

# Leeds Studies in English

**Article:**

Jürgen Schäfer, 'The Hard Word Dictionaries: A Re-Assessment', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 4 (1970), 31-48

**Permanent URL:**

[https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object\\_id=124821&silole\\_library=GEN01](https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=124821&silole_library=GEN01)



*Leeds Studies in English*  
School of English  
University of Leeds  
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

## THE HARD WORD DICTIONARIES:

### A RE-ASSESSMENT

By Jürgen Schäfer

At the beginning of the seventeenth century the influx of new words derived from Latin and the Romance languages had attained such proportions that a problem of communication not unlike the "language bar" of modern times made itself felt. The need for a new terminology in the arts and sciences, as well as the rhetorical inclination of the age towards embellishment, the *copia verborum*, had turned Caxton's "rude and common English" into the "eloquent language" of Puttenham and his contemporaries. Yet the very abundance of neologisms began to prove an embarrassment. The insecurity of many speakers untutored in classical languages is mirrored in seventeenth-century literature in the phenomenon anachronistically referred to as malapropism, the amusing tendency to confuse and distort polysyllabic Latin loan-words. "You cannot bear with another's confirmities" is Mistress Quickly's moralizing comment on Doll's quarrel with Falstaff, and Dogberry busily prepares the interrogation of Borachio by requesting that "the learned writer . . . set down our excommunication." Though these literary reflections of a socio-linguistic phenomenon cannot be regarded as direct historical evidence, the very development of a literary topos suggests that the problem was widely felt.

At this critical juncture in the development of the English language a new genre of books conceived to meet the needs of the historical prototypes of these *dramatis personae* began to appear, the lists of hard words. Shakespeare was in his fortieth year when Robert Cawdrey and his son, both of them schoolmasters, published the first monolingual dictionary (1604):<sup>1</sup>

A Table Alphabeticall, conteyning and teaching the true writing,  
and vnderstanding of hard vsuall English wordes, borrowed from  
the Hebrew, Greeke, Latine, or French. &c.

The balance of the long title addresses itself particularly to those people without training in the classics, "Ladies, Gentlewomen, or any other vnskilfull persons," and recommends itself for the expansion of the reader's active vocabulary, as well as the understanding of devotional literature, "hard English wordes, which they shall heare or read in Scriptures, Sermons, or elsewhere." The modest octavo volume comprises more than two thousand lemmas, mainly of Latin and French derivation, which as the title announces may be classified as "vsuall" but which are nonetheless glossed briefly.

The small book must have been an instant success; a second edition (1609) was soon called for, with a third appearing in 1613. Three years later the prosperous

market was invaded by a competitor when John Bullokar, a physician by profession and the son of William Bullokar the linguist, published his more ambitious work:<sup>2</sup>

An English Expositor: Teaching the Interpretation of the hardest words vsed in our Language. With Sundry Explications, Descriptions, and Discourses.

Bullokar compiled nearly twice as many hard words as Cawdrey, many of them neologisms, and also included a number of old words "onely vsed of some ancient writers, and now growne out of vse." In addition, he expanded some of his glosses to short articles running to one column or more in his two-column arrangement. Bullokar's venture also proved successful, with a second edition appearing in 1621, though it was to be only two years before Henry Cockeram's *The English Dictionarie* (1623)<sup>3</sup> appeared and established the title by which similar works have since been known. Cockeram attempted to surpass Bullokar by adding two additional reference lists to the compilation of hard words in Part I; in Part II a common word serves as lemma and enables the user to embellish his speech with "more refined and elegant" terms; Part III represents a modest encyclopaedia.

Whereas Cawdrey's *Table Alphabeticall* was not republished after a fourth edition in 1617, Bullokar's *Expositor* and Cockeram's *Dictionarie* together dominated the field for more than a generation until they were gradually superseded by new works.<sup>4</sup> Blount's *Glossographia* (1656) and Phillips's *New World of English Words* (1658) rekindled interest in the art of dictionary making, but the ancestors of these works – indeed of modern lexicography – are the three hard word dictionaries of the Jacobean period. The history of this development has been traced in some detail by Professors Starnes and Noyes<sup>5</sup> who relate the emergence of the hard word lists to two strands of linguistic education, one scholarly and the other popular. The former is represented by the bilingual and multilingual dictionaries of the period, especially Latin-English dictionaries, and the latter by the general efforts to raise the level of literacy through the publication of grammars, Edmund Coote's *The English Schoole-Maister* (1596)<sup>6</sup> being a notable example. Coote's primer concludes with a list of hard words which seems to have served as a model for Cawdrey's *Table Alphabeticall*, published eight years later.

In his analysis of these early stages Professor Starnes creates the impression of a self-perpetuating cycle when assigning dependencies: one dictionary maker copied from his predecessor and was in turn exploited by his successor. Cawdrey avidly borrowed from Coote and Thomas;<sup>7</sup> Bullokar plundered Cawdrey and Thomas; Cockeram bettered these efforts by excerpting Thomas, Cawdrey, Bullokar and the Rider-Holyoke English-Latin dictionary.<sup>8</sup> It is at least a question whether such a presentation does justice to the intricacy of the historical development.<sup>9</sup> Were the dictionary makers mere pedants who never went beyond a compilation of earlier dictionaries, their labours would seem strangely barren. Should additional sources be found in schoolbooks, as Professor Noyes speculates,<sup>10</sup> their rôle would appear even more marginal. It seems incomprehensible that in the age of Shakespeare no attempt should have been made to cope with new words encountered in the language and literature of the day. Evidence of such field-work, however scanty,

would increase our appreciation of the early dictionary makers; any attempt to incorporate material sampled from works of the period would lift them to a new level of professional accomplishment.

Yet another aspect of the problem directly concerns the history of the language. The entries of Cawdrey, Bullokar and Cockeram have been used extensively in the *OED* to document the history of many words. Several are last quoted from Bullokar's *Expositor*, and quite a number are first instanced from these dictionaries. Some of them were never found by the *OED* readers in any literary work, thus giving rise to the impression that the Jacobean compilers, all trained in classical languages and working with bilingual dictionaries, occasionally succumbed to the temptation to smuggle a few coinages of their own into their works. Such an impression is not fully justified since several can be traced to sources, so far overlooked, which in turn illuminate both the methods of the early dictionary makers and the history of individual words.

