

Leeds Studies in English

Article:

James A. Riddell, 'The Beginning: English Dictionaries of the First Half of the Seventeenth Century', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 7 (1974), 117-53

Permanent URL:

https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=123849&silo_library=GEN01



Leeds Studies in English

School of English

University of Leeds

<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

**THE BEGINNING: ENGLISH DICTIONARIES
OF THE FIRST HALF OF
THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY**

By JAMES A. RIDDELL

In A World of Errors Discovered in the New World of Words (1673), Thomas Blount excoriated Edward Phillips for the latter's thefts (including thefts of some mistakes) from Blount's own dictionary, Glossographia (1656). If the public exposure embarrassed Phillips, however, it did not embarrass him so much that he felt constrained to prevent further editions of his dictionary, although he did correct a few of the mistakes that Blount had noticed.¹ Henry Cockeram, who antedated Phillips as a plagiarist in the lexicographic field by some thirty-five years, was to some degree luckier. None of his contemporaries was sufficiently outraged by the extent of his borrowings (errors and all) to condemn him. The man to whom he owed his greatest debt, John Bullokar, was apparently content to ignore Cockeram's plunderings (Bullokar himself had taken from others); indeed, Bullokar's silence would seem appropriate, as a reviser of his work was to take material in turn from Cockeram. It seems that the only voice at all raised in public against Cockeram, however obliquely, was that of the anonymous author of Vindex Anglicus (1644)² who, although he did not mention Cockeram by name and did not concern himself with anyone's borrowings, evidently chose his forty-nine examples of kinds of words to be expunged from the English language almost entirely from Henry Cockeram's English Dictionarie (1623);³ but this, of course, did not amount to a comment upon Cockeram's methods of compiling his work. The indifference of Cockeram's contemporaries towards his methods as lexicographer was as representative in its way as the Dictionarie itself was representative of early lexicographic methods. There is no evidence that anyone in the first half of the seventeenth century was concerned with the manner in which lexicographers compiled their works, except the lexicographers themselves, and they did not choose to explain their methods or list their sources for words.

Cockeram's work, which was the first English word-book to be distinguished by the term "dictionary," was the third and last English dictionary to have its initial edition published in the first

half of the seventeenth century, and in scope it is a culmination of the first efforts in English lexicography. It and its two antecedents, Robert Cawdrey's Table Alphabeticall (1604) and John Bullokar's English Expositor (1616), have been studied in greatest detail by DeWitt T. Starnes and Gertrude E. Noyes.⁴ Although Starnes and Noyes are generally correct in their assumptions about some of the sources of the three earliest English dictionaries, about the borrowings that took place among those dictionaries, and thus about some early lexicographic methods, a good deal more remains to be said on the matter. In this study I shall discuss a number of sources not previously associated with the early seventeenth-century dictionaries, and, with particular reference to Cockeram's Dictionarie, endeavour to show how certain words were chosen from the earlier Latin-English dictionaries, and how non-lexicographical works were employed as sources. Indeed, I intend to deal mostly with Henry Cockeram, whose dictionary in a sense comprehended the work of his two predecessors; however, an examination of his work proves to be most profitable, I think, after some examination of the dictionaries of Cawdrey and Bullokar. I shall, therefore, discuss the three dictionaries in the order of the dates of their first publication, taking into consideration subsequent editions of all three up to 1650.

Robert Cawdrey's Table Alphabeticall

Starnes and Noyes give two definite sources for Cawdrey: the first is the "Table" appended to Edmund Coote's English Schoole-Master (1596),⁵ which they are certainly correct in calling "the immediate inspiration of Cawdrey" (p. 13); the second is Thomas Thomas's Dictionarium linguae Latinae et Anglicanae.⁶ They also point out that Cawdrey often expanded the definitions he got from Coote by referring to Thomas (p. 16), a practice, in its general principles, that was to become commonplace with early lexicographers.

In addition to these sources for the first edition of Cawdrey's dictionary one may add Peter Bales's The Writing Schoolmaster, a tract dealing with "brachigraphie" (i. e. shorthand), orthography, and caligraphy.⁷ The second portion of Bales's little volume "The Order of Orthographie," which comprises more than eleven of the book's seventeen signatures, is devoted almost entirely to a word-list entitled "The Table for Orthographie." Bales's entire work was largely inspired by Timothy Bright's Characterie,⁸ and his "Table" is no more than Bright's "Table of English Words" slightly altered and expanded. That Cawdrey is indebted to Bales can be illustrated by a few examples taken from Bales, all of which do not appear in Coote,⁹ and most of which do not appear

in Bright:

Bright		Bales	Cawdrey, 1604
		<u>Abash.</u> blush	<u>Abash</u> , blush.
		<u>Gaie.</u> fine	<u>gaie</u> , fine, trim.
		<u>Gloze.</u> dissemble	<u>gloze</u> , dissemble.
		<u>Gnibble.</u> bite.	<u>gnibble</u> , bite.
Grease	Fat or anoynt	<u>Grease.</u> fat.	<u>grease</u> , fat.
		<u>Modell.</u> measure	<u>modell</u> , measure.
		<u>Noyance.</u> hurt.	<u>noyance</u> , hurt.
Penalty	Punish	<u>Penaltie.</u> loose.	<u>penaltie</u> , losse.
<u>Pester</u>	Fill	<u>Pester.</u> fill.	<u>pester</u> , filled.

It is possible that Cawdrey also went to Bright for some words, but the evidence is slight. Of the forty-nine words under "G" in Cawdrey, 1604, there are four which appear in Bright, but not in Bales. Of these, two ("Gospell" and "Grave") are not defined by Bright, and two have definitions like Bright's, but somewhat fleshed out:

Bright		Cawdrey, 1604
<u>Gestes</u>	Doe	<u>gests</u> , things done, or noble acts of princes.
<u>Guise</u>	Manner	<u>guise</u> , fashion, shape, custome.

Three other of Cawdrey's sources can also be mentioned. They are: (1) "An exposition of certein words," appended to Neil Hemmingsen's A Postill, or Exposition of the Gospels; ¹⁰ (2) a similar list, "The Explication of Certaine Wordes," appended both to the text of the New Testament by the English College at Rhemes (Rheims) and to William Fulke's reprinting of that text with his refutations of its commentary; ¹¹ (3) John Rastell's An Exposition of certaine difficult and obscure words, and Termes of the Lawes of this Realme. ¹² The nine words under the letter "I" in Hemmingsen illustrate Cawdrey's borrowings from that source, which, it happens, provide many of the longest definitions to be found in the Table Alphabeticall:

Hemmingsen

Cawdrey, 1604

Impediments, letts, hinderances, stops.

impediment, let, or hinderance.

Incest, unlawfull copulation of man and woman within the degrees of kindred or alyance forbidden by Gods law, whither it bee in mariage, or otherwyse.

incest, unlawfull copulation of man and woman within the degrees of kindred, or alliance, forbidden by gods law, whether it be in marriage or otherwise.

Incorporate, to graft one thing intoo the body of an other, too make one body or substance of twoo, or mo, too mixt, or put toogyther.

incorporate, to graft one thing into the bodie of another, to make one bodie or substance of two or moe, to mixe or put together.

Incurre, too runne intoo.

incur, runne into.

Infallible, undeceyvable, that which wil not deceive, nor can bee beguyled, unguylefull, undeceytfull, deceptlesse, sure, certein, assured, soothfast.

infallible, undecivable, unguilefull, trustie.

Institute, too beegin, too go in hande with a thing, too ordeyn, too purpose, too appoynt, too make, too founde, too stablish, too decree, too set up a new, too bryng in a new.

institute, appoint, ordaine, begin, or go in hand with.

Interpret, expounde, open, make playne and manyfest to an other mans understanding, to shew the sense or meening of a thing. Also too accept or take the meenyng of a thing in good or ill parte.

interprete, open, make plaine, to shewe the sense and meaning of a thing.

Invocation, is a calling uppon any thing with trust in the same. It consisteth of two parts,

invocation, a calling upon any thing with trust in the same.

that is too wit, of prayer
and thanksgiving.

Justified, found righteous,
made righteous, accounted
or accepted for righteous,
that is too saye, free and
clere from sinne, or set
free from sinne and the
penalties therof.

justified, made or accounted
for righteous, cleane from
sinne.

