew him again, and dogged him into the bawdy-house, where he was taken. (207391, 1760)

A few compounds in the corpus include the noun dog in a metaphorical sense, e.g. dog-cart (a light horse-drawn vehicle), dog-iron (a tool) and dog watch (the night-watch on ships).

Nevertheless, the majority of occurrences of dogs in the texts refer to animals that played a role in crime scenes – either as protectors, warning signs or aggressors. Not many of them are referred to by their names, but typical names of dogs in the OBC texts are Rose, Lion, Keeper or Jack.

Dear Helka, I hope to have shown that we can approach the study of courtroom English in a number of ways. As dogs fulfil many roles in society, it is no surprise that we also find them mentioned in courtroom settings. I would like to end this paper with a quote from a poem by William Macintyre (1845: 150): Long may your dogs protect your peaceful homes, by threat'ning danger when a robber comes.
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