

# Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers

Volume 4: The Seventeenth Century

*Edited by*  
**John Considine**



Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers

Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers  
Volume 4: The Seventeenth Century

**Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers**  
*Series Editor: Ian Lancashire*

**Titles in the series:**

**Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers**  
**Volume 1: Old English**  
*Christine Franzen*

**Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers**  
**Volume 2: Middle English**  
*Christine Franzen*

**Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers**  
**Volume 3: The Sixteenth Century**  
*Roderick McConchie*

**Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers**  
**Volume 4: The Seventeenth Century**  
*John Considine*

**Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers**  
**Volume 5: The Eighteenth Century**  
*Anne C. McDermott*

Ashgate Critical Essays on  
Early English Lexicographers  
Volume 4: The Seventeenth Century

*Edited by*

John Considine

*University of Alberta, Canada*

 **Routledge**  
Taylor & Francis Group  
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2012 by Ashgate Publishing

Published 2016 by Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN  
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

Copyright © John Considine 2012. For copyright of individual articles please refer to the Acknowledgements.

Wherever possible, these reprints are made from a copy of the original printing, but these can themselves be of very variable quality. Whilst the publisher has made every effort to ensure the quality of the reprint, some variability may inevitably remain.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

**British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data**

Ashgate critical essays on early English lexicographers.

Volume 4, The seventeenth century.

1. English language—Early modern, 1500-1700—Lexicography. 2. English language—Lexicography—History—17th century. 3. Encyclopedias and dictionaries—History and criticism. 4. Lexicographers—England—History—17th century.

1. Considine, John (John P.)

423'.028'09032-dc22

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data:**

Ashgate critical essays on early English lexicographers.

v. cm.

Includes index.

Contents: v. 1. Old English – v. 2. Middle English – v. 3. The sixteenth century – v. 4. The seventeenth century – v. 5. The eighteenth century.

ISBN 978-0-7546-5691-3 (v. 1 : hardcover : acid-free paper) – ISBN

978-1-4094-2661-5 (v. 2 : hardcover : acid-free paper) – ISBN

978-0-7546-5692-0 (v. 3 : hardcover : acid-free paper) – ISBN

978-0-7546-5693-7 (v. 4 : hardcover : acid-free paper) – ISBN

978-0-7546-5694-4 (v. 5 : hardcover : acid-free paper) – ISBN

978-0-7546-6884-8 (set : hardcover : acid-free paper) 1. Lexicographers.

2. English language—Old English, ca. 450-1100—Lexicography. 3. English language—Middle English, 1100-1500—Lexicography. 4. English language—Early modern, 1500-1700—Lexicography. 5. English language—18th century—Lexicography. 6. Lexicology.

PE63.A84 2011

423.092'2—dc23

2011028155

ISBN 9780754656937 (hbk)

# Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Series Preface</i>	<i>xiii</i>
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>xv</i>

## **PART I BACKGROUND**

1	Lexicography in the Early Modern English Period: The Manuscript Record <i>Ian Lancashire</i>	3
2	Motives behind 17th Century Lexicography: A Comparison between German and English Dictionaries of that Time <i>Werner Hüllen</i>	15
3	The Early Modern English tradition of ‘hard words’ and the <i>Vindex anglicus</i> (1644) <i>Gerhard Graband. Translated by John Considine.</i>	23
4	Defining English: Authenticity and Standardization in Seventeenth-Century Dictionaries <i>Andrea R. Nagy</i>	41
5	Dictionary English and the Female Tongue <i>Juliet Fleming</i>	59

## **PART II OVERVIEW**

6	The Beginnings of English Lexicography <i>Allen Walker Read</i> Ed. [from drafts of 1935 onwards] <i>Michael Adams</i>	97
7	The Beginning: English Dictionaries of the First Half of the Seventeenth Century <i>James A. Riddell</i>	141

**PART III INDIVIDUAL DICTIONARIES**

- 8 What were Robert Cawdrey's Hard Words? Learned Terms and  
*A Table Alphabeticall* (1604)  
*R.W. McConchie* 181
- 9 Women and the Godly Art of Rhetoric: Robert Cawdrey's Puritan Dictionary  
*Sylvia Brown* 189
- 10 The Historical Significance of Cockeram's Treatment of Verbs of High  
Frequency  
*Kusujiro Miyoshi* 205
- 11 The Working Methods of Thomas Blount  
*Jürgen Schäfer* 217
- 12 Authenticating the Vocabulary: A Study in Seventeenth-Century  
Lexicographical Practice  
*N.E. Osselton* 221
- 13 Thomas Dawks's *The Complete English-Man* (1685): A Newly-Discovered  
Seventeenth Century Dictionary?  
*Edwina Burness* 239

**PART IV ENCYCLOPEDIAIC HISTORICAL AND SPECIALIZED DICTIONARIES  
OF ENGLISH**

- 14 Captain John Smith's *Sea Grammar* and its Debt to Sir Henry Mainwaring's  
*Seaman's Dictionary*  
*P.L. Barbour* 251
- 15 'New World of English Words': John Ray, FRS, the Dialect Protagonist,  
in the Context of his Times (1658–1691)  
*Jo Gladstone* 261
- 16 Theory Meets Empiricism: English Lexis in John Wilkins' Philosophical  
Language and the Role of William Lloyd  
*Gabriele Knappe* 301
- 17 *A Physical Dictionary* (1657): The First English Medical Dictionary  
*Jukka Tyrkkö* 323

**PART V BILINGUAL AND POLYGLOT DICTIONARIES**

- 18 The Lexicography of the Learned Languages in Seventeenth-Century  
England  
*John Considine* 343
- 19 Wordlists of Exotic Languages in Seventeenth-Century England  
*John Considine* 365
- 20 The French–English *Dictionarie* of Cotgrave (1611)  
*Peter Rickard. Translated by John Considine.* 377
- 21 Cotgrave in Irish  
*James Stewart* 387
- 22 John Minsheu: Scholar or Charlatan?  
*Jürgen Schäfer* 397
- 23 Wase, Torriano and Sherwood: Some Unacknowledged Lexical Debts  
*Janet Bately* 411
- 24 The Sources of the First Dutch and English Dictionary  
*N.E. Osselton* 429
- 25 The First English–Danish Dictionary: Friderik Bolling’s  
*Engelske dictionaryum* (1678)  
*Inge Kabell and Hanne Lauridsen* 437
- 26 Miège and the Development of the English Dictionary  
*Janet Bately* 453
- 27 Standing on the Shoulders of Giants: Abel Boyer’s Innovations in English–  
French Lexicography  
*Monique C. Cormier and Heberto Fernandez* 463
- Index* 495

*This page intentionally left blank*

# Acknowledgements

The chapters in this volume are taken from the sources listed below, for which the editor and publishers wish to thank their authors, original publishers or other copyright holders for permission to use their materials as follows:

**Chapter 1:** Ian Lancashire (2004), 'Lexicography in the Early Modern English Period: The Manuscript Record', in Julie Coleman and Anne McDermott (eds), *Historical Dictionaries and Historical Dictionary Research: Papers from the International Conference on Historical Lexicography and Lexicology, at the University of Leicester, 2002*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, pp. 19–30. Copyright © 2004 Max Niemeyer Verlag GmbH: Tübingen.

**Chapter 2:** Werner Hüllen (1990), 'Motives behind 17th century Lexicography: A Comparison between German and English Dictionaries of that Time', in Tomás Magay and J. Zigány (eds), *BudaLEX '88 Proceedings: Papers from the 3rd International EURALEX Congress*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, pp. 189–96.

**Chapter 3:** Gerhard Graband (1975), 'Die Frühne[uenglische] Tradition der "Hard Words" und der *Vindex Anglicus* (1644).' *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 76, pp. 88–107. Translated by John Considine.

**Chapter 4:** Andrea R. Nagy (1999), 'Defining English: Authenticity and Standardization in Seventeenth-Century Dictionaries', *Studies in Philology*, 96, pp. 439–56. Copyright © 1999 The University of North Carolina Press.

**Chapter 5:** Juliet Fleming (1994), 'Dictionary English and the Female Tongue', in Richard Burt and John Michael Archer (eds), *Enclosure Acts: Sexuality, Property, and Culture in Early Modern English*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 290–325. Copyright © 1994 by Cornell University.

**Chapter 6:** Allen Walker Read (2003), 'The Beginnings of English Lexicography', ed. [from drafts of 1935 onwards] Michael Adams. *Dictionaries*, 24, pp. 187–226. Copyright © 2003 The Dictionary Society of North America.

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

**Chapter 8:** Roderick McConchie (1992), 'What were Robert Cawdrey's Hard Words? Learned Terms and *A Table Alphabetical* (1604)', in Päivi Pahta, Irma Taavitsainen and Leena Kahlas-Tarkka (eds), *As Who Say – Many Happy Returns: Essays in Honour of Saara Nevanlinna*, Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, pp. 51–58. Copyright © 1992 Päivi Pahta, Irma Taavitsainen and Leena Kahlas-Tarkka.

**Chapter 9:** Sylvia Brown (2001), ‘Women and the Godly Art of Rhetoric: Robert Cawdrey’s Puritan Dictionary’, *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900*, **41**, pp. 133–48.

**Chapter 10:** Kusujiro Miyoshi (2012), ‘The Historical Significance of Cockeram’s Treatment of Verbs of High Frequency’. Commissioned for this volume.

**Chapter 11:** Jürgen Schäfer (1978), ‘The Working Methods of Thomas Blount’, *English Studies*, **59**, p. 405–8. Copyright © 1978 by Swets & Zeitlinger B.V., Amsterdam and Lisse.

**Chapter 12:** N.E. Osselton (1996), ‘Authenticating the Vocabulary: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Lexicographical Practice’, *Lexikos*, **6**, pp. 215–32.

**Chapter 13:** Edwina Burness (1988), ‘Thomas Dawks’s *The Complete English-Man* (1685): A Newly-Discovered Seventeenth Century Dictionary?’, *English Studies*, **69**, pp. 331–40. Copyright © 1988 Swets & Zeitlinger.

**Chapter 14:** P.L. Barbour (1972), ‘Captain John Smith’s *Sea Grammar* and its Debt to Sir Henry Mainwaring’s “Seaman’s Dictionary”’, *Mariner’s Mirror*, **58**, pp. 93–101.

**Chapter 15:** Jo Gladstone (1991), ‘“New World of English Words”: John Ray, FRS, the Dialect Protagonist, in the Context of his Times (1658–1691)’, in Peter Burke and Roy Porter (eds), *Language, Self, and Society: A Social History of Language*, Cambridge: Polity, pp. 115–53.

**Chapter 16:** Gabriele Knappe (2004), ‘Theory Meets Empiricism: English Lexis in John Wilkins’ Philosophical Language and the Role of William Lloyd’, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, **241**, pp. 69–89.