Several entries from the "Explication" in the Rhemes New Testament indicate Cawdrey's use of that source:

<u>Rhemes New Testament</u>	Cawdrey, 1604
<u>Acquistion</u> , getting, purchas- ing.	<u>acquistion</u> , getting, purchasing.
<u>Advent</u> , the comming.	<u>advent</u> , the comming.
<u>Adulterating</u> , corrupting.	<u>adulterate</u> , to counterfeit, or corrupt.
<u>Agnition</u> , knowledge or acknowledging.	<u>agnition</u> , knowledge, or acknowledging.
<u>Allegorie</u> , a Mysticall speache, more then the bare letter.	<u>allegorie</u> , similitude, a mis- ticall speech, more then the bare letter.
<u>Evangelize</u> , signifieth such preaching of good tidings, as concerneth the Gospel.	<u>evangell</u> , the gospell: or glad tidings.
<u>Eunuches</u> , gelded men.	<u>eunuch</u> , gelded, wanting stones.

Cawdrey's borrowings from Rastell's Termes of the Lawes
can be seen in the following examples:

Rastell, 1602	Cawdrey, 1604
<u>Abbetors</u> in murders are those that command, procure, counsell, or comfort others to murder	<u>abbetors</u> , counsellors.

Acceptance is taking in good part, and as it were an agreeing unto some act done before

acceptance, an agreeing to some former act done before.

Action is the forme of a suit given by the Law to recover a thing

action, the forme of a suite.

Contract, is a bargaine, or covenant betweene two parties.

contract, make short, also a bargaine, or covenant.

Discent, is in 2. sortes, either Lineal or collateral. Lineal discent is when a discent is conveyed in the same line of the whol blood, as Grandfather, Father, sonne, sonnes sonne, and so downward


descent, comming downe from another.

Plaintife, is he that sueth or complayneth

plaintife, the partie complaining.

Rejoinder, is when the defendant maketh answer to the replication of the plaintife

rejoynder, a thing added afterwards, or is when the defendant maketh answer to the replication of the plaintife.

There is danger in trying to be too precise about a lexicographer's sources: any lexicographer is likely to have included words for which he had no immediate, direct source - words which were, so to speak, simply in his head; and, furthermore, no one would imagine that all the sources for any dictionary could be discovered. With this caveat, I offer here a rough analysis of about three-quarters of Cawdrey's sources for the words under "G" and "H," without suggesting that these words are necessarily representative of the rest of Cawdrey's dictionary, although they are probably indicative. For the ninety-five words under "G" and "H" in the 1604 edition, Cawdrey seems to be indebted to his sources as follows: Coote, thirty-four words; Bales, fifteen or sixteen words; Bright, possibly six words; Hemmingsen, two words; Rhemes New Testament, perhaps one word. Fourteen of the words under "G" and "H" are designated with the sign , used to indicate terms taken from the French. Some of them are noted as being French in Coote, but others may have been suggested

by one of the French-English word-lists, such as those compiled by Claude Desainliens.¹³

I have been noting the date (1604) of the first edition of Cawdrey's dictionary because, contrary to currently prevailing assumption, it is different from subsequent editions. Starnes and Noyes say about the various editions of Cawdrey:

Though A Table Alphabeticall went through four editions - 1st, 1604, 2nd, date unknown, 3rd, 1613, 4th, 1617 - and though the title-page of the 1613 edition employs the phrase "much enlarged," the augmentation was negligible. Nor were there any important changes in the edition of 1617, except in the title. This reads, A Table Alphabeticall, or the English Expositor. The subtitle was borrowed from a rival publication by Dr. John Bullokar, which had been printed in 1616.¹⁴

However, Starnes and Noyes are wrong in this. The 1613 edition was enlarged, and the 1617 edition further enlarged.¹⁵ Under the letters "A," "G," and "L" are to be found in 1604, 383 entries; in 1613, 451 entries (about 18% more); and in 1617, 517 entries (about 11% more than in 1613, and about 31% more than in 1604).¹⁶ The dictionary was, then, substantially enlarged in later editions, but my central concern here will be more with the manner of the enlargement than with the extent of it. In the first place, to expand his dictionary, Cawdrey or his successor, the "T. C." who is cited on the title-page, went back to Thomas for many of his words, and to a lesser extent to Coote and to Bales,¹⁷ In addition, however, he turned to new sources, certainly to the Glossary appended to Thomas Speght's edition of Chaucer,¹⁸ and most likely to George Puttenham's Arte of English Poesie.¹⁹

Under "G," there are five more words (about 10%) in 1613 than in 1604. Of these two seem to come from Speght's Chaucer Glossary:

Speght, 1602

Cawdrey, 1613

galiard, lusty, frolicke.

Galiard, lusty, frolicke.

gnoffe, foole, chuffe, miser.

gnoffe, Miser, foole.

Support for the notion that these two entries, themselves not remarkable, come from Speght can be found in Cawdrey's entries under another letter. In the 1604 edition there are no words which begin with "W"; in 1613 there are thirteen. It is apparent that

all of them, save one, come from Speght:

Speght, 1602

Cawdrey, 1613

warished, eased, delivered.

Warish, ease, deliver.

welden, to move.

welde, move.

waltering, wallowing.

walter, wallow.

.

wean, refraine one from any thing.

wene, thought, doubt.

wene, thinke.

welken, the skie.

welken, skie.

wynde, go.

wend, goe.

wost, knowest.

wote, know.

wonnet, dwelleth.

wonne, dwell.

wymple, a kercher.

wimple, hoode, muffler.

wist, knowne.

wist, knowne.

wood, mad.

wood, madde.

wrake, revenge.

wreke, revenge.

The case for Cawdrey's having borrowed from Puttenham is weaker than that for his having borrowed from Speght, but is, I think, tenable. As there is no concordance for Puttenham, to discover words possibly borrowed from him by early lexicographers I have had to rely upon reading The Arte of English Poesie and noting those words which seem as though they may have been attractive to Cawdrey and to his successors. The method is so lax as to be virtually no method, but in the absence of a concordance is the only one available. My contention that Puttenham is a source for the early lexicographers, however, must be supported by the evidence itself rather than by the "method" used for obtaining it, though I have felt obliged to mention the latter. Indeed, the hit-or-miss nature of my inquiry would indicate that I have no doubt overlooked additional parallels between Puttenham and the early lexicographers, and that the very frailty of the "method" adds weight to the evidence it has produced.

In my attempt to show a connection between Puttenham and Cawdrey, I shall rely upon some words in Cawdrey which seem strikingly indebted to Puttenham for their definitions, and upon some words for which the first citation in the OED is to Puttenham in 1589 or to a source of later date:

Puttenham, 1589

by long ambage and circumstance of wordes (p. 186)

Analogie, or a convenient proportion (p. 262)

[decorum] we in our vulgar call it by a scholasticall terme [decencie] our owne Saxon English terme is [seemlynnesse] that is to say, for his good shape and utter appearance well pleasing to the eye, we call it also [comelynesse] for the delight it bringeth comming towards us, and to that purpose may be called [pleasant approche] (p. 262)

[Speech in meter] carieth his opinion this way and that whether soever the heart by impression of the eare shall be most affectionately bent and directed. The utterance in prose is not of so great efficacie (p. 8)

this was done by a maner of imprecation, or as we call it by cursing and banning of the parties, and wishing all evill to a light upon them (p. 57)

yet in steade of indignitie, yee have unworthinesse (p. 147)

Cawdrey, 1604

ambage, long circumstance of words.

analogie, convience, proportion.

decorum, comelines. (The first entry for this definition in the OED is "1613 R.C. Table Alph. ed. 3".)

efficacie, force or strength. (The first definition in the OED with this sense is dated 1633.)

imprecation, cursing, or wishing evill unto. (Puttenham provides the first citation for the word in the OED.)

indignitie, unworthinesse, unseemly usage, infamie, or disgrace. (Puttenham and Nashe [also 1589] provide the first

citations for the word in the
OED.)