A few decades before the Jacobean compilers started their work explanatory glossaries had begun to appear in the form of appendices to English books. They vary considerably in length and detail: some contain only a few dozen entries, others cover as many folio pages; one-word glosses may alternate with brief articles. This new aid to the reader's understanding is to be found in three different categories of works. Its first appearance seems to be in scientific treatises, particularly in translations of medical works.<sup>11</sup> Whereas these glossaries testify to the need for a precise professional vocabulary, the second group is connected with the awakening antiquarian interest and the new appreciation of Chaucer. In his introduction to *The Shepherdes Calender* (1579) the mysterious E.K. describes his glosses of archaisms as a new feature.<sup>12</sup> Three years later Thomas East published *Batman vppon Bartholome*, Stephen Batman's revision of the famous medieval encyclopaedia to which Batman prefixed a glossary of words he considered obsolete:

A necessarie Catalogue, of the most hardest olde English words, how they maye be truly vnderstood after our vsuall speaking, as well in all other old Copies, as in this booke: next vnto euery such word, is the knowen English. (sig. ¶¶6)

The most ambitious effort in this second group is to be found in the Chaucer editions of Thomas Speght.<sup>13</sup> The glossary of "old and obscure words of Chaucer" appended to the 1598 edition was revised and enlarged in 1602 and is unprecedented; there is nothing comparable in the three earlier Chaucer editions of the sixteenth century.<sup>14</sup> Translations of classical and contemporary literature comprise the third group in which such glossaries appear. Philemon Holland, the "translator general" of his age, added explanatory glosses to his versions of Plutarch and Pliny,<sup>15</sup> and Joshua Sylvester appended

A briefe explanation of most of the most-difficulties through the whole worke, for the ease of such as are least exercised in these kinde of readings (sig. XX2)

to his complete edition of Du Bartas' *Deuine Weekes and workes* (1605).

The catholicity of these explanatory glossaries is exemplified by the fact that they embrace the two conflicting linguistic currents of the age, the introduction of neologisms and the return to "the well of English undefil'd." It is surprising that their general nature has gone unrecognized.<sup>16</sup> It is also interesting that the glossaries increase in number towards the end of the sixteenth century and that the apex coincides directly with the beginnings of modern English lexicography. The connexion is not exclusively chronological. The very expression "hard words" distinguishing Cawdrey's, Bullokar's and Cockeram's compilations can be traced back to Coote's subtitle ("any hard English words") but it also occurs in these glossarial appendices long before Coote's primer or the first hard word dictionary. While E.K. mentions only "old wordes and harder phrases," Stephen Batman refers to "the most hardest olde English words," and the new linguistic term reappears as running title in the glossaries of Speght and Sylvester, as well as at the beginning of A.M.'s list.<sup>17</sup> It should be emphasized that this expression is not restricted to the narrow sense which modern historians of language seem to take for granted.<sup>18</sup> "Hard words" in Elizabethan and Jacobean usage are not the equivalent of neologisms, in contemporary parlance "inkhorn terms," but denote any kind of word, old or new — even proper names, which might present difficulties in understanding. Thus the inclusion of "olde words" by Bullokar and proper names by Cockeram reflects neither an extension in the meaning of this term nor a decisive new step in dictionary making; both are anticipated in the explanatory glossaries. The similarities between the first independent publications of "hard words" and the glossarial appendices are not limited, however, to a coincidence in time and title. It can be shown that all three of the early lexicographers derived a substantial part of their entries, lemmas and definitions, directly from these glossaries.

When compiling his *Table Alphabeticall* Cawdrey must have used the list of hard words appended to A.M.'s translation of Gaebelkhover's *Artzneybuch*. The list at the end of the *Boock of Physicke* includes 113 items, ranging from the now familiar *acute to jentation* ("breakfast"), and many of them are listed as first instances in the *OED*. Three quarters of these entries reappear in Cawdrey's dictionary. The possibility of a mere coincidence has to be dismissed. Of the 83 words common to A.M. and Cawdrey only eight (*acute, adustion, altitude, demonstrate, intrude, mature, seclude, vigour*) are also in Coote or Thomas, and Cawdrey may have found them there. Thirty, however, are first instanced in the *OED* from A.M.'s translation and several of these are not attributed to any other writer.<sup>19</sup> In addition, one word (*corroded*) attributed by the *OED* to Cawdrey is also to be found in A.M.'s list, and the semantic peculiarity of some glosses clearly indicates Cawdrey's method of preserving A.M.'s specialized medical meanings of long-established words while adding a more general paraphrase:

A.M.	Cawdrey
combine, reade heale	<i>combine</i> , heale, or couple together.
distended, read out of ioynte	<i>distended</i> , stretched out, or out of ioynt.
inoculated, read vnholed	<i>inoculated</i> , grafted, or vnholed.

By incorporating A.M.'s entry in the last example Cawdrey contaminates two homographs, the still current *inoculate* ("graft") and A.M.'s privative formation "not oculated," i.e. "not perforated."

The omission of thirty words glossed by A.M. is not surprising since Cawdrey, as Professor Starnes has shown, is eclectic in using his other sources. Some were perhaps dropped because there were other words with the same root. One entry even strongly suggests that A.M.'s word was not omitted but led, probably through compositorial negligence, to the creation of a ghost word: "illiquifacted, read vnmelted" (A.M.) seems to reappear in Cawdrey as "*illiquinated, vnmelted.*" According to Professor Starnes's calculations some 17-18% of Cawdrey's hard words were not taken over from Coote or Thomas. Since the entire dictionary contains some 2500 entries, the 75 borrowings from A.M.'s list constitute approximately 3% of Cawdrey's material. In mere numbers this indebtedness may seem negligible; though as a proof that Cawdrey went beyond the narrow pale of schoolbooks it is not unimportant. That he actually consulted a contemporary text, even a medical handbook, means that his work should perhaps be placed in a wider framework.<sup>20</sup>

Cawdrey's borrowings from A.M. are limited in number and his use of the glossarial appendix in *The Boock of Physicke* may have been mere chance. Though he considerably augmented the number of entries he found in Coote's primer, the elementary quality of the earlier work is preserved. John Bullokar's *Expositor*, however, does not simply continue the schoolmasterly tradition. The significant changes, beyond a further increase in the number of lemmas, are the introduction of many professional terms and the listing of "olde words" indicated by an asterisk. There are various theories about Bullokar's main sources for this expansion. Professor Starnes traces both innovations to the classical dictionaries, though these can hardly have provided a source for the archaisms.<sup>21</sup> Dr. Alston suggests that Bullokar drew on material which his father, the spelling reformer, might have collected for such a purpose.<sup>22</sup> It is indeed possible that William Bullokar bequeathed to his son the idea for a dictionary and some material; in final concept and execution the work has to be considered Bullokar's own. As a physician he must have been familiar with the medical glossaries and these might have persuaded him to try his hand at a new kind of compilation. His glosses of diseases and medicines are extensive, though he does not seem to have used either the glossary in Traheron's English version of *Vigo* or that in Mosan's translation of *Wirsung*, both of which are among the most extensive of their kind. In any case he certainly did not restrict himself to copying from English-Latin dictionaries, and it is questionable whether he is as deeply indebted to Thomas as has been maintained.