**Chapter 17:** Jukka Tyrkkö (2009), ‘*A Physical Dictionary* (1657): The First English Medical Dictionary’, in R.W. McConchie, Alpo Honkapohja, and Jukka Tyrkkö (eds), *Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 2)* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 171–89. Copyright © 2009 Jukka Tyrkkö.

**Chapter 18:** John Considine (2012), ‘The Lexicography of the Learned Languages in Seventeenth-Century England’. Commissioned for this volume.

**Chapter 19:** John Considine (2012), ‘Wordlists of Exotic Languages in Seventeenth-Century England’. Commissioned for this volume.

**Chapter 20:** Peter Rickard (1983), ‘Le ‘Dictionarie’ Franco–anglais de Cotgrave (1611) [The French-English *Dictionarie* of Cotgrave (1611)]’, *Cahiers de l’Association Internationale des Études Françaises*, **35**, pp. 7–21. Translated by John Considine.

**Chapter 21:** James Stewart (1968), ‘Cotgrave in Irish’, *Studia Neophilologica*, **40**, pp. 65–74. Copyright © 1968 Föreningen för Studia Neophilologica reprinted by permission of (Taylor & Francis Ltd, <http://www.tandfonline.com>) on behalf of Föreningen för Studia Neophilologica.

**Chapter 22:** Jürgen Schäfer (1973), 'John Minsheu: Scholar or Charlatan?', *Renaissance Quarterly*, **26**, pp. 23–35. Copyright © 1973 by the Renaissance Society of America, Inc.

**Chapter 23:** Janet Bately (2001), 'Wase, Torriano and Sherwood: Some Unacknowledged Lexical Debts', in Christian J. Kay and Louise M. Sylvester (eds), *Lexis and Texts in Early English: Studies Presented to Jane Roberts*, Amsterdam and Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, pp. 13–30.

**Chapter 24:** N.E. Osselton (1969), 'The Sources of the First Dutch and English Dictionary', *Modern Language Review*, **64**, pp. 355–62. Copyright © 1969 Modern Humanities Research Association.

**Chapter 25:** Inge Kabell and Hanne Lauridsen (1988), 'The First English–Danish Dictionary: Friderik Bolling's *Engelske dictionarium* (1678)', in Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen and Arne Zettersten (eds), *Symposium on Lexicography III: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Lexicography May 14–16, 1986 at the University of Copenhagen, Lexicographica Series Maior* 19, Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, pp. 373–87. Copyright © 1988 Max Niemeyer Verlag GmbH, Tübingen.

**Chapter 26:** Janet Bately (1983), 'Miège and the Development of the English Dictionary', in E.G. Stanley and Douglas Gray (eds), *Five Hundred Years of Words and Sounds: A Festschrift for Eric Dobson*, Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, and Totowa, NJ: Biblio, pp. 1–10.

**Chapter 27:** Monique C. Cormier and Heberto Fernandez (2004), 'Standing on the Shoulders of Giants: Abel Boyer's Innovations in English–French Lexicography', *Romanistik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, **10**, pp. 185–215. Copyright © Helmut Buske Verlag, Hamburg.

Every effort has been made to trace all copyright holders, but if any have been inadvertently overlooked the publishers will be pleased to make the necessary arrangement at the first opportunity.

*This page intentionally left blank*

## Series Preface

This series of five volumes showcases the collective achievement of English lexicographers from the Old English period to the late eighteenth century. These are the pioneering author-scholars who first witnessed, recorded, and analyzed the growth of English vocabulary over nine hundred years. Word-entries that they crafted and handed down to their successors constitute primary historical evidence of what English words meant, and of how their significance changed, well before the growth of the great scholarly historical dictionaries in the Victorian period. Indebted to continental bilingual and polyglot glossaries and dictionaries of Latin, yet tied to the native speech of the mother tongue, early English lexicographers erected the lexicographical structures that we take for granted today. Glossary-like word-entries, at first offering translations or synonyms, gradually acquired explanatory power until, in the post-Johnsonian eighteenth century, the formal lexical definition took shape. To read early dictionaries carefully is to encounter a theory of word-meaning that differs from that which we assume today to be true. To consult these reference books is often also to experience delight in the energetic, rich love of language that they communicate.

After documenting the vocabulary of Latin as taught in schools and universities, Early English lexicographers applied themselves to translate the large vocabularies of living European languages, especially French, Italian, and Spanish. They also documented terms of art such as belonged to lawyers, herbalists, physicians, explorers, mathematicians, architects, and sea-farers. Beginning in the late Tudor period, they assembled and interpreted the strange terminologies of Old and Middle English, distinguished local dialects, and tried to unravel the mysteries of etymology. Their cumulative effects harnessed the impact of printing and translation that doubled and redoubled the known size of the English language; and the resulting, uniquely English hard-word explosion stimulated the creative potential of the language. Far from being uniformly harmless drudges, Early English lexicographers created new ways of bringing words to public account. Sometimes mercilessly humiliated by royalty for writing treasonable word-entries, impoverished, imprisoned, and even drawn and quartered, they fought for livelihood by teaching languages, stoking native ambitions for the English tongue abroad, and turning stints in the New World to good use as opportunities to teach aboriginal tongues to would-be merchants. Early English lexicographers made dictionaries into one of the most lucrative of all language industries.

Each volume in the series is edited by a recognized authority who has surveyed the existing literature and, for the first time, has selected essays that are regarded as significant contributions to an understanding of the historical development of dictionaries during the period. Volumes also include some original essays specially commissioned for this series. Substantial introductions by the editors not only summarize the substance of these essays but contextualize them in an original and thorough overview of lexicographers and their works.

The five chronological volumes of this series will thus assist those engaged in scholarly research by making available the most important contemporary essays on particular topics in English historical lexicography. Reproduced in full with the original pagination for ease of reference and citation, these essays are an indispensable reference resource in the fields of the English language and an invaluable research tool for students of lexicography and English literature, textual history, and bibliography.

IAN LANCASHIRE  
*Series Editor*

# Introduction

This volume collects twenty-seven chapters on lexicography in seventeenth-century England.

This introduction does not attempt to be a comprehensive account of all seventeenth-century English dictionaries and wordlists. A vast amount of material is included in R.C. Alston's great *Bibliography of the English Language* (henceforth *BEL*, cited by volume and item number) which has been omitted here, and conversely, I discuss many works here which are not to be found in Alston because they were not printed—at the time of writing, Alston's volume 20, which will deal with manuscript materials, has not yet appeared—or do not bear on the English language. (I should add that although I have used Alston's work very extensively in the following pages, I only cite it explicitly where it provides a guide in bibliographical difficulties.) Likewise, I do not attempt to duplicate the valuable listing of pre-1640 glossaries in the first volume of Jürgen Schäfer's *Early Modern English Lexicography* (henceforth *EMEL*). I nevertheless aim here to give a brief account of every substantial lexicographical text produced in England during the period, with the exception of those which register languages from beyond Christian Europe, and the learned languages of the Classical and Biblical worlds, both of which categories are covered in Chapters 18 and 19, my own contributions to this volume.

Section 1 of the introduction will touch on some themes of general importance: the seventeenth century as a historiographical unit; the Continental context; the financing of dictionaries; influence and plagiarism; hard words and authenticity; and lexicography and society. Section 2 will cover general wordlists of current English, namely the dictionaries of Robert Cawdrey, John Bullokar, Henry Cockeram, Thomas Blount, Edward Phillips, Elisha Coles, and others. Section 3 will cover specialized wordlists of current and obsolete English under the headings of canting, legal, nautical, and dialect lexicography; historical lexicography and etymology; lexicography and universal language projects; and other specialized and encyclopaedic dictionaries. Section 4 will cover wordlists of foreign vernaculars, beginning with polyglot dictionaries then working through dictionaries of European languages: Italian; French; other Romance languages; Germanic languages; Celtic languages; other languages of Europe. Section 5 will conclude with a snapshot of dictionary ownership in England at the end of the century.

## 1. Dictionaries and Dictionary-Making in Seventeenth-Century England

### 1.1 *The Seventeenth Century*

In 1604, Robert Cawdrey's *Table Alphabeticall*—the first free-standing, monolingual dictionary to sample what it called the “usual” vocabulary of English—was published. In 1702, John Kersey's *New English Dictionary* offered a strikingly more systematic coverage

of common words than any of its independently published monolingual predecessors. These dates make the seventeenth century seem like a natural unit in English lexicography. Sir James Murray called the publication of Cawdrey's work "on the whole, the most important point in the evolution of the modern English Dictionary" (27). DeWitt Starnes and Gertrude Noyes's still unsurpassed classic *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson*, published in 1946 and reissued with a new introduction in 1991, begins with Cawdrey and marks the publication of Kersey's dictionary just after the turn of the century not only with a change of authors (Starnes did the seventeenth century and Noyes the eighteenth) but with the observation that the *New English Dictionary* "appeared at a critical stage in the evolution of the English dictionary and made a vital contribution" (69).

However, the claim that Cawdrey's and Kersey's dictionaries were landmarks does have to be hedged with qualifications. Printed dictionaries which were free-standing, concerned to register the vocabulary of English with no explicit restriction as to subject-field, and monolingual were not "the English dictionary" but one kind of English dictionary. In the early modern period they were less numerous than glossaries printed in other books, specialized dictionaries, and bilingual or polyglot dictionaries, and they coexisted with dictionaries and wordlists in manuscript. In Chapter 1, Ian Lancashire demonstrates how much lexicographical work from seventeenth-century England is still preserved in manuscript. The distinction between separately-printed dictionaries on the one hand and glossaries which form parts of larger works on the other is not robust (see, e.g., Tyrkkö, Chapter 17 for a dictionary issued both independently and as part of a greater work). The distinction between specialized and general dictionaries is very hard to make in the context of seventeenth-century lexicography, since hard-word dictionaries were by definition somewhat specialized, and specialized dictionaries might register common lexical items (see Miyoshi, "Gazophylacium"). The distinction between monolingual and bi- or multilingual dictionary traditions is also blurred—cf. Hüllen, Chapter 2, 18, "The English monolingual dictionaries of the time are actually a special case of bilingual dictionaries," and Nagy, Chapter 4, 50–51—and was rightly rejected by Gabriele Stein in her prequel to Starnes and Noyes, *The English Dictionary before Cawdrey*. So, Starnes and Noyes's reduction of the history of early modern English lexicography to a history of freestanding general monolingual dictionaries has come to seem increasingly unsatisfactory to many readers (see, e.g., Dolezal, "Writing"). 1604 and 1702 are convenient landmarks in that story, but not in the wider history of early modern English lexicography.