Cawdrey's edition of 1617 was enlarged beyond that of 1613, and in the case of this enlargement there is little uncertainty in locating sources. Starnes and Noyes notice that the title of the 1617 edition of Cawdrey is expanded by a borrowing from Bullokar to read, A Table Alphabeticall, or the English Expositor (p. 19). This they reckon to be the extent of Cawdrey's borrowing in the 1617 edition. It is, however, merely a clue to Cawdrey's borrowing. As I pointed out above, the 1617 edition is about 11% larger than the 1613 edition; a substantial portion of the additional words come from Bullokar. Of some 28 additional words under the letters "A" and "L" in the 1617 edition, 27 are certainly from Bullokar, and the other one may be. A few examples make the point clear:

Bullokar, 1616	Cawdrey, 1617
<u>Ablepsie</u> . Want of fight, blindness, unadvisednesse.	<u>ableprise</u> , want of fight, blindness, unadvisednesse.
<u>Accelerate</u> . To hasten.	<u>accelerate</u> , to hasten.
<u>Accoutrement</u> . Attire, or dressing.	<u>Accoutrement</u> , attire or dressing.
<u>Laike</u> . A lay man.	<u>laike</u> , a lay man.
<u>Libidinous</u> . Lustfull, leacherous.	<u>libidinous</u> , lustful.
<u>Loquacitie</u> . Much talke, or babbling.	<u>loquacitie</u> , much talke or babbling.
<u>Lucre</u> . Gaine, profit.	<u>lucre</u> , gaine, profit.

For the 23 words added to the letters "G" and "W" in the 1617 edition of Cawdrey, Bullokar provides perhaps half. Seven are definitely from his Expositor, five are from Speght's Chaucer Glossary, six are either taken directly from Speght or from Bullokar's borrowings from Speght, and five are from another source or other sources. Thus, some of the interrelations between the early dictionaries (to use Miss Noyes's term) are rather closer than has heretofore been recognized, and they will be seen below to be closer still.

John Bullokar's English Expositor

As in the case of Cawdrey's dictionaries, Starnes and Noyes correctly note those which are probably the major sources for Bullokar's dictionary, that is, Cawdrey and Thomas (pp. 21-23). Their conclusions, however, need some emendation and revision.²⁰ In the first place, mistakenly assuming that A Table Alphabeticall was little altered between 1604 and 1613, they ascribe Bullokar's borrowing to the wrong edition of that dictionary. Nevertheless, a number of words from Cawdrey's expanded later edition do appear in Bullokar, often slightly modified:

Cawdrey, 1613 (but not 1604)	Bullokar, 1616
<u>abstruse</u> , hid, secret, difficult.	<u>Abstruse</u> . Hidden: secret, not easie to understand.
<u>accumulate</u> , to heape together.	<u>Accumulate</u> . To heape up.
<u>aliment</u> , nourishment, sustenance.	<u>Aliment</u> . Nourishment.
<u>aspersion</u> , besprinkling.	<u>Aspersion</u> . A sprinkling.
<u>assassinate</u> , spoile, murther.	<u>Assassinate</u> . A robbing, spoiling, or murdering in the high way.

Furthermore, and of some interest in showing that early dictionaries were interrelated closely and in more than one way, is evidence that Bullokar knew and used some of Cawdrey's sources - sources other than dictionaries. Bullokar seems to have turned to Puttenham for some words, and certainly turned to Speght's Chaucer Glossary and to Rastell's Termes of the Lawes. In doing so he established a pattern later to be followed by his successor, Henry Cockeram. For words such as the following, Bullokar apparently relied upon Puttenham. The examples here are few, but, I think, reasonably convincing:

Puttenham, 1589	Bullokar, 1616
We call it in English proverbe the cart before the horse, the Greeks call it <u>Histeron proteron</u> we name it Preposterous (p. 170)	<u>Hysteron proteron</u> . A Greek terme, sometime used in derision of that which is spoken or done preposterously or quite contrary. We call it in English, The cart before the

horse. (Tilley²¹ gives no example other than Puttenham of the rhetorical term being associated with the proverb.)

the commendable parts of speech were set foorth by the name of figures, and all the illaudable parts under the name of vices, or viciosities (p. 156)

Illaudable. Not worthy of praise (The first entry in the OED is Puttenham, 1589.)

such rime is strained, so is it to this word [Ram] to say [came] or to [Beane [Den] for they sound not nor be written a like, & many othere like cadences which were superfluous to recite, and usuall with rude rimers who observe not precisely the rules of [prosodie] nevertheless in all such cases . . . it is somewhat more tollerable to help the rime by false orthographie, then to leave an unplesant dissonance to the eare (p. 81)

Prosodie. True pronouncing of wordes. (This definition is noted as "rare" in the OED; the first citation is to Bullokar.)

Bullokar went to Speght's Chaucer Glossary for a number of terms in his dictionary. Some of Speght's words which do not appear in Cawdrey are in the following list:

Speght, 1602

Bullokar, 1616

bargaret, a kind of daunce.

Bargaret. A kind of dance.

burled, armed.

Burled. It is sometimes signifieth Armed.

canceline, chamlet.

Canceline. Chamlet.

gawre, stare.

Gawre. To stare.

gippon, a doublet, or light coat.

Gippon. A doublet: a light cote.

gisarme, a certaine weapon.

Gisarme. A certaine weapon.

levesell, a bushe.

Levesell. A bush.

vechons, Hedgehogs.

Vechons. Hedgehogs.

wanger, a male, or bouget.

Wanger. A male or bouget.

The words that Bullokar took from Speght are very often indicated after the manner set out in his "Introduction to the Reader":

"Remember . . . that every word marked with this marke * is an olde word, onely used of some ancient writers, and now growne out of use" (sig. A4v). It is not remarkable that all of the words taken from Speght's Glossary are not starred by Bullokar (or his printer), but it is worth noting that Bullokar did indicate as "olde words" many of those taken from Speght,²² even if they had previously been absorbed (unidentified) into Cawdrey's Table Alphabeticall.²³

Bullokar's use of Rastell's Termes of the Lawes was similar. If Cawdrey had taken up a term from Rastell, Bullokar might well expand Cawdrey's definition by independently drawing upon Rastell. Thus one cannot tell to what extent, if at all, Bullokar was influenced by Cawdrey's choice of words from Rastell. Bullokar, as might be expected, also took over more terms than had Cawdrey. His indebtedness to Rastell can be seen in the following examples:

Rastell, 1602

Abbetors in murders are those that command, procure, counsell, or comfort others to murder

Abjuration is an oth that a man or woman shall take when they have committed felony, & flie to the Church or churchyard chosing rather perpetuall banishment out of the realme, then to stand to the law And this law was instituted by S. Edward the Confessor, . . . and was grounded upon the law of mercie Note this law is now chaunged by the statutes

Bullokar, 1616

Abbetour. Hee that counselleth or comforteth another to doe any evill.

Abjure. To sweare or forswear: a term used in Lawe, when one having committed a capitall offence flyeth to a Church, or Churchyard; and chooseth rather perpetuall banishment: viz. to abjure the Realme, then stand to tryall of Lawe. This Law was instituted by S. Edward the Confessour in favour of life, but now is not in use.

Lastage, that is to bee quite of a certaine custome exacted in Faires & Markets for carrying of things where a man will.

Lastage. Any heavy weight or balasse, layd in the bottome of ships to make them goe upright: It is also a terme in the common law, which signifieth to be quite of a certaine payment in faires and markets, for carrying of things where a man will.

Waive, is a woman that is outlawed. . . .

Waive. In our common law it signifieth a woman that is outlawed.

Two other sources for Bullokar can be noted here. The first is the "Explanation of certaine obscure words" appended to Philamon Holland's translation of Plutarch's Morals (or Philosophie), published in 1603. The following is a series of consecutive entries in Holland's "Explanation" and their counterparts (when such appear) in Bullokar:

Holland's Plutarch, 1603

Bullokar, 1616

Hemisphaere, that is to say, The halfe sphaere or globe, used commonly for that part of the heaven which is in our sight.

Hemisphere. Halfe the compasse of the heavnes: that part of the heavnes which is still visible to us.

Hexameter,

.

Hesatonos,

.

Hieroglyphicks, The Aegptians sacred Philosophie, delivered not in characters and letters, but under the forme of living creatures and other things engraven.

Hieroglyphikes. A darke mystical kind of writing, used chiefly in times past among the Pagane priests and learned men of Egypt to hide their knowledge from the vulgar sort. This writing was by making the formes of beasts and divers other figures, and could hardly bee understood without exposition, or great knowledge in the nature of things. For example: Eternity or everlastingnesse, they expressed by a round circle, which hath

no end: A king, by a scepter with an eye in the top thereof: A mat[ter] of haste, by a Dolphin, the swiftest of all fishes. And a matter of deliberation or advice, by an Anchor, which stayeth a ship in the waves. With a thousand such devices, not subject to common capacities to find out.

Holocaust, A whole burnt sacrifice: whereas ordinarily they burnt upon the altar, onely the inwards of the beast.

Holocaust. A sacrifice wherein the whole beast is offered, and no part reserved.