Particularly conspicuous among Bullokar's new lemmas are the legal terms often introduced with a reference to "our common law." Almost without exception he has derived these expressions from John Cowell's *The Interpreter: or Booke Containing the Signification of Words . . . and Termes, as are mentioned in the Lawe Writers, or Statutes*, published in 1607 and burnt by the hangman three years later.<sup>23</sup> Most of Cowell's glosses are lengthy and learned, often with specific references to the major Latin works on English law. For sheer reasons of space Bullokar could

not appropriate these definitions in full;<sup>24</sup> his concise paraphrases show an admirable grasp of the sense and a remarkable power of condensation. Very often the general meaning of the Latin is added by Bullokar at the beginning and Cowell's etymological notes are omitted:

Cowell	Bullokar
<p><i>Addition</i> (<i>additio</i>) is both the English and French word made of the Latine, and signifieth in our common law a title giuen to a man ouer and aboue his Christian and surname, shewing his estate, degree, occupation, trade, age, place of dwelling . . .</p>	<p><i>Addition.</i> An adding or putting to. In our common law it signifieth any title giuen to a man beside his name which title sheweth his estate, trade, course of life, and also dwelling place.</p>

Some forty glosses (about 10%) under the letter A clearly derive from Cowell's *Interpreter*; half of these lemmas also occur in Cawdrey but Bullokar has sharpened the schoolmaster's general definitions by drawing upon the lawyer's more technical glosses.<sup>25</sup> On this basis there is reason to assume that Bullokar's entries from the fields of "Logicke, Philosophy, . . . Physicke, Astronomie" were also borrowed from English reference works of the period and should outnumber the entries based on bilingual dictionaries.

Linguistically more intriguing than these other sources is the question as to where Bullokar gleaned his archaisms. Their number exceeds the 140 lemmas marked with asterisks; many other entries such as "*Fers.* The Queene in chesse play" and "*Wyuer.* A serpent much like a Dragon" have a definite Chaucerian ring. The identification of their origin is all the more important since Bullokar's "olde words" have been used as independent historical evidence for stylistic investigations<sup>26</sup> and since many of these archaisms provide last quotations for the *OED* documentation, a fact which might suggest the survival of these words up to Shakespeare's time.

Glossing archaisms can be traced back to E.K. and had also been anticipated in the "Vocabula Chauceriana" of the *Grammatica Anglicana* (1594).<sup>27</sup> This specific feature gives the *Expositor* an important additional dimension. It connects Bullokar's efforts with the contemporary literary interest in preserving or reviving old English words, an interest which found its finest expression in Spenser's poetry. It is not necessary to speculate whether Bullokar studied Chaucer or Spenser, for a comparison of his dictionary with Speght's glossary shows that he drew heavily on the editor's list of "the hard words of Chaucer." It is even possible to establish which of the two editions Bullokar used, since the 1602 glossary is considerably enlarged and, unlike the earlier glossary, includes nearly all of Bullokar's asterisked words. Most of the definitions are identical or very close to those of Speght. Under the letter K, for example, five of the fourteen entries are marked as archaisms and derive from Speght's second Chaucer edition:

## Speght

*kemeling*, a brewers vessell.  
*kepe*, b[ritish]. care.

*keinard*, micher, hedgecreeper.

*Kichell*, . . . A cake which Horace calleth *Libum: Vtq; sacerdotis fugitibus liba recuso:* and with vs it is called a gods Kichell, because godfathers and godmothers vsed commonly to giue one of them to their godchildren, when they asked blessing.

*knarri*, b. stubby.

In addition, other entries without an asterisk have also been taken over from Speght. Under the letter Y only “\**Yede*. Went” is indexed as an archaism, though three further examples derive from Speght:

*yate*, b. gate

*yexing*, b. sobbing.

*yore*, b. before, long, long, ago.

*Yate*. A Gate.

*Yexing*. Sobbing.

*Yore*. Long agoe, of olde.

Of the total entries with asterisks only nine are not to be found in Speght's glossary.<sup>28</sup> There is some evidence that Bullokar consulted E.K.'s explanatory notes to *The Shepheardes Calender* since they provide a source for three of these. This number may seem unconvincingly small but it includes the spurious meaning of *glen* (“hamlet”) which survived in English literature as a Spenser echo to the middle of the eighteenth century:<sup>29</sup>

## E.K.

The Widowes) He calleth Rosalind  
 the Widowes daughter of the glenne,  
 that is, of a country Hamlet or  
 borough . . . (April)  
 Narre) nearer. (July)  
 Whilome) once. (August)  
 Whilome) sometime. (October)

## Bullokar

\**Glinne*. A little village, or part of a Village.

*Hamlet*. A village in the countrey.

\**Narre*. Neerer.

\**Whilome*. Whilst. sometime once, or in time past.

Altogether there are some three hundred items in the *Expositor* deriving from Speght's glossary and perhaps three from E.K.'s explanatory notes, amounting to about 7% of the total lemmas. Numerically the archaisms seem less important than the borrowings from contemporary professional works. Linguistically, however, they deserve much more attention than the other entries. Not only is Bullokar the first to incorporate Chaucerian words and meanings into his dictionary, a fact which seems to have escaped Chaucer research,<sup>30</sup> but it is also true that most of these words



subsequently entered the dictionary tradition,<sup>31</sup> a fact which has apparently eluded historians of the language.

The discovery of the connexion between Bullokar and Speght helps to clarify and correct the history of several words as it has been presented in the *OED*. Isolated Middle English quotations are followed by one or two dictionary references from the seventeenth century, giving rise to the erroneous impression that these words were still current and that the dictionary makers based their recordings on contemporary usage. The word *fage* ("fiction, deceit") is quoted twice from literature of the fifteenth century (Page, 1420; Lydgate, 1450), later only from Coles's *English Dictionary* (1692-1732) and Bailey's *Universal Etymological English Dictionary* (1721); *finance* ("end") from the *Ludus Coventriae* (1400) and from Bullokar; *flo* ("arrow") from Alfred (893) to *Robyn and Gandeleyne* (1450) and from Cockeram. What all three words have in common, of course, is their appearance in Speght's glossary, their inclusion in Bullokar and their transmission through him to later dictionaries.<sup>32</sup> The *OED* policy in registering the later dictionary tradition is not only erratic; in many cases the opposite method is followed, with only the last literary occurrence being cited and the reappearance in the dictionaries being disregarded. Thus *caynard* ("sluggard") is quoted three times for the fourteenth century but no mention is made of the fact that, via Speght, it also occurs in Bullokar and, via Bullokar, in Cockeram.<sup>33</sup> In the case of *wanger* it is suggested that Speght's gloss established a dictionary tradition, though reference is not made to Bullokar, who actually borrowed the word, but to Kersey (*Dictionarium Anglo-Britannicum*, 1708).