### 1.2 English and Continental Lexicography

Continental European dictionaries in which English did not appear are not the business of this volume but were often a very important presence in English collections. For example, an educated seventeenth-century English reader who wanted to learn as much as possible about a Greek word would have done best to consult Henri Estienne's *Thesaurus graecae linguae*, published in Geneva in 1572–1573. There were a number of copies of this dictionary in England: Samuel Pepys, for instance, gave four pounds and ten shillings for a set on 24 December 1662, paying an extra ten shillings for "strings and golden letters" for the bindings, and Norwich City Library paid five pounds for a set in the following year (Considine, *Dictionaries* 94n152). For the reader who lacked access to this multi-volume work, there

were cheaper alternatives, but most of these were Continental imprints too, notably copies of the *Lexicon* of Scapula, an abridgement of Estienne's *Thesaurus*. A comprehensive study of dictionaries in the British Isles in the early modern period would need to attend very carefully to imported books.

Continental lexicography needs to be taken into account in two other ways as the story of seventeenth-century English lexicography is told. Firstly, there are important points of affinity. English dictionaries might be translations or reprints of Continental ones, as are the versions of William Bathe's *Ianua linguarum* which include English, or might at the least be strongly influenced by them, as are the dictionaries which derive ultimately from abridged re-workings of Robert Estienne's *Thesaurus linguae latinae*.<sup>1</sup> Secondly, there are important points of difference. Lexicography developed differently in different countries, and as well as seeing what early English lexicographers did, it is important to see what they did not do. One question which might be asked about the monoglot English dictionaries of the seventeenth century is why they are so small. None of them is comparable to the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* of 1612, a folio of 960 double-columned pages, or even to Jean Nicot's less extensive *Thresor de la langue francoyse* of 1606. An English lexicon on the same scale as the *Thresor* was in fact called for in a text of 1649 by an associate of the leading English allies of Comenius, John Dury and Samuel Hartlib (quoted in Read, Chapter 6, 108–12). In Chapter 2, Werner Hüllen sets out the striking differences between monolingual English lexicography of the seventeenth century and contemporary monolingual German lexicography as practised by Georg Henisch and Justus Georg Schottelius, with its strong interests in comprehensiveness, in the “generative possibilities of word-formation” (190), and in examples of usage. Rod McConchie has also compared early seventeenth-century English monolingual lexicography with that of Henisch and the Swedish lexicographer Johannes Schroderus, concluding that “The ‘hard words’ tradition seems to have been idiosyncratically English” (*Lexicography* 105; cf. Zgusta).

### 1.3 The Financing of Dictionaries

Another recurring theme in the story of seventeenth-century English lexicography is the practical business of the financing of dictionaries. Lexicography is very labour-intensive, so that the hours devoted to it can seldom be adequately remunerated, a particular problem when research assistants must be employed. Moreover, the publication of big dictionaries is expensive, and they do not always sell well. John Rider's English–Latin *Bibliotheca scholastica* of 1589 had been one of the first English books to be published by a group of booksellers sharing cost and risk alike, and by the last quarter of the seventeenth century, the fractionation of this property had developed to the point where one bookseller had a one-forty-eighth interest in the dictionary (Barnard 16, 17, 20). Other dictionaries were evidently published under similar arrangements: Howell's edition of Cotgrave's French dictionary, for instance, is recorded in eight different issues of 1650, corresponding to the eight booksellers for whom it was printed (Alston, *BEL* 12.1: 625–32). At least three major seventeenth-century English dictionary projects, namely Minsheu's *Ductor in linguas*, Castell's *Lexicon*

<sup>1</sup> For Bathe's *Ianua*, see Considine, Chapter 18; for dictionaries in the Estienne tradition, see Starnes, *Robert Estienne's Influence* 101–20.

*heptaglotton* (for which see Considine, Chapter 18), and Holme's *Academie of Armorie*, ran into serious funding difficulties. The economics of dictionary publishing in the period calls for further investigation (cf. the point about "niche marketing" in McConchie, Chapter 8, 187), as does its place in the larger story of networks of publication (see Tyrkkö, Chapter 17, for the latter point).

#### 1.4 Influence and Plagiarism

Lexicographers normally make use of the work of their predecessors. Sometimes this is a matter of checking a new wordlist against an old one for completeness or of taking over relatively small bodies of data, but sometimes the dependency of one dictionary upon another is very close. A new dictionary may be published as an edition of an old one, or as substantially independent. This choice may depend on the prestige of the predecessor, or on other practical criteria. Historians of lexicography are then left to ask whether a particular sequence of publications represents a tradition of editions of what is basically a single dictionary, or whether it represents a series of new dictionaries. For instance, I mention (in §2.3) the enlarged and rearranged dictionary edited by Samuel Clarke and published as the twelfth edition of Cockeram's *English Dictionarie* in 1670 rather than as a new dictionary, but the converse decision (as recommended in Read, Chapter 6, 131) would have been possible.

Where one dictionary is very closely related to an earlier one but does not claim simply to be a new edition or reprint of it, it may be described as a plagiarism of its predecessor. This charge was certainly made in the early modern period: for instance, Thomas Blount notoriously regarded Edward Phillips's use of his work as plagiaristic, and Guy Miège made the same charge against Abel Boyer (see §2.6, §4.2.2). However, the charge of plagiarism needs to be made with caution. Dictionaries improve on their predecessors incrementally: a good dictionary makes good changes to the material presented in earlier dictionaries rather than starting *ab initio*.

#### 1.5 Hard Words and Authenticity

Cawdrey's *Table Alphabeticall* announced its function on its title page as to teach "the true writing, and vnderstanding of hard vsuall English wordes, borrowed from the Hebrew, Greeke, Latine, or French" and to offer "the interpretation thereof by *plaine English words*," and subsequent monolingual dictionaries likewise referred to "hard words." But what are hard words in this sense? Starnes and Noyes had defined them as "those [words] of foreign origin which offered difficulty to the reader" (8), a definition underpinned by the familiar argument that the most interesting thing which happened to the English language during the early modern period was its borrowing of words from other languages. Nearly a quarter of a century passed before Jürgen Schäfer pointed out in a seminal paper that hard words really had to be understood as "any kind of word, old or new—even proper names [—] which might present difficulties in understanding" ("Hard Word Dictionaries" 34). Likewise, in Chapter 3, Gerhard Graband shows that a set of hard words selected from Cockeram by the author of a puristic pamphlet as examples of undesirable exotic elements in the English language include a number of forms which Cockeram had taken over from a Latin dictionary, together with

dialect forms and forms which the anonymous purist appeared to have invented or garbled himself.

Schäfer's refined definition of "hard words" was part of a reinterpretation of the hard-word dictionaries. He noted that Starnes and Noyes's strong interest in the dependency of a given dictionary upon its predecessors "creates the impression of a self-perpetuating cycle ... one dictionary maker copied from his predecessor and was in turn exploited by his successor"; and he also pointed out that "It is at least a question whether such a presentation does justice to the intricacy of the historical development. Were the dictionary makers mere pedants who never went beyond a compilation of earlier dictionaries, their labours would seem strangely barren" ("Hard Word Dictionaries" 32). Furthermore, although some words appear from their documentation in *OED* to originate with hard-word lexicographers who simply made them up, he argued on the contrary that readers for the *OED* had sometimes missed early contextual examples. In order to assess the originality and intellectual liveliness of the hard-word lexicographers, he suggested research into the use which they made of the glossaries in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century printed books, and into the words which they might have gathered from their wider reading (33). His general conclusion was that the origins of the hard-word dictionaries "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*" (44; cf. Read, Chapter 6, 102–3). In his posthumously published *EMEL*, Schäfer was able to affirm that his argument of 1970 had been right: Cawdrey and his contemporaries, "far from merely remodelling spelling lists or Latin–English dictionaries, had had direct recourse to works of their period containing ... monolingual glossaries of 'hard words'" (4). Starnes and Noyes's model of influence had been widely disseminated before 1970, and the fact that it may be insufficient has not yet been fully absorbed by writers on dictionaries (Schäfer, "Hard Word Dictionaries" 45n9; cf. Dolezal, "Writing" 2).

Andrea Nagy (Chapter 4) builds on Schäfer's work (on standardization see also Considine "Dictionaries and Standardization" and Sönmez, and cf. Howard-Hill 16–17). She sees him as representing one side in a debate about the extent to which the hard-word dictionaries describe actual English usage, the other side being represented by Starnes and Noyes—and by James Riddell in his "Reliability of Early English Dictionaries," a short piece which argued, for instance, that the definitions of *vegetive* as "whole, strong, quick, lively" in Blount's *Glossographia* or of *gyre* as "a trance" in Cockeram's *English Dictionarie* (the latter taken by Cockeram from Speght's Chaucer glossary) could not be regarded as evidence for "actual use" (4). Nagy argues firstly that the hard-word lexicographers did not all proceed in exactly the same way, and secondly that the whole debate over the authenticity of given words "depends upon an *OED*-influenced distinction between authentic and inauthentic English that is especially problematic with regard to the early modern period" (Chapter 4, 44–5). This latter point could be debated further. On the one hand, the distinction between real and spurious English words is not simply an anachronism, mapped back onto the seventeenth century from the nineteenth: the 1621 edition of Alexander Gil's *Logonomia anglica* notes with disapproval "that lexicographers collect invented words, and even coin them."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Gil notes the usefulness of the Latin dictionaries of Thomas and Rider and the *Ductor in linguas* of Minsheu as sources of English words in 1619 (150); he adds in 1621 "Fateor Lexicographos voces fictitias colligere, aut etiam cudere; vere Anglicas negligere, aut etiam ignorare; nostras inter artifices,

Cockeram himself is *OED*'s first authority for *mocke-words* in the sense "spurious words, words which do not really count as English," and Thomas Blount's preface to *Glossographia* mentions his hope that, in checking other dictionaries, "I have taken nothing upon trust, which is not authentick" (sig. A5v). On the other hand, one may ask why *hapax legomena* apparently coined by lexicographers (marked with the symbol <sup>-0</sup> in *OED*) should be less "actual" than those apparently coined by writers in other genres (marked with the symbol <sup>-1</sup>). Lexicographers do not stand outside the language they use, and their contributions to it can be productive. The *OED* entries for *gemmate* (v.), *insolate* (v.), *insuccate*, *nemorous*, *primigene*, *rustication*, and *vernility*, all apparently coined by Cockeram, all cite John Evelyn as the first non-lexicographical authority: is this evidence that Evelyn was using Cockeram's dictionary?<sup>3</sup> Nagy continues with an elegant methodological move, examining an alphabetical sample of the words registered in *more than one* of the hard-word dictionaries. This identifies a core of items which were hard words in the judgement of more than one lexicographer. A high proportion of them are Latinate, as has been noted elsewhere; what has not always been noted is that their register shows a balance between specialized terminology and other difficult words.