Homonymie, the double or manifold signification of a word or sentence, which is the occasion of ambiguity and doubts.

Homonymie. A terme in Logicke, when one word signifieth divers things: as Hart: signifying a beast, and a principall member of the body.

Horizon, That circle that determineth our sight, and divideth the one halfe of the spheare of heaven above, from that which is under, out of our sight.

Horizon. An imaginary line compassing the lowest part of the heavens that we can see; so called because it limiteth our sight, dividing the heavens underneath us, from that which is above. The sun rysing and going downe is ever in this line.

Horoscope, the observation of the houre and time of ones nativitie, together with the figure of the heavens at that very instant; and that for-sooth in the East.

Horoscope. The ascendent of ones nativitie, to wit, that part of the firmament which ascendeth from the East, when a child is borne. Astrologers call it, the first house.

This list illustrates (somewhat more forcefully than statistical accuracy would allow; Bullokar did not take over 75% of Holland's words, but rather less than 50%) not only that Bullokar borrowed from Holland,²⁴ but also that he dilated upon Holland, particularly to make a definition more concrete, or otherwise to make it clearer to the vulgar understanding.

Another source for some words in Bullokar is an "Index . . . of the hardest words," appended to one of Joshua Sylvester's

translations of Du Bartas' Divine Weekes and Workes.²⁵ Because of Bullokar's habit of improving definitions, one cannot say very definitely how many words he borrowed from Sylvester, but the number seems to be between fifty and eighty. Borrowings and improvements are illustrated in the following examples:

Sylvester, 1608

Antiperistasis, incounter of contraries, or contrarie-circumstance.

Cittadell, a Castle built, with a small Garrison to keepe a great Towne in awe.

Diameter, a straite line dividing any figure into equall parts, passing through the middle point of any figure.

Poetasters, Base, Counterfait, unlearned, wit-lesse, and wanton Poets that pester the World, either with idle vanities or odious villanies.

Remora, a little fish (which some call a Suck-stone) that suddainly stoppeth a shippe under all her sayles in her full course.

Bullokar, 1616

Antiperistasis. A tearme used in Philosophy, when heat being kept in by cold waxeth the stronger in it self, or cold kept in by heate, groweth more vehement.

Cittadell. A castle with a small garrison to keepe a towne in awe.

Diameter. A streight line which passing through the middle of any figure, divideth it in two equall parts.

Poetasters. A counterfeit Poet: a bad poet.

Remora. A little Fish which clinging to the bottome of a shippe, doth verie strangelie stay the shippe that shee cannot moove.

Thus, Bullokar used not only Cawdrey and one of Cawdrey's dictionary sources, Thomas, but also several other of Cawdrey's sources. In addition he "discovered" new sources, and, as I shall try to show, both his new and borrowed sources were to be used by his successor, Henry Cockeram.

Henry Cockeram's English Dictionarie²⁶

In the Romanes Lecture for 1900, Sir James A. H. Murray, speaking of Cockeram's dictionary, commented as follows:

Part I contains the hard words with their explanation in ordinary language; and instructive it is to see what words were then considered hard and unknown. Many of them certainly would be still, . . . concerning which we wonder who used them, or where Cockeram found them.²⁷

The answer to the first of Murray's questions would seem to be: it is likely that no one ever "used" many of the words in Cockeram's dictionary, if by "used" one means that the words were ever employed in communication, either written or spoken. But where Cockeram found the words is a different matter. It appears that many more of the words were, in fact, "used" than previous identification of Cockeram's sources has suggested. In short, many more of Cockeram's terms were mere dictionary words than Murray's question would seem to imply, and many more were words actually used than Starnes' and Noyes' listing of Cockeram's sources would seem to imply.

As did Bullokar, Cockeram went back not only to his immediate predecessor, but also to earlier dictionaries. Starnes and Noyes partially note this, as they point out that Cockeram went to Thomas and to Cawdrey, as well as to Bullokar. Another source that they note is John Rider's Biblioteca Scholastica (1589), or "later revisions (1606, 1612, 1617) of this book by Francis Holyoke" (p. 32). The indebtedness they point out, however, is restricted to the second part of Cockeram's three-part dictionary, that part which is devoted to giving elegant (i. e. Latinate) equivalents to relatively common English words. Although an examination of either the second or third parts of the English Dictionarie is beyond the scope of this essay,²⁸ it seems useful to point out, as Starnes and Noyes do not, that many of the entries in the first part of Cockeram's dictionary are simply taken from the second part and turned about, and that they supply a substantial portion of the entries in Part I. The first dozen items that Starnes and Noyes give as examples of Cockeram's borrowing from Rider-Holyoke are (pp. 32-33):

Rider, 1589; Rider-Holyoke, 1617

Cockeram, 1623

To Charge. or burden. Onero.

To charge. Onerate.

So charged. Oneratus.

.

Chargeable or burdenous.
Onerosus.

Chargeable. Onerous.

To charme, or enchaunt.
Incanto, excanto.

To Charme. Incantate.

A Charme or enchaument.
Incantatio.

A Charme. Incantation.

Chaste. Castus, continens.

Chaste. Continent.

Chastitie. Castitas, . . .
continentia.

Chastitie. Continencie.

To Chastise. Castigo.

to Chastise. Castigate.

Chiefe, or principall.
Primus.

the Cheefe. Prime.

Cheapnes. Vilitas.

Cheapnesse. Vility.

Cheese made of mares milke.
Hippace.

a Cheese made of Mares milke.
Hippace.

To Cherish. Foveo.

to Cherish. Foster.

Of "elegant" terms, only "incantate" does not appear in Part I of Cockeram's dictionary:

Cockeram (Part I), 1623

Onorate. To charge.

Onerous. Chargeable.

Incantation. A charme.

Continent. Chaste.

Continencie. Chastitie.

Castigate. To chastice.

Prime. The first, the chiefe, the morning.

Vilitie. Basenesse.

Hippace. A Cheese made of Mares-milke.

Foster. To cherish.

In the case of "Prime," Cockeram expanded his definition by going to Bullokar, a practice he not infrequently followed.

As did Bullokar, Cockeram turned not only to his predecessor and to earlier dictionaries but also to several of his predecessors' sources other than dictionaries, which suggests either an extraordinary coincidence or a knowledge of Bullokar's methods. Cockeram seems to have turned to Speght for some words which Bullokar did not choose. The words, relatively few in number, which Cockeram apparently found in Speght are often so common and their definitions so brief (e.g.: "Ure. Use"; "Span new. Very new.") that accumulation of examples will not definitely prove that Cockeram took them from Speght. One word-and-definition, however, which appears neither in Cawdrey nor in Bullokar, follows Speght so precisely, in sentiment and even in spelling, that it seems unlikely that Cockeram found it anywhere else:

Speght, 1602

Cockeram, 1623

lollar, a breaker of fasting daies.

Lollar. A breaker of fasting daies.

Like Bullokar, Cockeram relied upon the "Index . . . of the hardest words" appended to Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas.²⁹ Some of the more fetching of his borrowings from Sylvester are given below:

Sylvester, 1608

Cockeram, 1623

Aonian band, the Muses.

Aonian band. The Muses.

Bacchanalian Frowes, Woeman-priests of Bacchus, the God of Cups.

Bacchanalean frowes. Women-Bacchus-Priests.

Bocconi, Poisonie confections, Italian figges.

Bocconie. Poyson, or Italian figs.

Brutus heires. Englishmen, Brittans.

Brutus heires. Englishmen.

Hebridian Wave, the Sea about
the Iles Hiberides, to the
North from Ireland.

Hibridean wave. The Irish sea.

Jessean Harpe, the holy
musicke of David the Son of
Ishai, commonly called Jesse.

Jessean Harpe. Davids musicke.

Ovids heires: wanton Poets.

Ovids heires. Wanton,
lascivious Poets.

Panomphean, all-hearing.

Panomphean. All hearing.

Venus Escuage, Knights (or
Nights) service to Ladies.

Venus-escuage. Wanton flesh-
linesse.

(Cockeram's treatment of "Ovids heires" suggests that in the case of "Venus-escuage" he was more interested in expunging naughtiness than in even the mildest sort of humour.)

Cockeram, as did Cawdrey before him, may have turned to the Bible for some of his words and consulted one of the concordances then bound up with virtually all editions of the Geneva Bible, and with some editions of the Authorized Version:³⁰

Bible Concordance, 1600

Cockeram, 1623

(Accub [in margin]) Akkub, the
print, or marke of a foote,
where any creature hath gone.