Most interesting are those examples in which the Speght/Bullokar dependence settles open questions or points the way for further research. In several cases the *OED* editors were aware of the dubiousness of their entries but unable to establish the origin of the error. Under *Hau-*, for example, we find "*Hauselins*, in Cockeram (1623-31), error for *Hanselins*." This error can be traced back to Bullokar and to Speght's glossary of 1602. It originated in a compositorial slip in setting the second edition since the glossary of 1598 reads quite correctly "*hanselines*, vpper sloppes."<sup>34</sup> Another entry marked as doubtful is *gyre* in the meaning "trance," registered from Cockeram. This reading is not based on Cockeram's misunderstanding of the Drayton passage as suggested by the *OED* editors, but on the Speght/Bullokar gloss "*gyre*, trance." Speght's explanations were not always founded on sound historic and linguistic knowledge but were often inferred from the context. Some of his imaginative and incorrect guesses were perpetuated by Bullokar and his successors, for example, "*corbets*, places in walles, where Images stand." This misinterpretation is documented at length in the *OED* from Bullokar to dictionaries of the nineteenth century but its source is not given. For some words – *burnet* (sb. 1), *burled* ("a dictionary word of very questionable authenticity"), *foiterer*, *jonglerie* – Bullokar's entries are quoted as first occurrences although they, too, derive from Speght. Since these words are not in the Chaucer canon, they have probably to be traced to the unauthentic writings which Speght included in his edition.

From Speght's more than two thousand items Bullokar selected some three hundred,

and half of these he marked with an asterisk. Yet there is little to support the assumption that this differentiation was based on clearly defined principles. First of all, the alphabetical distribution of the archaic words is curiously uneven and corresponds in no imaginable way to the number and nature of Speght's listings; by far the highest percentage was selected from the letters F-L, whereas there are very few from M-R. Terms of chivalry seem conspicuous but it is doubtful whether any conclusions can be drawn from the fact that only half of them are characterized as old.<sup>35</sup> In general, it is difficult to find criteria for Bullokar's distribution of asterisks, since there is evidence throughout of a haphazard procedure. Words documented through the centuries to the present (*blithe, galosh*) are listed as archaisms, others already obsolete or archaic at Bullokar's time (*chalon, swain* = "servant") are not. Speght's gloss for the adverb *belive* ("anon") indicates a newly emerging rather than a Chaucerian sense, yet Bullokar marks it with an asterisk. There is even a strong suspicion that the compiler was completely unfamiliar with some of the words he borrowed; the retention of the misprint *hauselins* is difficult to explain otherwise. The cumulative evidence of these examples should caution us against considering Bullokar's "olde words" as a reliable historical and stylistic index reflecting the linguistic situation at Shakespeare's time. Little can be safely stated beyond the fact that Bullokar's asterisked entries are part of those taken over from Speght's glossary of 1602.

The precedent set by Cawdrey and Bullokar in making use of the lists of hard words appended to the publications of their day is continued by Cockeram though he clearly indicates the ambition to surpass his predecessors in all respects:

The English Dictionarie: or, An Interpreter of hard English Words. Enabling as well Ladies and Gentlewomen, young Schollers, Clarkes, Merchants, as also Strangers of any Nation, to the vnderstanding of the more difficult Authors already printed in our Language, and the more *speedy attaining of an elegant perfection of the English tongue*, both in reading, speaking and writing. Being a Collection of some thousands of words, neuer published by any heretofore.

The title contains a novel claim: *The English Dictionarie* helps in "the vnderstanding of the more difficult Authors already printed in our Language." Since Cockeram mentions "some thousands of words, neuer published by any heretofore," it is unlikely that his reference to "the more difficult Authors" merely alludes to his having absorbed the archaic words gleaned by Bullokar from Speght. The phrasing implies instead that the compiler consulted authors printed in English and sifted through their works for hard words.

In investigating the accuracy of this claim Cockeram's new lemmas have to be examined closely. First of all, however, a general misunderstanding concerning Part II of his dictionary has to be removed. This index enabling the user to replace the "vulgar" with the "exact and ample" term is often taken to constitute an independent section which contains additional neologisms. Professor Starnes has even advanced the theory that it is basically an anglicization of an English-Latin dictionary.<sup>36</sup> An analysis of the entries quickly shows that Part II is nothing but

a reversal of Part I. In some cases several individual lemmas are accumulated under one "vulgar" word; *unfortunate*, for example, is glossed in Part II as "*Inauspicious, Dismall, Saturnine, Disasterous*," each of which has a separate entry in Part I. It is true that some words occur only in the first and a few only in the second part but this seems to be due to incomplete cross-referencing rather than to a shift in method.

Cockeram, like his predecessors, greatly increased the number of lemmas, though his additions are primarily words which have remained rare. Whereas Cawdrey restricted himself to "vsuall" hard words and Bullokar concentrated on professional terms and archaisms, Cockeram's new listings (e.g. "*Pabulation. Grasing, feeding; Vstulate. To curle or burne*") seem to provide excellent examples of extravagant inhornisms. A check against the *OED* confirms this impression; many of Cockeram's new lemmas are attributed only to him, sometimes to later dictionaries as well, or else have not been registered at all.<sup>37</sup> A long list of these "strange words . . . which one suspects were never seen in English writing"<sup>38</sup> could be easily compiled and their number might indeed suggest that among the early lexicographers Cockeram is the word coiner *par excellence*, busily adapting words from classical dictionaries and content to copy the balance from his predecessors.

It seems unfair to Cockeram, however, simply to dismiss as unsubstantiated, clever advertising his claim to have examined "the more difficult Authors," and Cockeram himself provides at least one piece of evidence supporting its accuracy. In the section devoted to birds in Part III he refers to a contemporary author in defining a lemma:

*Barnacle*, a kinde of Sea Gull, it growes not by *Venus* act, but as  
*Dubartas* writes.