### 1.6 Lexicography and Society

The relationship of hard-word lexicography to the social life of the English language has been debated. In Chapter 5, Juliet Fleming discusses the ways in which early modern English dictionaries refer to women as a supposed target audience, as for instance Cawdrey and Blount do: *A Table Alphabeticall* is, according to its long title, "for the benefit & helpe of Ladies, Gentlewomen, or any other vnskillfull persons" (cf. Brown, Chapter 9, 190–91), and *Glossographia* is "chiefly intended for the more-knowing Women, and less-knowing Men" (sig. A5v). She argues that the identification of women as unskilful users of English is a matter of choosing them "to represent the lexical extravagance that would justify regulation" (Chapter 5, 64), not least since the emergence of the Chancery standard in the fifteenth century meant that by the early seventeenth century, no regional variety justified the making of rules by threatening the dominance of the standard. Fleming's argument is not always entirely convincing: is Cawdrey's claim that "Some men seek so far for outlandish English, that they forget altogether their mothers language" really a "suggestion that women are no longer fit guardians of English but are themselves implicated in its elaboration and corruption"?<sup>4</sup> But the paper is a stimulating one, which rightly demands that attention be given to the ideological aspect of lexicography. A different argument about ideology in the early monolingual dictionaries is made by Paula Blank in her *Broken English* (1996), where she proposes that

---

& rusticos audies; potius quam apud Scriptores inuenies" (152): "I confess that lexicographers collect invented words and even coin them, and neglect words which are really English and are even ignorant of them; you will hear our words used by workmen and countrymen more easily than you will find them in writers" (my translation).

<sup>3</sup> Two of them, *insuccate* and *primigene*, are not registered in any of the other dictionaries in the *Lexicons of Early Modern English* database.

<sup>4</sup> Fleming 305, citing Cawdrey sig. A3r, a passage borrowed from Sir Thomas Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique* (fo. 86r). Cf. Brown, Chapter 9, 195–6.

their makers all “speak of eliminating linguistic differences, either by obliterating certain neologisms—including the invented dialects of the rich and the poor—or neutralizing them by publishing them more broadly” (23).

## 2. General Wordlists of Current English

The seventeenth century saw the publication of six free-standing non-specialized English dictionaries, and the publication and preparation of a number of other general wordlists of current English. The overview of this monolingual tradition in Starnes and Noyes’s *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson* is now complemented by Noel Osselton’s “Early Development of the English Monolingual Dictionary” in the *Oxford History of English Lexicography* edited by A.P. Cowie.

More than a decade before the publication of Starnes and Noyes’s book, the lexicographer and historian of lexicography Allen Walker Read had written his own account, “The Beginnings of English Lexicography,” accepted for publication in 1935 but then withdrawn by Read since he hoped to expand it into a book; after revisions in 1975, it finally appeared posthumously in 2003 (Chapter 6). Read saw seventeenth-century English lexicography as shaped by the confluence of a pedagogical tradition with those of classical lexicography; glosses and bilingual dictionaries; the “impulse from the scientific study of language”; antiquarian dictionaries; and specialized dictionaries (97–8). He was never satisfied enough with his overview to release it for publication, but its vision of the whole scope of seventeenth-century lexicography is still deeply impressive.

### 2.1. *The Wordlist in MS Rawlinson Poet. 108 (after 1612)*

One wordlist calls for attention at the beginning of this section, since it has been thought to antedate all of the other lexicographical work which will be treated here. This is a manuscript wordlist of 418 items in the range *A–baskett*, plus a few strays from later in the alphabet, (Bodleian MS Rawlinson Poet. 108), which was presented in an article of 1986 by Noel Osselton as possibly belonging to the sixteenth century. Osselton was in fact quite scrupulous in saying that although the date of the manuscript might be circa 1570, “we cannot be sure about this” (“A Dictionary Compiler” 105). Ian Lancashire has demonstrated that the Rawlinson wordlist draws on that of Francis Holyoake’s second edition of Rider’s *Bibliotheca scholastica*, published in 1612, or on one of the subsequent editions (“Perils” 230–36; see also Chapter 1, 11).

### 2.2. *Robert Cawdrey, A Table Alphabeticall (1604; 4th edition 1617)*

The glossary of 1,368 hard words in Edmund Coote’s *English Schoole-Maister* of 1596 (Schäfer, *EMEL* 1: 42) demonstrably underlies the 2,498 lemmas of the first free-standing monolingual dictionary of “vsuall English wordes,” Robert Cawdrey’s *Table Alphabeticall*, which was published as an octavo of 130 pages in 1604 (Schäfer, *EMEL* 1: 51; for an overview,

see Simpson). Starnes and Noyes (18) summarized the process by which they believed that Cawdrey worked as follows:

From Coote, Cawdrey got much of his introductory matter and, we think, the original word list with the one-word or one-phrase definitions. Later, Robert Cawdrey, or more probably his son Thomas, used the Latin–English dictionary of Thomas Thomas to supplement the simple definitions from Coote and to increase the word list together with new definitions.

Read had written in 1935 that Cawdrey's dictionary was "a mere adaptation" of Coote's wordlist, modifying this in 1975 to "for the most part, an adaptation" (Chapter 6, 102n14). The modification shows his increasing awareness that a model of simple adaptation of Coote's work by Cawdrey is not satisfactory. He could have pursued this line of thought further. So, for instance, the translation by A. M. of a Dutch version of Oswald Gabelkover's *Artzneybuch* as *The Boock of Physicke* (1599) had a 113-item "expositione of such wordes which are in this Booke deriued of the Latines, which for the common, and vulger poeple is made, because they should the better vnderstande the meaninge of the harde wordes" (sig. kk6r). In his "Hard Word Dictionaries," Schäfer showed as a first example of the reassessment for which he called that 83 of these words, 75 of which were not to be found in Coote or Thomas, reappeared in Cawdrey's dictionary: he had clearly been reading the "expositione" 34–5; *EMEL* 46). This particular indebtedness was not in fact a new discovery: it had been observed by Read, to whose attention it had been drawn by the lexicographer and literary scholar L.F. Powell (Chapter 6, 104). But it is proof of Cawdrey's having read independently of his lexicographical sources on one occasion. Schäfer's realization that if he had done this once he might have done it repeatedly led him to an original and productive discussion.

This new thinking about Cawdrey was paralleled independently by that of James Riddell, laid out in the first section of Chapter 7 (142–50, 174n4). Riddell agrees with Starnes and Noyes that Coote's wordlist was "the immediate inspiration of Cawdrey" (142, quoting Starnes and Noyes 13), but demonstrates that Cawdrey also took words from the glossaries appended to a book about shorthand and spelling, certain theological books, and Speght's edition of Chaucer, and argues that he also took material from the main text of the *Arte of English Poesie* of 1589. The picture which he and Schäfer built up was of a much more active process of compilation than had been suggested by Starnes and Noyes. This process evidently continued beyond 1604: the second edition, of 1609, "newly corrected, and much enlarged, by T. C.," Robert's son Thomas Cawdrey, ran to 3,009 lemmas; the third, of 1613, to 3,086; and the fourth, of 1617, to 3,264 (Schäfer, *EMEL* 1: 56, 57, 61). Riddell comments on the sources of this new material. The kinds of words in which Cawdrey registered are re-examined by Rod McConchie in Chapter 8, which comes to the conclusion that the dictionary's existence "is as well explained by its intended market than by attempting to see it as a new lexicographical departure" (187).

That Cawdrey was a Puritan clergyman provides another perspective from which to read his dictionary. In Chapter 9, Sylvia Brown argues that the *Table Alphabeticall* "can be understood as both a product of Puritan culture and one of its constituent texts," and "that its ostensible female readership is one of the strongest reasons for reading the first English dictionary as a Puritan text" (191). She discusses the place of Cawdrey's dictionary and his

*Treasurie or Store-House of Similies* (1600) in the godly project of edification—building up the Church by preaching and teaching—and comments on the place of women as exemplary listeners, learners, and teachers in this project. As she points out, the title page of the dictionary explains that its female or unskilful users will, with its help, “the more easilie and better vnderstand many hard English wordes, which they shall heare or read in Scriptures, Sermons, or elsewhere.” Brown concludes by noting that we have practically no evidence for how Cawdrey’s dictionary was read: it is a very rare book, whose four early editions survive in a total of five copies (Alston, *BEL* 5:1–4). Its most important influence may have been through the subsequent dictionaries which drew on it (see Miyoshi, “Cawdrey’s *Table*”).

### 2.3 John Bullokar, *An English Expositor* (1616; “19th” edition 1775)

Three editions of Cawdrey’s *Table Alphabeticall* had been published before a second venture was made into the market for monolingual English dictionaries. This took place in 1616, with the publication of John Bullokar’s *An English Expositor, Teaching the Interpretation of the Hardest Words Used in our Language*. The *English Expositor* drew on Cawdrey’s dictionary, and its entry count was not very much more extensive: 4,249 lemmas in the first edition (Schäfer, *EMEL* 1: 60). Its second and third editions, of 1621 and 1641, printed the same wordlist as the first; only in a series of twenty-one or more further editions from 1654 onwards was it expanded and remodelled, becoming a long-running publishing success (Alston, *BEL* 5:5–29). Its author described himself on the title-page as “Doctor of Physicke,” and claimed in his dedication to Jane, Viscountess Montague, that the dictionary had been “written in my youth, at the request of a worthy Gentleman” (sig. A2r), possibly his father William Bullokar, author of the first grammar of English, who had once planned to write a dictionary for use with his idiosyncratic reformed spelling system (Read, Chapter 6, 100–101). The *English Expositor* included new features such as the subject-labelling of some specialized lexical items (discussed in Gotti) and the identification of archaic forms (discussed in Kerling, 50–77); Bullokar also invited corrections, and promised, though in vain, to include them in a revised impression. More strikingly, he allowed himself a much more discursive definition style than Cawdrey, especially in the first half of the alphabet (see Osselton, “Alphabet Fatigue” 87), so that despite the closeness of their entry counts, his work extends over 224 double-column octavo pages as opposed to Cawdrey’s 130 single-column pages. To take an example at random, Cawdrey’s entry *epithite* gives the etymological label (g) and the definition “a name or title giuen to any thing,” while Bullokar’s entry *epithete* offers the definition

Any word or short sentence, added to a Noune substantiue, to expresse some qualitie of it: as in saying, *Barbarous* crueltie, *vbridled* lust: anger *the short madnes of the mind*: where *barbarous*, *vbridled*, and *the short madnesse of the mind*, are Epithetes expressing the qualitie of crueltie, lust and anger.

This discursive quality extends to the inclusion of at least one first-person statement, s.v. *crocodile*: “I saw once one of these beasts in London brought thither dead, but in perfect forme, of about three yards long.”