Accub. The print of any crea-
tures foot.

Anak. A Giant . . . of whom
came the Anakims or Giants.

Anakim. A Giant.

Corim. A Measure; . . . it
is eighteene gallons of our
measure, or thereabout.

Corim. A measure of 18.
gallons.

Kab. A measure conteining
about 3. of our wine quarte.

Kab. Three wine quarts.

Cockeram perhaps turned also to another of Bullokar's probable sources, Puttenham's Arte of English Poesie; but it must be admitted that the evidence for this contention is rather slim. Although there are more than a few unusual words which appear in Puttenham and again in Cockeram (e. g. "facundity," for which the OED gives 1530 for the date of the first entry and 1624 for the

second), I have chosen just five, which offer as strong evidence as I have been able to discover:

Puttenham, 1589

(Brachiloga, or the Cutted comma [marginal notation])
This figure for pleasure may be called in our vulgar the cutted comma, for that there cannot be a shorter division then at every words end. The Greeks in their language call it short language (p. 213)

conduplicatio, . . . is a maner of repetition, when one and the selfe word doth begin and end many verses in sute (pp. 199-200)

their fence playes, or digladiations of naked men, their wrastlings, runnings (p. 37)

therefore of learned dutie asketh martiall grandiloquence (p. 150)

because the speaker seemes to make a collection of all the former material points, to binde them as it were in a bundle and lay them forth to enforce the cause and renew the hearers memory, then ye may geve him more properly the name of the [collectour] or recapitulatour (p. 237)

Cockeram, 1623

Brachilogies. Short speeches. (First two entries in the OED are from Puttenham and Cockeram. The third entry is dated 1716.)

Conduplicate. To double. (Cockeram provides the only entry for this word in the OED. Puttenham provides the first for "conduplication.")

Digladiation. Fight, strife, debate. (Literal. Puttenham is the first [of three] entries in the OED.)

Grandiloquus. Which useth great words. (Puttenham is the first entry in the OED.)

Recapituler. Which briefly rehearseth. (The OED gives but two examples of "recapitulator," 1382 Wyclif and Puttenham. It does not recognize "recapituler.")

These entries offer a clue to Cockeram's method, or more accurately to one of his methods, in compiling his dictionary. No one seems to have inquired into the principle Cockeram followed in choosing which words he would borrow from Thomas's Dictionarium, probably on the grounds that to seek for principle

in such chaos would be a task without possibility of reward. I wish to suggest that perhaps Cockeram did not pull out all his borrowings from Thomas at whim, that perhaps sometimes he found the words first and then went to Thomas for definitions of them. All five of the above words from Puttenham have definitions taken straight from Thomas, but one of them is particularly to the point here. Cockeram seems to have taken "recapituler" from Puttenham and to have looked for a word like it in Thomas. He would have found there only "Recapitulatio . . . A summe or brief rehearsing of a thing spoken at large before." One would expect Cockeram to have Englished this as "recapitulation." He seems, however, to have had already in mind Puttenham's agent noun and to have adjusted accordingly the definition of the abstract noun given by Thomas.

That Cockeram did select words and then turned to Thomas for definitions of them can be seen in his borrowings from what is the most interesting of his sources, some of the work of Thomas Nashe. So far as I am aware, no one has suggested that the early lexicographers sought out terms in works of literature, but most assuredly Cockeram did just that in several pieces by Nashe.³¹ Nashe, of all writers, is likely to have been attractive to a man interested in compiling a dictionary of hard words, for as he says of his own language:

[Some] object unto me the multitude of my boystrous compound wordes, and the often coyning of the Italionate verbes which end all in Ise, as mummianize, tympanize, tirannize

To the . . . ranke of reprehenders that complaine of my boystrous compound wordes, and ending my Italionate coyned verbes all in Ize, thus I replie: That no winde that blowes strong but is boystrous, no speech or wordes of any power of force to confute or perswade but must bee swelling and boystrous. For the compounding of my wordes, therein I imitate rich men who, having gathered store of white single money together, convert a number of those small little scutes into great peeces of gold, such as double Pistols and Portugues. Our English tongue of all languages most swarmeth with the single money of monasillables, which are the onely scandall of it.³²

Nashe's "Italionate coyned verbes" seem indeed to have been attractive to Cockeram, as a good many of them appear in his English Dictionarie, including two of those Nashe cites above, "mummianize" and "tirannize." Some other examples appear below.

In dealing with Nashe I shall first show that Cockeram did indeed borrow words from him, and then I shall indicate some of his sources (one of whom was Thomas) for his definitions of them. In the following list are words to be found in Nashe and Cockeram, and apparently nowhere else, including the OED:

Nashe	Cockeram, 1623
any that were <u>Creditor-crazed</u> , and deade and buried in debt (<u>Ch. T.</u> [II, 64]).	<u>Creditor-crazd.</u> Banquerout.
hee sends for his Barber to depure, <u>decurtate</u> , and sponge him ("Epistle Dedicatorie" to <u>Len. St.</u> [III, 148]).	<u>Decurtate.</u> To shorten.
My eyes have been dronke . . . wyth giving but ordinarie entercourse through their sea-circled Ilands to my distilling <u>dreriment</u> (<u>Unf. Trav.</u> [II, 213]).	<u>Dreriment.</u> Sorrow, heavinesse.
she hath steeled my soft impressive hart, and <u>mirmidoniz'd</u> myne eyes (<u>Ch. T.</u> II, 57]).	<u>Mirmidoniz'd.</u> Hardened.

There are also some few words for which the OED gives as citations only Nashe and Cockeram, or Nashe and Cockeram and other dictionaries, or Nashe and dictionaries later than Cockeram's, or gives Cockeram for the first citation. Some examples are:

Nashe	Cockeram, 1623
thou must be <u>Anthropophagiz'd</u> by thyne owne Mother (<u>Ch. T.</u> [II, 73]).	<u>Anthropophagize.</u> One man to kill and eat anothers flesh. (Cockeram is the first entry in the <u>OED</u> .)
once more I wil <u>assertionate</u> , Vertue hath no enimie but pryde. (<u>Ch. T.</u> [II, 41]).	<u>Assertionate.</u> To avouch. (Nashe and Cockeram only citations in the <u>OED</u> .)

her Hart, her Lunges, her Liver, & her Gal, are all carioniz'd and contaminated with surfets of selfe-will (Ch. T. [II, 51]).

with a lustful collachrimation lamenting my Jewish Premunire (Unf. Trav. [II, 305]).

no Trophy remayning, no stone but discituate (Ch. T. [II, 78]).

thou that ere this has dispar-radiz'd our first Parent Adam (Ch. T. II, 80).

a blacke inckie hood embayling her bright head (Ch. T. II, 61); so embailing and girdling in this mount (Len. St. III, 166).

she had no other refuge of fosterment, she was constrained, . . . having but one onely sonne, to kill him and rost him (Ch. T. [II, 71]).

give me leave, with the sportive Sea Porposes, preludiatelie a little to play before the storme of my Teares (Ch. T. [II, 9]).

Man, woman, chylde, he shall unmortalize & mangle (Ch. T. [II, 48]).

Carionized. Stinking (Nashe and Cockeram only citations in the OED.)

Collachrimation. A weeping with. (Cockeram first citation in the OED, which, however, also lists "collacrimate," with Nashe, Cockeram, and one other dictionary cited.)

Discituated. Displaced overturned. (Nashe and Cockeram only citations in the OED.)

Disparadized. Falne from happinesse to miserie. (Nashe and Cockeram only citations in the OED.)

Embayling. Compassing. (Nashe and Cockeram only citations in the OED.)

Fosterment. Foode, nourishment. (Nashe and Cockeram only citations in the OED.)

Preludiatelie-done. Done as a Prologue. (Nashe and Cockeram only citations in the OED.)

Unmortaliz'd. Kild, dead. (Nashe and Cockeram Part II only citations in the OED.)