*First 'twas a greene Tree, next a stately Hull,*  
*Lately a Mushrompe, now a flying Gull.*

The two verse lines are a quotation from Joshua Sylvester's translation *Bartas: His Devine Weekes and workes*.<sup>39</sup> This remarkable mixture of Christian epic, didactic poem and encyclopaedic history by the Huguenot and disciple of the Pléiade Guillaume de Salluste, sieur du Bartas, exerted a strong influence on English literature in the early seventeenth century and its effects, especially on the metaphysicals, have been commented upon in some detail;<sup>40</sup> even Dryden admitted that as a boy he had thought "inimitable Spenser a mean poet in comparison of Sylvester's *Dubartas*."<sup>41</sup> The popularity of Sylvester's congenial translation was enormous and far outlasted that of the original in France. Parts were published before the turn of the century; the complete edition appeared in 1605 and had run through five editions before Cockeram compiled his dictionary.

Since Cockeram quotes from this work, there is the possibility that he collected some of his material from its long glossarial appendix of the "Hardest Words." A comparison of several entries in Sylvester's glossary and in the *Dictionarie* confirms this. In accordance with his general procedure Cockeram usually lists the borrowed items in Part I and reverses them in Part II:

## Sylvester

*Chimeras*, strange Fancies, monstrous  
Imaginations, Castles in the Aire.

*Karos*, a drowsie and stupifying  
disease in the head.

*Orion*, a tempest-boading star.

These definitions occur only in Cockeram; they are not in Cawdrey, Bullokar or Thomas. Curiously enough we find Bullokar's gloss for *chimera* ("A strange monster . . .") not in Parts I or II but in Part III, an interesting reflection of Cockeram's methods. Another conspicuous group of entries taken from Sylvester and totally absent from the earlier hard word dictionaries consists in poetical periphrases based on classical mythology and the Bible:

*Amalthean Horne*, plenty of all  
things.

*Delian Twins*, the Sun and Moon.

*Jessean Harp*, the Holy Musicke of  
David, the Son of Ishai, commonly  
called Jesse.

Several of the words credited by the *OED* to Cockeram are in reality borrowings from Sylvester. *Delian*, cited above, belongs to this category. In addition, there are some rare Greek loan-words which are either attributed to Cockeram (*eleutherian* <ἐλευθέριος; *panomphaean* <πανομφαίος) or not listed at all (*epicarpian* <ἐπικάρπιος; *pheretrian* <φερέτριος).<sup>42</sup> A brief glance at Sylvester's translation and at his glosses reveals the true source of these epithets for Zeus. Du Bartas ingeniously improves upon the dry Biblical account of the praying contest between Elijah and the priests of Baal (I Kings 18) by putting invocations to various deities into the mouths of the heathens; in his translation Sylvester makes them more uniformly directed to Zeus.<sup>43</sup> Most of the expressions in this passage are later explained in the glossary and the above examples are taken over almost verbatim by Cockeram:

*Eleutherian*, Deliverer.

*Epicarpian*, Fruit-keeper.

*Feretrian*, Peace-bringer, or  
dread striker.

*Panomphean*, all-hearing.

## Cockeram

*Chymaeras*. Strange phantasies,  
castles in the ayre.

Castles in the ayre. *Chymaeras*.

*Karos*. A drowsie disease in the head.  
a drowsie Disease in the head. *Charos*.

*Orion*. A tempest boading. [sic]  
a Star boading a tempest. *Orion*.

*Amalthean horne*. Plenty of all  
things.

Plenty of all things. *Amalthean-  
horne*.

*Delian twins*. The Sunne and Moone.  
the Sunne and Moone. *Delian twins*.

*Iessean Harpe*. Dauids musicke.  
Dauids musick. *Iessean harpe*.

*Eleutherian*. A Deliuerer.  
a Deliuerer. *Eleutherian*.

*Epicarpean*. A Fruit-keeper.  
a Fruit keeper, *Epicarpean*.

a Peacemaker. *Pheretrian*. [only  
in Part II]

*Panomphean*. All hearing.  
the all Hearing God. *Panomphean*.

The items clearly derived from Sylvester's glossary are not very numerous for there seem to be little more than fifty, amounting to only a fraction of one per cent of the *Dictionarie's* lemmas.<sup>44</sup> The point at issue, however, is not the extent of Cockeram's indebtedness to Sylvester but rather the methods he employed in gathering material. In this respect these fifty examples are highly significant since they demonstrate that Cockeram did indeed consult one of "the more difficult Authors already printed in our Language" and, further, that he did not restrict himself to examining the glossary alone. In the case of Bullokar we cannot prove that he read his Chaucer, but Cockeram has to be exonerated from the suspicion of literary philistinism. It is not only the "barnacle" quotation cited above which shows that he read more than Sylvester's notes; his commentary on the Mexican tree *melt* ("maguey") is a direct paraphrase of the poem itself:<sup>45</sup>

There mounts the *Melt*, which serves in *Mexico*  
For weapon, wood, needle, and threed (to sowe)  
Brick, hony, sugar, sucket, balm, and wine  
Parchment, perfume, apparel, cord and line:

.....  
Somtimes thereon they grave their holy things,  
Laws, lauds of Idols, and the gests of Kings:

.....  
Somtimes they twine them into equall threds;  
Small ends make needles; greater, arrow-heads:  
His upper sap the sting of Serpents cures:

.....  
His burnéd stalks, with strong fumosities  
Of piercing vapours, purge the *French* disease.

(Sylvester, I. 104. 606-21)

*Melt*, a tree in *Mexico*, being well ordered, serues for weapons, needle, and threed, Suger, Hony, Sucket, Balme, Wine, Cords, Parchment, Lines, Perfume, and apparell: on the leafes thereof they graue the Iests of Kings, sometime by twyning them they make Arrow heads of them: the sappe thereof cures the stinging of Serpents, and the burning of the lower part of the stalke, cures the *French* disease, &c.

(Cockeram, III, s.v. *Trees*)

Neither in his introduction nor in his glosses does Cockeram ever mention other writers to whom he may be indebted, and their identity and number are open to speculation. Since he scanned Sylvester's text for "hard words," we are encouraged to extend the search for sources to works without glossaries. When the ranks of Elizabethan writers are mustered for "more difficult Authors," Thomas Nashe, one of the extravagant word-coiners of the period, comes readily to mind. His Rabelaisian gusto sometimes obscures the fact that the English language owes many neologisms to his creativity, a number of which have become standard. The majority of his coinages, of course, remained rare; hundreds of these hard words from the Latinate *commacerate* ("harrass") to the humorous nonce-formation

*humblesso* are attributed in the *OED* only to Nashe. In some cases an additional quotation is recorded from Cockeram. This may be coincidental since the quotations in the *OED* are not complete. There are, however, some two dozen neologisms<sup>46</sup> attributed by the *OED* to Nashe not on record for any other writer before they reappear in Cockeram's *Dictionary*; nor are they to be found in Cawdrey, Bullokar or Thomas, Cockeram's accepted sources. The number of these words, apparently very rare at the time but nonetheless common to Nashe and Cockeram, suggests that, like Sylvester, the notorious Elizabethan pamphleteer was another of Cockeram's sources.