As in the case of Cawdrey, Bullokar's sources are reductively treated by Starnes and Noyes: "That Cawdrey's *Table* and Thomas' *Dictionarium* served as a basis for Bullokar's *Expositor*, the illustrations [of entries evidently derived from one or the other] ... show clearly. Naturally, the greater debt is to the Latin-English, as this is by far the larger work" (23). Schäfer took the story further in 1970, pointing out material which Bullokar had taken from Cowell's *Interpreter* (for which see §3.2) and commenting on the "admirable grasp of the sense" and "remarkable power of condensation" evident in the definitions in question (35–6). He also discussed the source of many of Bullokar's archaisms, namely the glossary from Speght's edition of Chaucer of 1602. Riddell (Chapter 7, 151–6) shows his use of Rastell's law dictionary, the *Arte of English Poesie*, and the glossaries from Speght, Philemon Holland's translation of Plutarch's *Moralia*, and Joshua Sylvester's translation of du Bartas. The list has been extended, e.g. in discussions of the 318 entries, about eight per cent of the total, for medical terms (McConchie, *Lexicography* 112–14; cf. the list of sources in Schäfer, *EMEL*, 1: 60). Bullokar's claim in his epistle to the reader that "in my yonger yeares" the dictionary "cost mee some obseruation, reading, study, and charge" (sig. A3v) seems more reasonable now than it must have seemed to early readers of Starnes and Noyes.

#### 2.4 Henry Cockeram, *The English Dictionarie* (1623; 12th edition 1670)

The third of the early hard-word dictionaries, and the first to use the form *Dictionarie* in its title, was Henry Cockeram's *The English Dictionarie, or, An Interpreter of Hard English Words*, published in a volume of 332 octavo pages in two issues in 1623. Cockeram was a cadet of a Devonshire gentry family, who may have been teaching in a school in Exeter at the time when his dictionary appeared, and subsequently became a nobleman's steward in Ireland (Considine, "Henry Cockeram"). The cancel title page of the second issue of *The English Dictionarie* referred to the work of Cawdrey and Bullokar, calling Cockeram's work "a Collection of the choisest words contained in the Table Alphabeticall and English Expositor, and of some thousands of words neuer published by any heretofore." This form of words was evidently meant as a claim of superiority rather than an acknowledgement of indebtedness, but since it was not replicated on the title pages of future editions, it may have been felt to be uncomfortably ambiguous. Cockeram was indeed indebted to his predecessors, although he used them selectively and abridged a number of Bullokar's definitions to bring them into conformity with his own much terser style (Starnes and Noyes 28–31; cf. Riddell, Chapter 7, 167–71).

*The English Dictionarie's* macrostructure was innovative. Rather than presenting lexical items in a single alphabetical sequence, Cockeram offered first (Part I) a hard-word dictionary of 5,836 of "the choicest words ... wherewith our language is inriched"; then (Part II) a list of common words with their harder equivalents, based on the hard-word list but with 616 additional items, for the use of the writer who had a common word in mind but was "desirous of a more curious explanation by a more refined and elegant speech"; and then (Part III) an encyclopedic dictionary of 934 "persons, Gods and Goddesses, Giants and Deuils, Monsters and Serpents, Birds and Beasts, Riuers, Fishes, Herbs, Stones, Trees, and the like" in alphabetically ordered topical classes (sig. A4v; entry counts from Schäfer, *EMEL* 1:62). The whole was in effect a two-way dictionary of the hard and plain registers of English,

with an encyclopedic annexe. Its triple sequence was thought worth copying by one of the revisers of the *English Expositor* but would be abandoned in the twelfth edition of the *English Dictionarie*.

Starnes and Noyes (32–3) saw the entire wordlist of the second part of Cockeram’s dictionary as taken over from the English–Latin wordlist of an edition of Rider’s *Bibliotheca scholastica*, just as appears to have been true of the Rawlinson manuscript dictionary, but Schäfer (“Hard Word Dictionaries” 39–40) and Riddell (Chapter 7, 157–9) both observed that it was a reversal of the wordlist of the first part, in which there were to be sure lemmas and definitions which drew on Rider. Taking up this line of argument, Kusujiro Miyoshi argues in Chapter 10 that Cockeram’s treatment of phrasal verbs in Part II, far from showing dependence on Rider, is evidence for his innovative interest in phraseology in a monolingual context.

Cockeram does appear to have coined English words from Latin originals more freely than Cawdrey or Bullokar: the revised entries for *narrable*, *necyomancy*, *nexible*, *nidulate*, and others in the online *OED* suggest strongly that these words are Cockeramisms (cf. Graband, Chapter 3). But not all of the words he added to those registered by his predecessors were his coinages. He found some, for instance, in the glossary and text of Sylvester’s *du Bartas*, and recorded forms such as *anthropophagize* or *chamelionize* from Nashe, sometimes consulting Latin dictionaries for help in wording the definitions of the words which he had found (Schäfer, “Hard Word Dictionaries” 40–43 and *Lexicography* 2–3; Riddell, Chapter 7, 159–66). In his foreword, immediately after writing about the enrichment of the English language, Cockeram asked his readers to “obserue that I haue also inserted ... euen the *mocke-words* which are ridiculously vsed in our language,” going on to call these “*fustian termes*” (sig. A4v). This category may have included some of Nashe’s words as “*fustian*,” but the dictionary has no status-labelling to indicate stigmatized words. The question of Cockeram’s sources and of his attitude to them is therefore complex. The twelfth edition of his dictionary mentioned above, reworked by the ejected minister Samuel Clarke, was the last (see Alston, *BEL* 5: 30–44).

## 2.5 Thomas Blount, *Glossographia* (1656; 5th edition 1681)

The first editions of the first three hard-word dictionaries appeared within a single twenty-year period. More than thirty years were then to elapse before a new monolingual dictionary of English appeared. This book, *Glossographia, or, A Dictionary Interpreting All Such Hard Words ... as Are Now Used in our Refined English Tongue*, was the work of a recusant gentleman with legal training, Thomas Blount, who later described it as written “for his divertisement,” and as “the fruit of above Twenty years spare hours” (*World of Errors* sig. A2r). It was, most obviously, much bigger than its predecessors, its 10,577 entries being registered in an octavo of 688 pages, meant for the desk, not the pocket.<sup>5</sup> One reason for this was that Blount’s dictionary was meant in part for his social equals: he included the legal vocabulary “necessary for every Gentleman of Estate to understand” and the heraldic vocabulary which would enable the gentleman reader to give a technical description of his own coat of arms (*Glossographia* sigs. A3r–v). Two of his heraldic entries, for *canton* and *gyron*, are illustrated with diagrams, a minor innovation. His own legal knowledge led to his compilation of a law dictionary (for

<sup>5</sup> I owe the figure of 10,577 to Ian Lancashire; Robertson and Robertson, items 50 and 52, give a count of 10,000 for the 1656 edition and 11,800 for that of 1670.

which see §3.2), and his antiquarian interests were expressed in an unpublished history of his own county, Herefordshire, and correspondence with contemporary antiquaries (Bongaerts 61–70 and *passim*).

Blount claimed in the preface to the *Glossographia* that he had been moved to write a dictionary by finding unfamiliar words in his reading over the years, and he gave some examples, starting with “the Turkish History,” in which “I met with *Janizaries, Mufties, Timariots,*” and so on (sig. A2r; cf. Osselton, Chapter 12, 226). Having gone on to give the impression that his dictionary is founded on his own general reading, Blount then confused the issue by claiming to have “extracted the quintessence of *Scapula, Minsheu, Cotgrave, Rider, Florio, Thomasius, Dasipodius, and Hexams Dutch, Dr. Davies Welsh Dictionary, Cowels Interpreter, &c.*” (sigs. A5r–A5v), although he certainly does not appear to have used all of these dictionaries extensively; he may have consulted some of them for his etymologies, which he presented much more systematically than had been done in the three early hard-word dictionaries.<sup>6</sup> So, did he rely on finding words in his reading or on splicing bits of other dictionaries together? In a familiar clash of narratives, Starnes and Noyes state that “a careful estimate, letter by letter, of the borrowings in the *Glossographia* indicates that 58 per cent of Blount’s entries derive, partly or wholly, from the Latin–English dictionaries of Thomas and Holyoke” and claim that “he depended too little on reading actual documents and recording words therefrom and too much on Latin–English dictionaries” (42, 45), while Jürgen Schäfer, in Chapter 11, argues that “the number of lemmas that Blount cannot have found either in the Latin–English dictionaries or the earlier hard word dictionaries and, hence, must have derived from other sources is considerable” (219). A way to examine this question is by looking at the entries for which Blount gave authorities, another innovative feature of his dictionary. Noel Osselton notes that about 21 per cent of entries in the *Glossographia* cite authorities, and comments on the ways in which they are cited and the models for this citational practice. He observes that “it seems reasonable to assume that in making many of the more interesting entries in his dictionary [Blount] was simply drawing upon books which came his way or were in his library” (Chapter 12, 227). That is not to say that his work was independent of that of his predecessors. It is easy to show, for instance, that he drew for many entries, though selectively, on Cockeram (Riddell, Chapter 7, 171–3); so, for example, in the list given above of seven words first attested in Cockeram and first attested outside lexicography in Evelyn, five were taken over by Blount. But Osselton demonstrates beyond reasonable doubt that Blount’s dictionary was a product of its maker’s intelligent analysis of his wide personal reading.

Finally, although his definition style tended to be terse, Blount did from time to time allow himself the expression of his personal beliefs, particularly in the matter of religion:

<sup>6</sup> Bongaerts (26) comments on their use in the range *d–dz*, comprising 609 entries: Rider (revised by Holyoake) and Thomas together are the source of 339 entries, Cotgrave of 66, Minsheu’s *Ductor in linguas* of 20, Cowell of 18, and Hexham of 1. Scapula, Florio, Dasypodius, and Davies do not seem to have been used in the range. Scapula is cited elsewhere as the authority for *kenodoxy* “the love, study, or desire of vainglory,” i.e. for its etymon κενοδοξία. Florio is cited s.vv. *abbord, theomancy, and volta*, and appears to be the source of Blount’s entry *invitiate*, for which the two dictionaries are the only sources cited in *OED*. Davies is cited for the supposed Welsh etymon of *blith*, and Dasypodius for the sense of the element *sig* in *Sigismund*.

*conventicle*, for instance, is defined as “a little private Assembly, commonly for ill,” and the entry for *puritan* in the second edition (1661) reports the controversialist Thomas Pierce as describing puritans as “things, which being inwardly full of filth, do either esteem themselves *pure*, or would fain by others be so esteemed.”<sup>7</sup> Blount the antiquary is perhaps to be heard speaking out of the last years of the Commonwealth in an addition published in the second edition to the entry *procession*: “in the late Bishops time, it was the custom for Clergy-men to go in *Procession* in Rogation week, they sung Psalms, prayed for the fruits of the earth, and visited the bounds of their several Parishes; now disused” (this was updated again in the third edition, of 1670, when episcopal government and rogation-tide processions had been revived).