In both Nashe and Cockeram are to be found many other words of similar nature, that is words which are "Italionate" or otherwise eccentric or obscure. For most of these words the OED will give one or perhaps several citations other than Nashe and/or Cockeram; thus, although I cannot demonstrate absolutely that

Cockeram did borrow all or most of them from Nashe, I think (having shown the probability of a connection) it is reasonable to infer that he did.³³ Occasionally a confused definition will help to support this inference. For instance, Cockeram has for the word "ensnarl" the heterodox definition "to gnash the teeth."³⁴ It seems plausible that his definition is the unhappy result of a misreading of Nashe, who writes: "and gnawing through every part of thy scull, ensnarle their teeth amongst thy braines, as an Angler ensnarleth his hooke amongst weedes" (Ch. T. [II, 140]). For "saturnine" Cockeram has the definition "most unluckie." At one place the word appears in Nashe in a way that could easily be misconstrued to support Cockeram's improbable definition: "Ratified it is (bad-fated Saturnine boy) that thou must be Anthropophagiz'd by thine owne mother" (Ch. T. [II, 73]). As Cockeram seems also to have taken "anthropophagize" from Nashe (see above), there is additional reason to suspect that he had this particular sentence before him at one time.

Contrary to the inference that might be drawn from these two examples, however, Cockeram does not seem to have taken definitions (to whatever extent misconstrued) from Nashe except when he could not find them elsewhere. His method seems to have been, as it probably was when he borrowed words from Puttenham, to find the term in Nashe and then, if possible, to get a definition for it from Thomas's Dictionarium or from one of the Rider-Holyoke dictionaries or, less commonly, from Bullokar. Although Nashe's context could have inspired the sense of the following definitions, their wording seems indebted to the Latin-English dictionaries:

Rider-Holyoke, 1617	Cockeram, 1623
<u>Anthropaphagus</u> That eateth or feedeth upon mans flesh.	<u>Anthropophagize</u> . One man to kill and eat anothers flesh. (See context in Nashe above.)
Thomas, 1596	
<u>Assertio</u> An affirmance or affirming; . . . an avouching.	<u>Assertionate</u> . To avouch. (See context in Nashe above.)
<u>Intercessus</u> A comming or putting betweene, an intreating.	<u>Intercessionate</u> . To intreat for one. (Nashe, one other [1598], and Cockeram only citations in the <u>OED</u> .)

Refragor To resist,
repugne, be against, con-
trarie to, gainesay, or
denie.

Refragate. To gainesay,
(Nashe, Cockeram, and one
other [1661] only citations in
the OED.)

These examples, though representative, are only moderately conclusive, largely because of Cockeram's habit of shortening his definitions by omitting one or more elements of the definitions offered by his sources. One result of this practice is that the connection between Cockeram and Nashe is not always so clear as it might be. Furthermore, sometimes Cockeram's definition for a word will not fit into Nashe's context, and sometimes the form of the word itself has little to do with the term being defined by (say) Thomas, when Thomas's definition seems to be the one Cockeram borrowed. It is not surprising that the most convincing evidence that Cockeram did indeed take terms from Nashe and their definitions from one of the Latin-English dictionaries comes from a Cockeram blunder. One of the entries in his English Dictionarie is the odd "Mirrowring. Wondering." In Nashe's Christs Teares over Jerusalem is the following sentence: "Vengeance on your soules and all the discending generations of the seede of your Trybes, for thus mirrouring mee for the Monarch-monster of Mothers" (II, 76). Cockeram seems to have taken the term from Nashe (the date of the earliest entry for this form of the verb "mirror" in the OED is 1852); but where did he get the definition, which hardly fits into Nashe's context? Apparently Thomas provided it for him. In his Dictionarium one finds "Miror. . . . To marveile, to wonder at" There is no reason to suspect that Cockeram got the form of the verb from Thomas, or that he got the definition of it from Nashe. But if he was in the habit of taking words from Nashe and definitions from Thomas, the construction of Cockeram's entry, if not the substance of it, makes sense.

If Cockeram did take words from Puttenham and Nashe, and the definitions for those words from such Latin-English dictionaries as Rider-Holyoke and Thomas, then we have at least part of an answer to a question that has not previously been asked, although it perhaps should have been: How did early lexicographers decide which words to borrow from the Latin-English dictionaries? But the question, it should be stressed, is only partly answered. For some words, such as the following, it seems unlikely that any principle of selection was operative, but rather something of a taste for the odd:

Cockeram, 1623

- Acersecomicke. One whose haire was never cut.
Adstupiate. Greatly to esteeme riches.
Bubulcitate. To cry like a cow boy.
Bulbitate. To befilth ones breech.
Commotrix. A maid that makes ready and unready her
Mistris.
Cucuriate. To crow like a cocke.
Degulate. To consume in belly cheere.
Depalmate. To give one a box on the ear.
Glacitate. To cry like a gander.
Obligurate. To spend in belly-cheere.³⁵

For editions subsequent to that of 1623 Cockeram added some new material to his English Dictionarie. Starnes and Noyes point out that Cockeram "enlarged many of his definitions between his first (1623) and his seventh (1642) editions. For the expansions he continued to draw from Bullokar" (p. 30). The expansions appear, in fact, in the second edition of 1626, and Cockeram did not draw only from Bullokar. Looking into the nature of those expansions, I should first like to consider Cockeram's method of borrowing from Bullokar. He seems to have lacked Bullokar's learning or invention, but also seems to have hit upon the notion of disguising to some extent his borrowings. Thus, when he took a definition of two or more elements from Bullokar, his habit was to change their order, or sometimes merely to omit an element or a portion thereof. In the latter case he usually omitted the first element(s) of the definition and retained the last. In some instances this has little effect:

Bullokar, 1616	Cockeram, 1623	Cockeram, 1626
<u>Acute.</u> Sharpe, wittie.	<u>Acute.</u> Witty.	<u>Acute.</u> Witty, sharpe.
<u>Approbate.</u> To like, to allowe.	<u>Approbate.</u> To allow.	<u>Approbate.</u> To allow, to like.

In other instances, his omissions or inversions, or both, lead to some ludicrous definitions:

Bullokar, 1616	Cockeram, 1623	Cockeram, 1626
<u>Adore.</u> To worship, to give divine reverance.	<u>Adore.</u> To worship.	<u>Adore</u> , to worship, to give.
<u>Cheeke varnish.</u> Painting used by some women.	<u>Cheeke-varnish.</u> Painting.	(same as 1623)
<u>Comment.</u> Notes of instruction set in some bookes, to expounde such things as cannot easily bee understood. Sometime it is taken for a lie or fayned tale.	<u>Comment.</u> A lye or tale, sometimes a note of instruction set in the margent of a Booke to expound that which is hard to bee understood.	(same as 1623)
<u>Expose.</u> To set forth: to set to view; to put abroad in hazzard.	<u>Expose.</u> to set to view, to set abroad.	(same as 1623)
<u>Jacent.</u> Lying along.	<u>Jacent.</u> Lying.	(same as 1623)
<u>Membrane.</u> The upmost thin skin in any part of the body.	<u>Membrane.</u> The thinne skinne and upmost of any part of the body.	(same as 1623)

Cockeram's practice of slightly altering his borrowings from Bullokar can be seen elsewhere. In his second edition, of 1626, Cockeram inserts into "A Premonition from the Author to the Reader" a passage lifted almost intact from Bullokar's "An Instruction to the Reader":

Bullokar, 1616

Have care to search every word according to the true Orthography thereof, as for Phoenix in the Letter P. not in F. for Hypostaticall in Hy: not in Hi: Remember also that every word marked with marke * is an olde word, onely used of some ancient writers, and now growne out of use. (sig. A4v)

Cockeram, 1626

Onely by the way, I would entreat thee, gentle Reader, that thou wouldst have care to search every word according to the true Orthography thereof, as for Physiognomie, in the Letter P. not in F. for Cynicall, in Cy. not in Ci. and where thou meetest with a word marked thus * know you that it is now out of use, and onely used of some ancient Writers. (sig. A4)

What is to be remarked here is not that Cockeram would take material from Bullokar, but that he would feel some constraint to conceal, however feebly, the fact that he had taken it. This seems consistent with his manipulation of the elements of the various definitions that he picked up from Bullokar. I must confess, however, that although I find Cockeram's attempts to cover his tracks are probably interesting, I do not know what they mean. Surely no one would be deceived by his efforts, and, given that such plagiarism was the common practice in lexicographic circles (if that is not too expansive a term), it is hard to imagine that anyone would care. He must have paid some attention to what he was saying in the above passage lifted from Bullokar, not only because he saw fit to change the examples in the two models for the orthography lesson, but also because he starred a few words in the 1626 edition, whereas none was starred in the 1623 edition. That he chose to include the comment on "olde words" seems to have been more for the sake of being able to claim modification than for the modification itself, for he used the asterisk in the most desultory possible manner. For instance, he starred four words under "A" (all four are from Bullokar; the first two are not starred in Bullokar, and the second two correspond to the only two words Bullokar did star under "A"), and starred not a single word under the letters "G," "L," and "W" (although under those three letters, he took some twenty-four starred words from Bullokar). The circumstances remain the same in later editions of Cockeram: the same four words under "A" remain starred, no stars are introduced into "G," "L," or "W," and this holds true for editions of Cockeram up to and including the eighth of 1647.