As has been mentioned, the *OED* lists Cockeram's work as a source providing the earliest examples for many English words. But in at least four cases the word in question (*anthropophagize*, *augurate*, *collachrymation*, *vociferate*) had already been used and perhaps coined by Nashe some thirty years earlier.<sup>47</sup> In addition, the spelling of some of Cockeram's lemmas suggests that they were taken directly from Nashe's text,<sup>48</sup> and the compiler's glosses sometimes seem to offer an interpretation of the corresponding passages in Nashe:

Nashe	Cockeram
Yea, theyr Firmament-propping foundation shal be adequated with the Valley of <i>Iehosaphat</i> . (II. 48. 18-19)	<i>Adequate</i> . To make leuel. [Defini- tion not recorded in <i>OED</i> ] to make Leuell. <i>Adequate</i> .
If there were any that were Credi- tor-crazd, and deade and buried in debt . . . (II. 64. 29-30)	<i>Creditor-crazd</i> . Banquerout. [not in <i>OED</i> ] Bankrout. <i>Creditour crazed</i> .
That colour on their cheekes you behold superficializd, is but sir Iohn whites, or sir Iohn Red-caps liuery. (II. 150. 2-4)	<i>Superficialized</i> . Painted. Painted. <i>Superficializ'd</i> .

These three examples are taken from *Christ's Tears over Jerusalem*, which contains most of the words already cited. It seems beyond question that Cockeram read this work when searching out hard words. According to McKerrow,<sup>49</sup> Nashe's moralistic treatise paralleling the sins of Jerusalem and those of London attracted no great attention at the time of its publication in 1593-94, though there were immediately two issues and another posthumous edition in 1613, any of which may have been in Cockeram's possession. The evidence that Cockeram consulted other works by Nashe cannot be considered conclusive. Two words found only in Nashe and Cockeram occur in Nashe's *Lenten Stuff* (*chameleonize*, *encomionize*) and one in *The Unfortunate Traveller* (*enwidened*).

By its very nature the material precludes the possibility of establishing the exact number of words Cockeram gleaned from Nashe's pages, nor is such information germane to the argument. Contrary to accepted views, there is sufficient evidence to support the theory that in collecting his new material Cockeram did not merely

anglicize Latin words. He must have studied and excerpted at least one of Nashe's works, as well as Sylvester's *Deuine Weekes*. There is reason to believe that he drew on many more works of contemporary literature, the identification of which is left to the ingenuity of the Elizabethan and Jacobean specialist. In this connexion it is of interest that in a wider sense both *Christ's Tears over Jerusalem* and the *Deuine Weekes* may be regarded as devotional literature. Although two works are not enough to establish the reading preferences of "Henry Cockeram, Gentleman," about whom we know so little, they do point up the fact that his authors are not necessarily the most prominent in today's literary consciousness. The "thousands of words" mentioned by Cockeram are perhaps an exaggeration, but the number of works consulted may still be considerable.

To characterize the author of *The English Dictionarie* as an inventor of useless inhornisms does injustice to both the nature and the extent of his contribution. This applies to Cawdrey and Bullokar as well, though undoubtedly to a lesser degree since, unlike Cockeram, neither enjoys a reputation as word-coiner. There is no question that many of the entries in these early dictionaries are the first, often the only, instances on record in the *OED*; several are not recorded there at all. To assume on this basis that the more outlandish "hard words" should be attributed to the lexicographers' inventiveness is to conclude perhaps logically but not necessarily accurately. Even the very limited selection in these pages provides more than a dozen examples in which such words can be antedated and traced to the compiler's sources.

The existence of these additional sources must in turn lead to a modification in theories assessing the origin of the early dictionaries and the methods used in compiling them. Their origin can no longer be traced exclusively to the schoolmasterly tradition of the sixteenth century as represented by bilingual classical dictionaries and Coote's *English Schoole-Maister*. A root of equal importance is the explanatory glossaries appended by editors and translators to contemporary works. It is, therefore, misleading to cite the indebtedness of each lexicographer to his predecessors without including these glossaries in the evaluation. It may be true that each compiler based the bulk of his work upon two or three earlier dictionaries, but the analysis should not stop there since it fails to reflect how complex the interdependencies actually were or how inconclusive the historical documentation has sometimes been.

It is not the object of the present essay to establish all the sources of the Jacobean lexicographers, nor is the claim advanced that all the major new sources are now revealed. It is hoped, however, that sufficient material has been presented to render indispensable a revaluation of the achievements of the early lexicographers and to encourage further investigation into the connexions between their efforts and the language and literature of the period.

## NOTES

- 1 Reprinted with a brief introduction by R. A. Peters in the Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints Series (1966).
- 2 No. 11 in Dr R. C. Alston's series, *English Linguistics 1500-1800* (1967).
- 3 No. 124, *English Linguistics 1500-1800* (1968).
- 4 The last, twelfth edition of Cockeram appeared in 1670; the final, nineteenth edition of Bullokar in 1775. Bibliographical details in R. C. Alston, *The English Dictionary* (Leeds, 1966), pp. 2-7.
- 5 De Witt T. Starnes and Gertrude E. Noyes, *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson 1604-1755* (Chapel Hill, 1946); cf. also the concise survey by J. A. H. Murray, *The Evolution of English Lexicography* (Oxford, 1900).
- 6 No. 98, *English Linguistics 1500-1800* (1968).
- 7 Thomas Thomas, *Dictionarium Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae* (London, 1588?). By 1620 twelve editions of this work had appeared.
- 8 John Rider, *Bibliotheca Scholastica* (London, 1589); F. Holyoke, *Riders Dictionary* (London, 1606, 1612, 1617).
- 9 Starnes's theory of the origins of English lexicography has been generally accepted. Cf. Martin Lehnert, "Das englische Wörterbuch in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart," *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik*, IV (1956), 277-280; N. E. Osselton, *Branded Words in English Dictionaries before Johnson* (Groningen, 1958), pp. 7-16; Margaret Schlauch, *The English Language in Modern Times* (Warsaw, 1959), pp. 107-108.
- 10 "The First English Dictionary, Cawdrey's *Table Alphabetical*," *M.L.N.*, LVIII (1943), 600f.: "The main source of Cawdrey's dictionary is therefore to be found, I believe, in pedagogical works and schoolbooks, many of which contained lists of words to be studied for spelling, pronunciation, syllabication, etc. The addition of definitions to such lists was a natural step."
- 11 *The most excellent workes of chirurgerye made by M. J. Vigon*, transl. B. Traheron (London, 1543; later editions 1550, 1571, 1586); *A most excellent and learned woorke of chirurgerie called Chirurgia parua Lanfranci*, transl. J. Halle (London, 1565); Christoph Wirsung, *Praxis medicinae vniuersalis*, transl. Jacob Mosan (London, 1598; later editions 1605, 1617, 1654); Oswald Gaebelkhover, *The Boock of Physicke*, transl. A. M. (London, 1599).
- 12 Edmund Spenser, *The Minor Poems*, ed. C. G. Osgood, et al. (Baltimore, 1943), i. 10: "Hereunto haue I added a certain Glosse or scholion for the exposition of old wordes and harder phrases: which maner of glosing and commenting, well I wote, wil seeme straunge and rare in our tongue."
- 13 It should be noted that Speght also included unauthentic writings in his Chaucer editions; these writings are identified by Eleanor Prescott Hammond, *Chaucer: A Bibliographic Manual* (New York, 1908), pp. 123-126, 406-463. In the following no distinction is made between authentic and unauthentic Chaucerian words.
- 14 Hammond, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-127, 504.
- 15 Pliny the Elder, *The Historie of the World. Commonly called, The Naturall Historie*, 2 vols. (London, 1601); a "briefe Catalogue of the words of Art" is prefixed to vol. ii. Plutarch, *The Philosophie, commonlie called, the Morals* (London, 1603); "An Explanation of Sundry Tearmes somewhat obscure . . . in favour of the unlearned Reader" appears in an appendix.