The *Glossographia* had run to a fifth edition by 1681 (Alston, *BEL* 5: 45–52; but the “second edition” of 1659 is a reissue of the first edition of 1656, and then the “second edition” of 1661 is a new edition). Its relationship with the work of Edward Phillips will be discussed in the next section; it was also drawn upon in the *Ladies Dictionary* of 1694 (see Brown and Considine) and the *Glossographia anglicana nova* of 1707 (Bongaerts 31; Osselton, “*Glossographia*”), and in Guy Miège’s *Great French dictionary* of 1687–1688 (Bately, Chapter 26, 458–9).

## 2.6 Edward Phillips, The New World of English Words (1658)

Two years after Blount’s dictionary appeared, Edward Phillips, who is now most famous for having been the nephew and pupil of John Milton, published his *New World of English Words*, or, *A General Dictionary*. This was at first sight a considerable improvement on Blount’s work in a number of ways. It was handsomely laid out in folio, with an engraved frontispiece and comely double-columned pages. Blount had used black-letter type for headwords, perhaps influenced by its use in the law books in which he had had part of his intellectual training, and Phillips abandoned this practice. Blount had admitted that “To compile and compleat a Work of this nature and importance, would necessarily require an Encyclopedie of knowledge, and the concurrence of many learned Heads” (sig. A5r). Phillips claimed on his letterpress title page to offer

All those Terms that relate to the Arts and Sciences; whether *Theologie, Philosophy, Logick, Rhetorick, Grammer, Ethicks, Law, Natural History, Magick, Physick, Chirurgery, Anatomy, Chimistry, Botanicks, Mathematicks, Arithmetick, Geometry, Astronomy, Astrology, Chiromancy, Physiognomy, Navigation, Fortification, Dialling, Surveying, Musick, Perspective, Architecture, Heraldry, Curiosities, Mechanicks, Staticks, Merchandize, Jewelling, Painting, Graving, Husbandry, Horsemanship, Hawking, Hunting, Fishing, &c.*

He announced that he had made use of contributions from experts in particular subjects to cover this material, from Elias Ashmole for antiquities to Robert May for cookery. The lists changed in successive editions, that in the fifth identifying Henry Purcell as a consultant for music (see Tilmouth). Starnes and Noyes say that “There is no evidence in the text to indicate that specialists did actually make contributions” (54), but this is not true: for a number of

<sup>7</sup> Further examples of Blount’s sectarian definitions are quoted by Bongaerts 10.

technical words (e.g. *mahl-stick*, for which Phillips is the first authority in the revised entry in *OED*), Phillips appears to have had no published source. By seeing that a dictionary needed consultants, Phillips took an important step towards the idea of a comprehensive dictionary: he understood the whole body of knowledge which is encoded in a language both as the subject of the general lexicography of that language and also as too extensive to be known by a single person. Likewise in the preface in which he sketched some features of the history of the English language, he argued that “the Saxon, or German tongue is the ground-work upon which our language is founded” (sig. B4v): this is the argument of someone interested in the whole vocabulary of English, and able to distinguish the basic from the ornamental.

Phillips drew, as Blount had admitted to doing, on several earlier dictionaries, including Speght’s Chaucer glossary, Minsheu’s polyglot *Ductor in linguas*, and Charles Estienne’s onomastical *Dictionarium historicum, geographicum, poeticum* of 1553, a widely-used school text (Kerling 95–9; Starnes, *Robert Estienne’s Influence* 91–100; for Speght and Minsheu see §3.5 and §4.1, and for Estienne, Considine, Chapter 18). However, he also made extensive unacknowledged use of Blount’s *Glossographia*, and about half of his entries are rephrased or abridged from this source (Starnes and Noyes 50–51; Bongaerts 28–9). Blount was angered by this—and surely not so much by the extent of the borrowing, which he was to match in his own use of Cowell’s *Interpreter* in his law-dictionary *Nomo-lexicon*, as by the fact that it appeared so soon after the publication of *Glossographia*, and in a rival work. After a similar appropriation of material from *Nomo-lexicon* fifteen years later, Blount published the first English pamphlet devoted to attacking a dictionary, *A World of Errors Discovered in The New World of Words*, in which he denounced Phillips’s work as “extracted almost wholly out of mine” and listed its errors with sarcastic relish, exclaiming “so ridiculously absurd” or “Perfect nonsense!” or “Thou Boy!” at intervals (sigs. B1v, B2r, C1v). As a list, they are indeed rather a sorry spectacle: misprints are taken over slavishly from Blount and other sources, and a few easy words are bungled. But some of Blount’s animadversions are unduly harsh: in particular, Phillips’s inclusion of common words such as *besom* or *parsley* no longer seems ridiculous. An appendix of “affected words from the *Latin* and *Greek*” in Phillips’s fourth edition (sigs. Eee1r–2v; see Osselson, *Branded Words* 17–43) appears to have been drawn from the *Glossographia*, and this is not just a sly counterattack but also an indication of Phillips’s interest in moving away from some of the rare lexical items in the early hard-word dictionaries and Blount, and towards a coverage of general vocabulary and the vocabularies of the arts and sciences. His dictionary would last longer than Blount’s: a fifth edition of 1696 was reissued in 1700, and a revision of this in 1706 by J. K., an extremely intelligent lexicographer usually identified as John Kersey the younger, would be “one of the first of the universal dictionaries” (Starnes and Noyes 56; Alston, *BEL* 5: 53–62).

### 2.7 Elisha Coles, English Dictionary (1676)

After the double star of the Blount–Phillips dictionaries had risen in the 1650s, there was no further attempt at a major monolingual English dictionary until the eighteenth century. One was indeed proposed, by the diarist and virtuoso John Evelyn, who recommended the making of “a Lexicon or collection of all the pure English words” and “a full catalogue of exotic

words” in correspondence with one of his colleagues in the fellowship of the Royal Society in 1665 (cited by Read, Chapter 6, 118). This project, however, was never begun.

The last general monolingual English dictionary of the seventeenth century was a much more unassuming publication, the English Dictionary published in 1676 by Elisha Coles, who described himself on the title-page as “School-Master and Teacher of the [English] Tongue to Forreigners,” and also produced a spelling dictionary and an elementary Latin dictionary (see §2.7 and Considine, Chapter 18). He is not to be confused with his uncle Elisha Coles, who was a writer on Calvinism, or with his uncle’s undistinguished son Elisha. This book was self-consciously a contribution to a tradition: the epistle to the reader boasts that

The addition that is made to the number of words in former Authors of this kind, is almost incredible (considering the bulk) being raised from seven in th<sup>e</sup> Expositor to almost thirty thousand here; which is some thousands more than are in Mr. *Blunts Glossographia* or Mr. *Philips World of Words*. (sig. A3r; the entry count was in fact 25,698)<sup>8</sup>

Coles’s point about the bulk of his dictionary is that he has scaled back down from the 360 folio pages of Philips to 308 pages of octavo, printed in a smaller type than Phillips’s but also with many definitions abridged from the *New World of Words* (Starnes and Noyes 58–62). Some of his new material comprised archaic words, just over two thousand being marked as such, which were largely taken from Skinner’s *Etymologicon*; canting words from Richard Head’s *Canting Academy*; and dialect words from John Ray’s *Collection of English Words* (for the archaisms see Kerling 157–73, and for dialect and cant see Starnes and Noyes 61, and Wakelin 160–61; for the sources, see §3.5, §3.4, and §3.1 below respectively). The entire wordlist was arranged in a single alphabetical sequence. The presence of a short introductory list of homonyms is a reminder of Coles’s pedagogical aims: although this dictionary was padded out with lexical items unlikely to be of use to schoolboys, it was a classroom book rather than a book for a gentleman’s library. Coles’s most significant overall achievement was indeed the making of the first attempt at a compendious school dictionary, more portable than its predecessors of the 1650s and fuller than the early hard-word dictionaries: “here,” he concluded, “is very much in very little room” (sig. A3v). Twelve editions of this “meritorious work” had appeared by 1732 (Alston, *BEL* 5: 63–74; Murray 33). Its defining style was innovative in one respect, a use of single-clause *when*-definitions such as “*Obtuse angle*, when two lines include more than a square,” which anticipates that of modern dictionaries for learners of English as a foreign language (Osselton, “Innovation”).

### 2.8 Other Dictionaries and Wordlists

A tradition of spelling-books registered English lexical items from the 1560s onwards (see Alston vol. 4 and Michael 90–108). Coote’s *English Schoole-Maister* had been the first of these to be hugely successful, and was reprinted throughout the seventeenth century, an edition of 1737 claiming to be the fifty-fourth (Alston, *BEL* 4: 13–46). Its treatment of words was not altogether characteristic of the genre, since they appeared in an alphabetized list, with short glosses, from “*Abandon cast away*” (74) onwards. By contrast, Tobias Ellis’s

<sup>8</sup> I owe the precise entry count to Ian Lancashire.

*The English School*, of which the first surviving copy is of the fifth edition of 1680 (Alston, *BEL* 4: 69), listed monosyllables, disyllables, and so on in separate internally alphabetized sections, without glossing them. About sixty different spelling-books had their first editions in the seventeenth century, including one by Elisha Coles, *The Compleat English Schoolmaster* of 1674. Marginal to the lexicographical tradition as they were, they played a foundational part in many people's education. Edwina Burness discusses one of these lists from the point of view of lexicography: the title-page claims among other things to offer "a Dictionary for bad Spellers" and "an Expositor for hard words" (Chapter 13, 239). Dawks's wordlist registers about 8,000 words in a single alphabetical sequence, includes glosses, and draws on dictionaries such as Coles and even Blount and Phillips, making it an example of the point at which the spelling-book tradition comes closest to mainstream lexicography.

A second peripheral lexicographical genre is that of the phraseological dictionary of English, of which an unusually well-developed example is Joshua Poole's *The English Parnassus* of 1657 (Michael 151–53). Its first section is a list of monosyllables grouped by rhyme, beginning with the series "Babe | Blabbe | Crabbe | Drabbe" etc. (1); such series appeared in a number of eighteenth-century spelling books (Michael, 101–3). Next is an alphabetical dictionary of epithets drawn from the last few decades of English poetry: Aaron, for instance, might be "Sacred, mitred, holy, blessed, grave, priestly, pious" and an abbey "Rich, wealthy, cloysterd, monkish, religious, old, antient" (43). Just as the famous lexicon of Julius Pollux offered thirty-three terms of abuse for a tax-collector to its readers in the second century AD, so Poole offered his readers fifty-eight epithets for a bee, or seven for a besom. A list of longer quotations follows, in alphabetical order of subject, as do some miscellaneous forms of dispraising—"An unnecessary letter in the alphabet of creatures" (579)—forms of breaking off—"But like a winter's day, I must make amends for my unpleasantnesse in my shortnesse" (587)—and so on. Here, Poole's work becomes a general rhetorical handbook only tangentially related to the lexical dictionary. Likewise, *The Academy of Complements*, published anonymously in 1639 and with an author's preface signed "Philomusus" thereafter, does include a short alphabetical "table expounding the hard English words" in its second edition (sigs. M4v–8r) and subsequent editions, but is largely a miscellany rather than a dictionary or wordlist.