It has already been mentioned that Cockeram expanded his dictionary by augmenting definitions he had taken from Bullokar. He also included additional words and definitions in his second edition, thus further justifying the statement on the title-page, "The second Edition, revised and enlarged." Of the twenty-seven words added under the letter "A," eighteen are from Cawdrey or Bullokar (it is not always possible to say that one dictionary rather than the other was Cockeram's source for any given word) and nine are from the "Index . . . of the hardest words" in

Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas. But Cockeram was scarcely more rigorous of principle in his manner of augmenting his dictionary than in his manner of starring old words. He tended to add words towards the beginning of his dictionary but not towards the end. Thus for the letter "A" he added twenty-seven words, for "B" sixteen words, for "G" one word, for "L" two words, and for "W" none. This pattern is roughly the same one he followed in expanding definitions for words he had already borrowed from Bullokar in his edition of 1623. That is, definitions towards the beginning of the Dictionarie were often expanded in the 1626 edition, the definitions towards the end were not. The following examples consist of four consecutive words borrowed from Bullokar under "A" and four under "R":

Bullokar, 1616

Cockeram, 1623

Cockeram, 1626

Alpha. The first letter of the Greekes: wherefore it is sometime taken for the first or cheef in any thing.

Alpha. The first letter of the Greekes.

Alpha, The first letter of the Greekes, taken also for the first or chiefe in a thing.

Alphabet. The crosserow of letters, the A, B, C.

Alphabet. The Crosserow.

Alphabet, The Crosserowe of letters, the A, B, C.

Alphabeticall. Belonging to the Alphabet.

Alphabeticall. Belonging to the Crosserow.

Alphabeticall, Belonging to the Crosserowe.

Altercation. An angrie reasoning or wrangling in words.

Altercation. An angry reasoning in words.

Altercation, An angry reasoning or wrangling in words.

Reliques. Things left or remaining. Most commonly it is taken for the bodies, or some part of the bodies, or somewhat which hath toucht the bodies of Saints now in heaven.

Reliques. Things left or remaining.

Reliques, Things left, or remaining.

Remisse. Slack, negligent or carelessse.

Remisse. Negligent, slack.

Remisse, Negligent, slack.

Remit. To send back; sometime to release or forgive.

Remit. To send back.

Remit, To send back.

Remorse. Doubtfulness in conscience, to doe a thing.: a staggering in minde: sometime pittifulnesse or repentance of a bad done.

Remorse. Repentance of a bad deed done, pittifulnesse.

Remorse, Repentance of a bad deed done, pittifulnesse.

Thus when talking of the extent of Cockeram's augmentations and modifications in editions past the first, one must take into consideration the distribution of those augmentations and modifications. Starnes and Noyes take their examples for Cockeram's expansion of his dictionary entirely from the letter "A," and although their central point that Cockeram did continue "to draw from Bullokar" is correct, it is misleading to assume that examples taken from "A" are representative. He did continue to draw from Bullokar (and elsewhere), but only enough to convince a reader glancing through the first part of his "revised and enlarged" dictionary that it was somewhat different from the first edition. As with his starring of words, his aim seems to have been more to justify a claim on the title-page than to advance English lexicography.

But advance English lexicography he did, or, if "advance" is the wrong word, at least he influenced it. In their discussion of Blount's Glossographia and Phillips' New World of Words, Starnes and Noyes barely acknowledge Cockeram's influence on the first two dictionaries of the second half of the seventeenth century; in fact they fail even to mention Cockeram as being one of Blount's sources. They do say that Bullokar's dictionary had some influence on Blount's, and they acknowledge that for Phillips' New World of Words Bullokar and Cockeram were "subordinate sources" (p. 49). The OED, however, lists a number of words, in the order of several hundred, for which Cockeram and Blount and other (later) dictionaries provide the only entries. Although it is possible that Cockeram and Blount coincidentally plucked the same words from the Latin-English dictionaries, it seems more likely that Blount consulted Cockeram for some suggestions, such as the following, for which Cockeram and Blount provide the only citations in the

OED:

Cockeram, 1623

Blount, 1656

Adhamate. To hooke, to bind.Adhamate (adhamo) to catch or take with hook or net.Amnick. A River.Amnick (amnicus) of or belonging to a River.Argentagenie. The silver-sickness.Argentanginy (argentangina) the silver Squincy, when one for many feigns himself sick and not to speak.Cacologie. Ill report.Cacology (cacologia) evill speech or report, detraction.Cucubate. To crie like an owle.Cucubate (cucubo) to make a noise like an Owl, to howl or whoop.Discalceate. To put off ones Shoes.Discalceate (discalceo) to pull off ones shoes.Pectinate. To combe.Pectinate (pectino) to kemb, to harrow corn, while it is in gras, to rake corn together.Soleated. Shod like a horse, with Iron in his shooes.Soleated (soleatus) shod, as horses are, or that wears pattens.Torquated. One wearing a chaine.Torquated (torquatus) that wears a collar or chain.Transfume. To smoake throw.Transfume (transfumo) to smook thorow.

Blount, however, was more adept than Cockeram, and in his dictionary and in subsequent dictionaries of the seventeenth century one does not find some of the more amusing entries that had crept into Cockeram's Dictionary.³⁶ For instance, entries like those for "Bulbitate," "Commotrix" (above, p. 153), "Comment" and "Membrane" (above, p. 154) simply do not appear in such dictionaries as Blount's and Phillips', or in those of later compilers who, like Phillips, were heavily indebted to Blount.³⁷ Although Blount relied upon Cockeram for some material, especially

for his choice of Latin words made English, in his seriousness of purpose he was closer to the spirit of Bullokar. But unlike Bullokar, who was apparently content to ignore the plunderings of Cockeram (which were, in fact, far more outrageous than those of Phillips), Blount, perhaps because of a new earnestness among English lexicographers, took Phillips to task for his foolishness. Early and later seventeenth-century lexicographers, as might be expected, reflected different attitudes towards the English language. In their own way they illustrated the difference between a Thomas Nashe and The Royal Society.

NOTES

- 1 The matter is discussed in some detail in DeWitt T. Starnes and Gertrude E. Noyes, The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson (Chapel Hill: U. of North Carolina P., 1946), pp. 51-56.
- 2 Harleian Miscellany, V (1810), 428-434.
- 3 Of the forty-nine examples, thirteen do not appear at all in the OED, although all are in Cockeram; for twenty-four more Cockeram is the only source noted in the OED that would have been available to the author of Vindex Anglicus.

Cockeram's Dictionarie, first published in 1623, was in its seventh edition by 1642.
- 4 Especially DeWitt T. Starnes, "English Dictionaries of the Seventeenth Century," U. of Texas Studies in English, No. 17 (1937), pp. 15-51; Gertrude E. Noyes, "Some Interrelations of English Dictionaries of the Seventeenth Century," PMLA, 54 (1939), 990-1006; Starnes and Noyes, The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson, Chaps. 2, 3, and 4. In addition, I should mention that after the present study was completed, I discovered that some of the findings in it had been anticipated by Prof. Jürgen Schäfer in his very useful article "The Hard Word Dictionaries: A Re-assessment," Leeds Studies in English, 4 (1970), 31-48.
- 5 See Miss Noyes' note "The First English Dictionary, Cawdrey's Table Alphabeticall" (MLN, 58 (1943), 600-605) on the relation of Cawdrey to other English schoolmasters.
- 6 First edition, 1587. It was in its sixth edition by 1600.
- 7 One edition only, 1590.
- 8 One edition only, 1588.
- 9 Under the letter "G," for example, which I use in illustration below, there appear in Bright 195 words, in Bales 224 words, and in Cawdrey 49 words. Bright and Bales, interested in shorthand, included very many "easy" words. Coote and Cawdrey restricted themselves, more or less, to relatively "hard," but not uncommon words.
- 10 Translated into English by Arthur Golding. The first edition is that of 1569; the fourth and last edition is that of 1578.
- 11 The first Rhemes edition is that of 1582. Fulke's version was first printed in 1589. In succeeding editions of both versions the "Explication" was reprinted without alteration.
- 12 First printed in 1525 [?]. It subsequently appeared under varying titles and with varying degrees of amendment in no fewer than twelve editions by 1602. The edition of 1602, the last to appear prior to the Table Alphabeticall, is the one referred to below.
- 13 The Treasury of the French Tong, 1580; A Dictionarie of French and English, 1593.