- 16 Sanford V. Larkey, "Scientific Glossaries in Sixteenth Century English Books," *Bulletin of the Institute of the History of Medicine*, V (1937), 105-114, has assembled some material but sees only one aspect of the development. F. O. Matthiessen, *Translation: An Elizabethan Art* (Cambridge, Mass., 1931), p. 180, seems to regard Holland's glossaries as a peculiarity of this translator. Richard Foster Jones, *The Triumph of the English Language* (Oxford, 1953), p. 96, comments at some length on the glossary in the Gaebelkhover translation but does not mention the fact that A.M. simply follows a tradition established a generation earlier; he implies rather that such glossaries become prevalent only after 1640 (p. 274).
- 17 Speght (1598, 1602): "The hard words of Chaucer, explained"; Sylvester (1605): "An Index of the Hardest Words"; A.M. (1599): "The expositione of such wordes which are in this Booke deriued of the Latines, which for the common, and vulger people is made, because they should the better vnderstande the meaninge of the harde wordes."
- 18 See Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 27: "these new-fangle 'hard words'"; Starnes, *op. cit.*, p. 8: "'hard' words — those of foreign origin which offered difficulty to the reader"; the same is implied by A. C. Baugh, *A History of the English Language* (2nd ed., London, 1959), p. 279f.
- 19 Words with a quotation only from A.M. (and sometimes an early dictionary) are set in italics and spelling has been modernized: acetosity, angust, aridity, censation, cibaries, circumligate, contaminous, *curvify*, dulcify, ebulliate, ebullient, excavate, fermented, feruid, floscle, foraminated, frigeify, fulvid, gustation, imperate (*v.*), *inoculated* (*a.*), *insperge*, *interpellate* (*v.*), *jentation*, *minutely* (*adv.* 1), *pistate*, *pluviatile*, *preterlapsed*, *snippering*, *vertiginousness*.
- 20 This dependence lays open to criticism OED methods of historical documentation. Of the words taken over by Cawdrey from A.M. six were not found in any other writer. One of these is documented only from A.M. (*pluviatile*); three from A.M. and Cawdrey (*inoculated*, *jentation*, *snippering*); one from A.M., Cawdrey and Cockeram (*pistate*); one from A.M. and Cockeram (*curvify*). Such documentation neither indicates that the dictionary quotations, when given, are derived from the preceding quotation, nor does it clearly state when the word entered the dictionary tradition.
- 21 *Op. cit.*, p. 21: "In Bullokar's reference to 'olde words now growne out of use, and divers termes of art, proper to the learned in Logicke, Philosophy, Law, Physicke, Astronomie,' there is an extension in the scope of the dictionary. For such an extension, Bullokar had precedent in the Latin-English dictionaries of Cooper and Thomas."
- 22 See the introductory note to his reprint of the *Expositor*. After his work on orthography, *Bullokar's Booke at Large* (1580), and his *Bref Grammar for English* (1586) William Bullokar had announced his intention to conclude the series of linguistic works with a dictionary.
- 23 In his dictionary Cowell, Regius professor of Civil Law in Cambridge, gave offence to the Commons with those of his definitions which supported the view that England was an absolute monarchy. After its suppression in 1610 the book was subsequently reissued shortly before the Civil Wars and continued in several editions into the eighteenth century; cf. *DNB*, John Cowell.
- 24 Cowell's article on *addition*, for example, is three times the length quoted below and gives additional details, together with three bibliographical references.
- 25 Lemmas also in Cawdrey are italicized and the spelling modernized: abate, abatement, abbot, *abet*, abettor, *abjure*, abjuration, *abridge*, *accessory*, *acquittal*, *action*, addition, adjournment, *administer*, administration, *administrator*, *advent*, *advowson*, aerie, *alien*, *amerce*, *amercement*, annates, annuity, *appeal*, appropriation, *arbiter*, *arbitriment*, *arbitrator*, *arrearage*, assets, *assign*, assignment, *assumpsit*, *attainder*, *attaint*, attorney, *attornment*, *avow*, *avowry*.