### 3. Specialized Wordlists of English

All seventeenth-century dictionaries and wordlists of English were restricted in some way: "specialized" in this section refers to explicit specialization of subject-field or function.

#### 3.1 Canting Lexicography

Canting lexicography, the registration of the highly distinctive vocabulary supposedly used by English vagabonds, began with a series of sixteenth-century wordlists. These were drawn on in the early seventeenth century by Thomas Dekker, who included a "Canter's Dictionary" in his *Lanthorne and Candle-Light, or, The Bellmans Second Nights Walke* of 1608 (sig. B1r–B2r). This material was reprinted under various titles (Schäfer, *EMEL* 1: 54; Alston, *BEL*

9: 225–31 and 233–38; Coleman 29–37). The “Canters Dictionary” was attacked two years later in an alphabetical list of 136 items included in Samuel Rid’s *Martin Mark-All, Beadle of Bridewell, his Defence and Answer to the Belman of London*, which marked items excluded or wrongly defined in Dekker’s list (sig. E2r–4r; Schäfer, *EMEL* 1: 56; Coleman 38–43). After this early flurry of activity, no new canting glossary was produced until the third quarter of the century, when the hack writer Richard Head included a canting vocabulary in his picaresque fiction *The English Rogue* in 1665 (Alston, *BEL* 9: 239–47; Coleman 47–54), and improved it eight years later in the cant–English and English–cant wordlists of his miscellany *The Canting Academy*, from which a couple of later seventeenth-century miscellanies drew material (Head, *Canting Academy* 34–56; Alston, *BEL* 9: 248–64; Coleman 55–70). A manuscript wordlist based on that of *The English Rogue* was copied into a late edition of one of the works which reproduces Dekker’s “Canting Dictionary” (Coleman 39, 53–54). Elisha Coles included cant words in his dictionary, as did the compilers of the encyclopedic *Ladies Dictionary* of 1694 (Starnes and Noyes 60–61; Brown and Considine xvi–xvii, xx). At the end of the century, perhaps in 1699, one B. E. produced the first free-standing cant dictionary, *A New Dictionary of the Terms Ancient and Modern of the Canting Crew* (Coleman 76–126).

### 3.2 Legal Lexicography

The first free-standing monolingual dictionary produced in England was, Ian Lancashire has argued, Rastell’s *Exposiciones terminorum legum anglorum* of the 1520s (“Perils,” 240–43; “Law” 8–14). Under the later title *Les termes de la ley*, this dictionary continued to be revised into the eighteenth century (there was an edition by Thomas Blount in 1667) and reprinted into the nineteenth (Cowley lxxxii–lxxxiv; Bongaerts 44–5). The first free-standing dictionary of the distinctive terminology of Scots law, Sir John Skene of Curriehill’s *De verborum significatione*, followed in 1597 and was reprinted in 1641 and 1681.

In 1607, the civil lawyer John Cowell produced his *Interpreter*, a dictionary of legal terms with a strong historical perspective, which was the first really controversial dictionary of English (see Cowley lxxxiv–lxxxviii; Considine, *Dictionaries* 174–8; and Lancashire, Chapter 1, 9). It was inspired by Cowell’s sense of the superiority of the great sixteenth-century Continental law dictionaries to anything available in English. The supposed absolutism of some of its entries, for instance those for *king* and *parliament*, led to the book’s being called in by royal proclamation. This was not the end of its career, however. Two paginal reprints were published in 1637, supposedly under the protection of William Laud and in support of the absolutism of Charles I, and a folio edition, claiming to be “necessary for such as desire throughly to be instructed in the knowledge of our Laws, Statutes, or other Antiquities” appeared in 1658. The emphasis on antiquities is noteworthy: the book would, as the century went on, be read as much for its antiquarian interest as for its use as a law book.

In the 1670s, the tradition of dictionaries deriving from the *Interpreter* bifurcated. Thomas Blount produced his Νομο-λεξικον [*Nomo-lexicon*]: *A Law-Dictionary* in 1670, about half the items in which were taken, usually with revision, from Cowell (Bongaerts 46). Blount did not identify this work as an edition of Cowell on his title-page. A few months after it was published, Blount wrote to Anthony Wood that it was “at the presse surreptitiously, being transcribd and mutilated, and disguisd with som new title, and this by a beggarly halfwitted

schollar hird for the purpose, by som of the Law-booksellers, to transcribe that in 4 or 5 moneths, which cost me twice as many years in compiling” (Bongaerts 110). The new book, Νομοθετης [*Nomothetes*], edited by the legal hack-writer Thomas Manley, appeared in 1672, cleverly presented as a new edition of *The Interpreter*, “First Compiled by the Learned Dr. Cowel, and now enlarged from the *Collections* of all others who have written in this kind. With An Addition of many Words omitted by all former Writers.” It drew heavily on Blount’s work, down to the imitation of its title, and restored some of the entries of Cowell’s which Blount had deleted (Bongaerts 48). A second edition came out in 1684. A second edition of Blount’s *Nomo-lexicon* appeared in 1691, its title-page advertising “some Corrections, and the Addition of above Six Hundred Words”; this may have been an exaggeration (Bongaerts 49). One other law-dictionary of the seventeenth century, the *Philological Commentary, or, An Illustration of the most Obvious and Useful Words in the Law* of the immensely productive writer on religion Edward Leigh (for whose Biblical dictionary, *Critica Sacra*, see Considine, Chapter 18), appeared in 1652 with a second edition in 1658; the standard account of pre-modern English law dictionaries notes curtly that “It was designed for the use of students and is neither comprehensive nor original” (Cowley lxxxviii–lxxxix). As well as this tradition of printed law dictionaries, there was a vigorous manuscript tradition—seventeenth-century lawyers were very often owners and compilers of legal manuscripts (Baker 475–6)—some of whose products, such as the judge and antiquary Francis Tate’s 600-page “Lexicon juris,” compiled before 1616, were very substantial (Lancashire, Chapter 1, 9).

### 3.3 Nautical Lexicography

Lawyers evidently need dictionaries; sailors less evidently. However, there was a significant seventeenth-century tradition of the registration of nautical vocabulary (see Fox 94). Cosmographical terms had been glossed in sixteenth-century treatises on navigation, but the language of practical seamanship was not registered until the early 1620s, when Sir Henry Mainwaring, retired pirate, first cousin by marriage of John Donne, and lieutenant of Dover Castle, wrote his “Abstract and exposition of all things pertayning to the Practick of navigation,” which he dedicated to the marquess of Buckingham, and which circulated in manuscript, fourteen copies being extant (Considine, “Narrative and Persuasion” 205; Lancashire, Chapter 1, 8). It was eventually printed in 1644 as the *Sea-Mans Dictionary*, licensed as “very fit to be at this time imprinted for the Good of the Republicke.” Meanwhile, in 1626, the first English printed book on seamanship had been published by Captain John Smith, the former Virginian colonist who believed that his life had been saved by the chief’s daughter Pocahontas (for his lexicography of Delaware, see Considine, Chapter 19). This was called *An Accidence, or, The Path-way to Experience, Necessary for all Young Sea-Men, or those that are Desirous to Goe to Sea, Briefly Shewing the Phrases, Offices, and Words of Command, Belonging to the Building, Ridging, and Sayling, a Man of Warre, and how to Manage a Fight at Sea*. Smith’s book does indeed show its lexical items briefly, listing them without any explanation to speak of. For instance, the marginal note “The Masts, Caps and Yeards” stands by a paragraph which begins “The boule spret, the pillow, the sturrop, the spret sayle, the spret sayle yeard, the spret sayle top mast” (12), and continues in the same vein. Can these originally have been meant to be captions for an illustrated text? Baldly presented as

they are, the words which Smith lists were in many cases new to the printed record of English, and provide *OED* with 52 first citations. The *Accidence* was reissued in 1627, and a second edition came out in 1636, but by then, Smith had produced an improved version, with much more explication, the *Sea Grammar*. P.L. Barbour discusses the use of one of the manuscript copies of Mainwaring's work by Smith in his revision (Chapter 14). The *Sea Grammar* was reprinted as the *Sea-Mans Grammar* in 1652, and again in 1691–1692 and 1699, and a new edition of the *Sea-Mans Dictionary* was published in 1666 (with variants dated 1667 and 1670); Barbour points out (99) that a passage on nomenclature in Nathaniel Butler's *Six Dialogues about Sea-Services* (1630s–1640s, but not printed until 1685) borrowed from Mainwaring and Smith. The other attempt at an English nautical glossary in the seventeenth century, the “Alphabetical Dictionary” printed in James Lightbody's *Mariners Jewel* of 1695 (53–88), is based on Smith.

### 3.4 Dialect Lexicography

There are a number of dialect words in the “*Dictionarium rusticum*” of 1668 which forms the third part of John Worlidge's *Systema agriculturae* of 1668–1669 (165–78; for it, see Bately, “Ray”), some of them marked—“*Dallops*, A Term used in some places for Patches, or Corners of Grass or Weeds among the Corn”—and some not, for instance *crones* “Old Eaws,” which Ray would in the next decade identify as southern dialect (though *OED* does not). Worlidge explained in a prefatory note (166) that his glossary was made partly to overcome some of the practical problems caused by the great divergence of dialect words for agricultural matters. The first attempt to gather English dialect words in a dedicated list rather than mentioning them in lists made for other purposes was that of the naturalist and theologian John Ray, who published his *Collection of English Words, not Generally Used, with their Significations and Original, in Two Alphabetical Catalogues, the One of such as are Proper to the Northern, the Other to the Southern Counties* in 1673.<sup>9</sup> This appeared in a second, much enlarged, edition in 1691, which included a 40-word “Catalogue of Local Words parallel'd with *British* or *Welsh*” (122–30) communicated to Ray by the naturalist and Celticist Edward Lhuyd; “A Catalogue of North Country Words” (131–8) from Robert Thomlinson, the future founder of the public library at Newcastle, also communicated by Lhuyd; and a “Glossarium Northanhymbricum” (139–52) from William Nicolson, antiquary and future bishop of Carlisle, this last commenting on the Old English origins of northern dialect words as Lawrence Nowell had done in the previous century.<sup>10</sup> (Keynes 38–43, 29–30). In Chapter 15, Jo Gladstone discusses Ray's place in the social world of mid-seventeenth-century science and its implications for his dialect lexicography and his botanical wordlists. She also examines the broader social history which his work illuminates: the tharcakes and dowlers and harns of the early modern rural diet, and the names for the articles which might be tithed. Ray was a blacksmith's son, able to take dialect seriously.