- 14 p. 19. In his facsimile edition of the 1604 Table Alphabeticall, Robert A. Peters accepts the evaluation of Starnes and Noyes (Gainsville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1966), p. xiii.
- 15 It should be noted that the second edition (1609), of which there is one recorded copy, at Pembroke College, Cambridge, also employs the phrase "much enlarged" on its title-page. So far as I have been able to determine, through the generous assistance of Professor Lila Geller, it is virtually the same as the edition of 1613.
- 16 Four words which appear in the 1604 edition under "A" do not appear in the 1613 and 1617 editions.
- 17 He seems pretty well to have exhausted the resources of Hemmingsen and the Rhemes New Testament for the first edition, and he or his successor seems not to have returned to these sources nor to Rastell's Termes of the Lawes when expanding A Table Alphabeticall in later editions.
- 18 The first edition is that of 1598. I refer here to the second, and last, edition of 1602, which seems to have been the one used by Cawdrey, as the word "waltering" (see list of words under "W" in text on p. 134 appears only in the 1602 edition. This also is the edition referred to by Bullokar (see n. 22).
- 19 The only early edition is that of 1589. All page references are to The Arte of English Poesie, ed. Gladys Doidge Willcock and Alice Walker (Cambridge: C. U. P., 1936).
- Of the dozens of works, the texts (rather than the "tables") of which were examined because early entries in the OED indicated that they might possibly be sources for the early lexicographers, The Arte of English Poesie is one of the few that has seemed to justify the effort.
- 20 It might be mentioned in passing that their comment on the number of entries in the 1656 edition of the English Expositor is also incorrect. They say that in it "there are, in fact, few actual additions to the entries or few changes of any kind" (p. 23). The claim on the title-page that the volume was "withe the addition of above a thousand words enlarged" is more nearly accurate.
- 21 Morris Palmer Tilley. A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Ann Arbor: U. of Michigan P., 1950).
- 22 It is possible to identify the edition of Speght used by Bullokar as that of 1602:

Speght, 1598	Speght, 1602	Bullokar, 1616
<u>corbets</u> , stones whereon Images stand.	<u>corbets</u> , places in walls where images stand.	<u>Corbets</u> . Places in walles where Images stand.

(Concerning the general definition of the word the OED says: "Erroneously explained in Dictionaries, etc., from misinterpreting the . . . passage in Chaucer." Speght, precisely, was the originator of the definition.)

- 23 I suspect that Bullokar also borrowed a few "olde words" from the 121 words P[aul?] G[reaves?] cites in the "Vocabula Chauceriana" in his Grammatica Anglica (1594), but I cannot prove it.
- 24 Bullokar may also have turned to the list of words appended to Holland's translation of Livy's Romane Historie (1600). However, that list is relatively brief and contains some terms and definitions which appear virtually unaltered in the Plutarch; I cannot satisfactorily demonstrate that Bullokar used it.
- 25 I refer here to the "Index" in the second edition of the collected Weekes and Workes (1608). The first collected edition was printed in 1605. In the second edition of 1608 the "Index" was expanded, and later remained virtually unaltered in the editions of 1611, 1613, and 1621. As I show below (n. 28), the edition of 1608 was the one probably used by Henry Cockeram.
- 26 There has been some confusion lately about the circumstances of the first two issues of Cockeram's dictionary. R. C. Alston (A Bibliography of the English Language, Vol. 5, The English Dictionary, Leeds: Arnold and Son, 1966) gives for item 30 Cockeram's dictionary as published by Edmund Weaver, and for item 31 "[another issue]" as published by Nathaniel Butter. The Scolar Press facsimile edition has a note to the effect that Butter's issue must be the second because his title-page is a cancel and because the work was entered to Weaver in the Stationers' Register on February 15, 1623. Miss Noyes was correct, however, in noting that the work was entered to Butter ("Some Interrelations," p. 991, and Starnes and Noyes, pp. 26-27). Furthermore, according to the Catalog of Printed Books of the Folger Shakespeare Library, it is Weaver's issue which has the cancel title-page. Weaver's must be assumed to be the second issue.
- 27 The Evolution of English Lexicography (Oxford: Clarendon P.), pp. 28-29.
- 28 Cockeram describes the two latter parts: "The second Booke contains the vulgar words, which whensoever any desirous of a more curious explanation by a more refined and elegant speech shall looke into, he shall there receive the exact and ample word to expresse the same: Wherein by the way let me pray thee to observe that I have also inferred (as occasion served) even the mocke-words which are ridiculously used in our language, that those who desire a generality of knowledge may not bee ignorant of the sense, even of the fustian termes, used by too many who study rather to bee heard speake, than to understand themselves. The last Booke is a recitall of severall persons, Gods and Goddesses, Giants and Devils, Monsters and Serpents, Birds and Beasts, Rivers, Fishes, Herbs, Stones, Trees, and the like, to the intent that the diligent learner may not pretend the defect of any helps which may informe his discourse or practice." ("A Premonition from the Author to the Reader," sigs A4v-A5.)
- 29 Although I could not for Bullokar, I can for Cockeram indicate the edition of Du Bartas that was consulted. It could not have been the edition of 1605 because, like Bullokar, Cockeram relied upon an expanded "Index" of one of the later editions. Two words, neither of which appears in Bullokar, provide the evidence as to which later edition it was. "Aonian band," which appears in Cockeram, does not appear in the Du

Bartas of 1621, thus eliminating that edition. Of the editions of 1608, 1611, and 1613, the one of 1608 seems most likely to be the one Cockeram used. "Bacconie" is so spelled in all editions except those of 1605 and 1608, in which it is spelled "Bocconie"; in Cockeram it is "Bocconie." And since he could not have used the edition of 1605, with its shorter "Index," that of 1608 stands as the edition he probably consulted.

- 30 The edition cited here is the one of 1600, printed by Robert Barker (Darlow and Moule [rev. Herbert], 257).
- 31 Having shown how Cockeram so often used the same sources as his predecessors, I am tempted to believe that Bullokar, and perhaps Cawdrey also, relied upon Nashe. And that temptation is especially strong since I have become reluctant to suspect Cockeram of any sort of originality in the compiling of Part I of his Dictionarie. There is, in fact, some slight evidence that both Cawdrey and Bullokar took words from Nashe; however, I have not been able to accumulate enough evidence to support more than a suggestion to that effect.
- 32 In the address "To the Reader" from the second edition of Christs Teares over Jerusalem (1594), The Works of Thomas Nashe, ed. R.B. McKerrow, rev. F.P. Wilson (Blackwell: Oxford, 1958), II, 183-184. All references to Nashe are to this edition.

Dates for Nashe's works are: Anatomie of Absurditie, 1590; Pierce Penillesse, 1592; Christs Teares over Jerusalem, 1593; The Unfortunate Traveller, 1594; Have with you to Saffron-Walden, 1596; Nashes Lenten Stuffe, 1599.
- 33 Because there is not a concordance to Nashe, I have had to rely upon the obviously spotty practice of reading through Nashe and looking up in Cockeram words that I think he might have been tempted to borrow from Nashe. Considering the uncertainty of the process, the yield has been rather a good one. I have found some ninety words that seem to me almost certainly to have come from Nashe; I have found about 150 more that seem to me likely to have come from Nashe. Most of the words are from Ch. T., followed by Unf. Trav., Len. St., Have with you, Pierce P., and Anat. Abs. I have not found satisfactory evidence that Cockeram used other of Nashe's works.
- 34 Cockeram provides the only citation in the OED for this definition.
- 35 For all of these words, except "bubulcitate," Cockeram provides the only citations in the OED. For "bubulcitate" both Cockeram and Phillips (A New World of Words) are cited.
- 36 Blount also omitted all but four of the forty-nine words cited in Vindex Anglicus as ridiculous words. Those he retained are, "Brochity," "Liguration," "Mephitick" and "Orbation."
- 37 Elisha Coles, An English Dictionary, 1676; Stephen Skinner, Etymologicon Linguae Anglicanae, (not, strictly speaking, an English dictionary, but it does deal with the etymology of English words); the anonymous Gazophylacium Anglicanum, 1689. For their indebtedness to Blount, see Starnes and Noyes, Chaps. 6-8.