- 26 Esko V. Pennanen, *Chapters on the Language in Ben Jonson's Dramatic Works* (Turku, 1951), pp. 143-146, excerpts Bullokar's and Cockeram's (1631 edition) asterisked words for a checklist of Jonson's vocabulary. He notes that "more than half of the words which Bullokar marked as archaisms are found in Chaucer." He makes no attempt, however, to trace them to their source nor does he seem to be aware of the Bullokar/Cockeram dependence.
- 27 Ed. Otto Funke (Vienna, 1938). Margarete Rösler, "Veraltete Wörter in der *Grammatica Anglicana* von 1594," *Englische Studien*, LIII (1919/20), 168-195, has shown that not all of the words included are authentic Chaucerian expressions but are "Chaucerisms" in Thomas Nashe's sense of the word, i.e. archaisms. Bullokar did not use this list.
- 28 Bullokar's spelling is retained: *bardes*, *glinne* ("glen"), *leede* ("lide"), *narre*, *palliard*, *palliardise*, *sprent*, *viands*, *whilome*.
- 29 Cf. *OED*, s.v. *glen*. The form *glinne*, later picked up by Cockeram, is probably the mistake of Bullokar's compositor; it is not a variant spelling in any of the later Spenser Folios which Bullokar might have used.
- 30 Cf. Hammond, *op. cit.*, p. 504: "No dictionary previous to those of Skinner (1671), and Junius (before 1677, though not published until 1743), systematically included Chaucerian words, although Cowel's *Interpreter* of 1607 and Blount's *Glossographia* of 1656 made reference to and explained various Chaucerian passages, especially legal phrases."
- 31 With few exceptions Cockeram, for example, takes over the lemmas and glosses which Bullokar derived from Speght. He lists most of them both in Parts I and II. Cf. under B the following (spelling modernized): *bain*, *bale*, *baleful*, *belt* (only 1), *blancmanger*, *blithe*, *boon*, *borax*, *bragget*, *bret-full*, *brokage*, *burnet*, *bugle* (only 1), *burdon*, *buxom* (only 1), *buxomness*. Osselton, *op. cit.*, is obviously unaware that some of his branded words (*bain*, *welkin*) derive from Speght/Bullokar.
- 32 Cf. also (spelling modernized): *bargeret*, *bret-full*, *chalon*, *chevisance* (7.c), *clum* (sb. 1), *dag* (sb. 1.2), *emmoised*, *ennew* (v. 1), *entalent*, *fers*, *frounce* (sb. 1.1), *gipon* (revived by Scott), *guerre* (v.), *haysugge* (now dialect), *hulster* (v.), *legister* (sb. 1), *losenger*, *swain* (2), *swinker* (revived in the nineteenth century), *tapinage*.
- 33 Speght: *keinard*. Cf. also: *arbalestre*, *falding*, *fret* (v. 1. 1; Speght: *ifretten*), *gab* (v. 1. 3), *gaure* (1), *haine*, *halke*, *halse* (v. 1.2), *howgates*, *knar* (3; Speght: *gnarre*), *levesel*, *voluper*, *wone* (sb. 3.4), *wood-shaw*, *wyver* (sb. 1).
- 34 *Chivancy*, quoted as Bullokar's error for the Chaucerian *chevachee*, is also in Speght. *Gerful* ("wild, changeful") is quoted twice from Chaucer, whereas the listing *geriful* (s.v. *gery*) cites only Bullokar, with the note "perhaps mistake for gerful," although Bullokar's entry is copied from Speght. The spelling *taas* for *tass* (sb. 1), listed in the morphological documentation, is not only phonetically improbable for the seventeenth century but also not authentic; Bullokar found it in Speght.
- 35 Words with an asterisk are italicized: *aventail*, *arbalestre*, *flo*, *gonfanon*, *haqueton*, *haubergion*, *jambeau*, *jazerant* (Bullokar: *gesseran*), *penon*.
- 36 *Op. cit.*, p. 33: "It is obvious that Cockeram found most, if not all, of his so-called 'vulgar' words in the English-Latin section of the Rider-Holyoke dictionary; and the 'more refined and elegant' terms represent Cockeram's attempt to Anglicize Rider's Latin equivalents of the English." This erroneous conclusion rests on a few examples from the letter C (cf. p. 32f.). Even though these are selected, a more careful investigation would have revealed that practically all of them occur in reversed order in Part I. In addition, more than half of them, lemma and gloss, are identical with Bullokar's entries; cf. *Expositor*, s.v. *castigate*, *continent*, *continency*, *embryon*, *foster*, *incantation*, *objurgate*, *onerate*, *prime*.

- 37 Under *Ad-* there are the following examples (words not in the *OED* are italicized):  
 adamate, adaration, addecimate, adecastic, adequitate, adesed, adhabitate, adhalate,  
 adhamate, adipate, *adolescenturate*, adpugne, *adruminge*, adstupiate, adulable,  
 advesperate, advigilate.
- 38 Starnes, *op. cit.*, p. 28.
- 39 Joshua Sylvester, *The Complete Works*, ed. A. B. Grosart, 2 vols. (Blackburn, 1880),  
 i.82.1130-31. Later quotations from this edition.
- 40 Cf. A. H. Upham, *The French Influence in English Literature* (New York, 1908), pp.  
 145-218, and C. S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century Excluding  
 Drama* (Oxford, 1954), p. 543f.
- 41 *Of Dramatic Poesy and Other Critical Essays*, ed. G. Watson, 2 vols. (London, 1962),  
 i. 277.
- 42 Another entry originating in Sylvester and omitted in the *OED* is Cockeram's "*Bocconie*.  
 Poyson, or Italian figs." It is the plural form of *boccone* ("mouthful," also "poisonous  
 bait") and Sylvester introduces it to render Du Bartas' *boucon* ("poisonous dish or  
 drink") in the description of the allegorical figure of Wrath; cf. i. 120. 718-727 and  
 Glossary.
- 43 I. 245. 548-555. Among others the original does not include *epicarpian* and *pheretrian*;  
 cf. *The Works of Guillaume de Salluste Sieur du Bartas*, ed. Urban Tigner Holmes, Jr.,  
*et al.*, 3 vols. (Chapel Hill, 1935-40), iii. 425. 489-494.
- 44 A selection of additional examples supporting a Sylvester/Cockeram dependence: *Ajax'*  
*shield*, *Aonian band*, *Arabian bird*, *arch-colonel*, *Argolian showers* (only II, s.v.  
*golden*), *bacchanalian frows*, *Brutus' heirs*, *comitial ill*, *gonorrhoea*, *Gordian knot*,  
*Idalian fire*, *meanders*, *nepenthe* (I; III, s.v. *herbs*), *Ovid's heirs*, *Panchaian fumes*,  
*peripneumony*, *Pierian maids*, *Venus' escuage* (only I).
- 45 Sylvester's gloss reads: "Melt, an admirable Tree in Mexico, a mighty kingdome of  
 America."
- 46 *Abrase*, *assertionate*, *carrionize*, *chameleonize*, *collachrymate*, *deploremet*, *discruciamet*,  
*disparadise*, *embail*, *embain*, *encomionize*, *enwiden*, *palpabriz*, *plangorous*,  
*preludiatly*, *prosternate*, *rebutment*, *refragate*, *seminarize*, *semovedly*, *superficialize*,  
*tragedize*, *unexistence*, *unmortalize*.
- 47 Cf. *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. Ronald B. McKerrow, 5 vols. (London, 1904-10),  
 ii. 73. 11, iii. 218. 16, ii. 305. 7, iii. 190. 31.
- 48 Both Nashe and Cockeram have, for example, the unusual form *dormative* for *dormitive*  
 (from French *dormitif*).
- 49 *Op. cit.*, iv. 213f.