<sup>9</sup> The date on the title-page is 1674, but Keynes (38) quotes a letter of Ray's of 17 January 1674 which reports that almost all copies of the book had by then been sold: evidently it came out late in 1673 with the following year's date on the title page, a common practice.

<sup>10</sup> For the collection in general see Keynes 38–43 and 29–30; for dialect and Old English, see Considine, *Dictionaries* 167–8.

The only other substantial dialect wordlist to be printed in seventeenth-century England was the “Alphabetical Clavis” appended to the second edition of the lawyer George Meriton’s comic *York-Shire Dialogue in its Pure Natural Dialect as it is Now Commonly Spoken in the North Parts of Yorkeshire*, which was published in York in 1684–1685 with Meriton’s poem *The Praise of York-Shire Ale*. The “Clavis” glossed about 420 lexical items from the dialogue. Some of these were common English words which Meriton had re-spelt to indicate north Yorkshire pronunciation: “A Keauke, is a Cook. Knawe, is Know.” Many, however, were dialectal: “To Kedge, is to fill one very full” (cf. *OED* s.v. *cadge* v. sense 5, which this antedates) and “A Kite, signifies the belly” (cf. *OED* s.v. *kyte* n.). The third edition of the dialogue, in 1697, added “some observations, of the dialect and pronuntiation of words in the East Ryding of York-shire.” Ray and Meriton stand out in the early history of English dialectology: apart from one in an edition of Ray’s correspondence in 1718, no further dialect wordlists of any length would be printed in England until the 1740s, though a handful of words from East Anglia were gathered by Sir Thomas Browne in his tract “Of Languages” in 1684, and there may be similar cases elsewhere (Wakelin 159–60; Alston, *BEL* 9: 10, 11, and 33).

A manuscript wordlist of Scots was prepared by Franciscus Junius (François du Jon) in the seventeenth century (Considine, *Dictionaries* 220), and another was prepared by Sir William Dugdale (Lancashire, Chapter 1, 6), but the first printed Scots–English wordlist did not appear until 1710 (Alston, *BEL* 9: 71).

### 3.5 Historical Lexicography and Etymology

The historical lexicography of Old English began in the sixteenth century with the manuscript dictionaries of Laurence Nowell and John Joscelyn, and continued in the first half of the seventeenth with more unpublished dictionaries, noteworthy among them the works of Sir Simonds D’Ewes, of Sir William Dugdale, and of the Dutch polymath Jan de Laet (there is an overview in Considine, *Dictionaries* 191–202). Only one Old English wordlist was published in the first half of the century, the intriguing vocabulary of about 685 items—about 615 of them being Old English—included in Richard Verstegan’s *Restitution of Decayed Intelligence in Antiquities Concerning the most Noble and Renowned English Nation* (see Goepp). A good, comprehensive Old English dictionary was finally published by William Somner, who had assisted D’Ewes in his dictionary project and had also made use of Dugdale’s dictionary (Tornaghi), as well as publishing an edition of a famous Old Dutch wordlist (Considine, *Dictionaries* 203–16). This dictionary, the *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum* of 1659, was not superseded for over a hundred years. It had become scarce by the end of the seventeenth century, as is evidenced by the famous complaint made in 1699 to Humfrey Wanley by Edward Thwaites of Queen’s College, Oxford, then a “nest of Saxonists,” that “We want Saxon lexicons. I have fifteen young students in that language, and but one Somner for them all” (Nichols 4: 141). In the 1690s, Thomas Benson of Queen’s produced two specimens of an abridgement of Somner, which was published in 1701; much of the work may have been done by Thwaites (Alston, *BEL* 3.1: 7–8, 9; Nichols 4:142).

Meanwhile, the historical lexicography of Middle English had begun with the publication of some minor wordlists in the sixteenth century, and with the study of the language of

Chaucer. 2,034 lemmas had been glossed in Thomas Speght's edition of Chaucer in 1598, and 2,607 in the extensively revised wordlist in his next edition, of 1602 (Kerling 31–40; Schäfer, *EMEL* 1: 21). This wordlist would be a rich resource for seventeenth-century lexicographers; its use by Cawdrey, Bullokar, and Cockeram has been noted above. A manuscript glossary was adapted with considerable abbreviations from that of the first edition of Speght by the antiquary Joseph Holland between 1598 and his death in 1605 (Caldwell). However, apart from a reprint of the 1602 Chaucer in 1687, the only other attempt at a Middle English glossary to be published in England in the seventeenth century was the two-page wordlist added to an edition of two short texts by Wycliffe in 1608 (Alston, *BEL* 3. 1:34). Short glossaries also appeared in two seventeenth-century editions of Spenser's *Shepherds Calendar*; they are not, of course, to be confused with the commentary by "E. K." which had been part of the work from its first edition onwards (Alston, *BEL* 3.1: 66, 68). Reading early English documents called for a command of medieval varieties of Latin and French as well as Middle English and Old English, and guides to these are discussed in Considine, Chapter 18.

The study of early varieties of English made it possible to undertake dictionaries of English etymology, of which three appeared in the seventeenth century (Lieberman 26–30; Considine, "Stephen Skinner's *Etymologicon*"). These were the *Etymologicon linguae anglicanae* of Stephen Skinner published in Latin in 1671 and in Richard Hogarth's abridged translation in 1689 as the *Gazophylacium anglicanum*; the manuscript etymologicon of Franciscus Junius, completed before 1677 but only published in 1743; and the 34-page "Etymologicon Britannicum" of Edward Bernard, published in George Hickes's *Institutiones grammaticae* of 1688–1689 (sigs. Qq1r-Uu1v), as the only Icelandic wordlist of seventeenth-century England would be (see §4.2.4). As Kusujiro Miyoshi has pointed out ("*Gazophylacium*"), the *Gazophylacium* was the first monolingual English dictionary to treat a number of common words, and was a source for Kersey's *New English Dictionary* of 1702.

### 3.6 Lexicography and Universal Language Projects

One of the characteristic linguistic activities of the seventeenth century was the construction of universal language schemes, generally meant to further understanding of the natural world and to rationalize international and interconfessional relations. These were influenced by developments in the study and teaching of natural languages, and in particular by the works of Comenius, some of which are discussed briefly in Considine, Chapter 18. A number of them advanced far enough to call for the production of wordlists (for details, see Considine, *Dictionaries* 293–306). Some of these were never realized. So, *A Common Writing* of 1647 by Francis Lodwick or Lodowyck, a proposal for an ideographic writing-system, ended with the promise of "a *Lexicon* which is intended, God permitting," which would have been indexed by an alphabetical "collection ... of all the words extant in the English tongue" (sig. E3v), and in 1652, Sir Thomas Urquhart, the translator of Rabelais, claimed not very plausibly to have made and lost "the Grammar and Lexicon of an Universal Language" (5; see Considine, *Dictionaries* 294), of which the lexicon had consisted of seven hundred pages in folio. Others were at least sketched. In 1657, the clergyman and schoolmaster Cave Beck published a short dictionary called the *Universal Character*, which consisted of a list of 3,996 English words to each of which a unique number was assigned, together with a preface explaining how these

numbers could be used together with a simple system of alphabetically-written inflections and prefixes to indicate their grammatical functions. Every other language in the world, Beck argued, could have a dictionary based on the same numeration of concepts made for it. The project lapsed after the publication of a French version. Two more sophisticated wordlists were the “Lexicon grammatico-philosophicum” and “Lexicon latino-philosophicum” which formed part of George Dalgarno’s *Ars signorum* of 1661. The former is a single-sheet foldout of rather more than a thousand subject-grouped items, and the latter is a more conventional double-column wordlist which gives about 1,500 Latin words with brief equivalents in Dalgarno’s invented language.

A much more ambitious universal-language dictionary was published later in the 1660s, compiled by William Lloyd, who subsequently became one of the more colourful bishops of the later seventeenth century. This was part of a greater work, the *Essay towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language* of John Wilkins, like him a fellow of the Royal Society, published in 1668 as a folio of 636 pages. The last 162 pages, with their own half-title, comprised “An alphabetical dictionary, wherein all English words according to their various significations, are either referred to their places in the philosophical tables, or explained by such words as are in those tables.” Wilkins wrote at the beginning of the *Essay* that “the *Dictionary* ... I doubt not, will be found to be the most perfect, that was ever yet made for the *English Tongue*” (sig. c1r), and it was called “the best *English* Dictionary that was ever published,” in a grammar text of 1711 (Greenwood 27). It is indeed arguably a monolingual dictionary of English, presenting about 11,500 words (cf. Knappe, Chapter 16, 317n67), often with careful distinction of senses. However, one of its functions is to guide readers to the places of English words in Wilkins’s philosophical scheme and hence to their equivalents in his philosophical language, and I therefore treat it in this section of specialized dictionaries rather than in §2.

It has been discussed as a pioneering contribution to lexicography by Fredric Dolezal, who notes that it was the first English dictionary “to use a highly systematic and methodological construction of entries ... to have a self-defining lexicon (that is, words used for definitional purposes were also defined) ... [and] to include a broad range of the ordinary (i.e. non-technical and non-hard) English vocabulary in its lexicon” (Dolezal, *Forgotten* 1, 57), and it has been treated as part of the onomasiological tradition by Werner Hüllen (*English Dictionaries* 244–301). Gabriele Knappe (Chapter 16) discusses the relationship of the dictionary to the *Essay*, noting the dependence of its wordlist on those of English–Latin dictionaries rather than that of the *Essay* itself.<sup>11</sup> The dictionary was compiled, she suggests, as a parallel work against which the philosophical language of the *Essay* might be tested and by means of which it might be improved. There is some overlap between this article and the same author’s treatment of the dictionary in her monograph on phraseology and English language study (Knappe, *Idioms* 369–414), in which she comments on its “innovative and very well-considered approach to the treatment of phraseological units” (405), a topic which has recently also been treated by Fredric Dolezal (“Collocations”).

---

<sup>11</sup> It contributed in its turn to the English–Latin lexicographical tradition: Littleton’s dictionary of 1678 made use of some of its analyses of sense.

### 3.7 Other Specialized and Encyclopedic Lexicography

Other classes of specialized dictionaries and wordlists can only be indicated very briefly here. One unfinished manuscript dictionary which relates to the work on the clarification of the English language in which some seventeenth-century fellows of the Royal Society were interested is the “Dictionary of Sensible Words” for which the natural philosopher Sir William Petty FRS drew up a list of just over a hundred headwords such as *God*, *liberty*, *fanatic*, *pleasure*, and *wit*, to all of which he felt it should be possible to assign precise, illuminating definitions (Considine, *Dictionaries* 297; Read, Chapter 6, 120–21). Other notebooks of philosophical definitions are extant (Lancashire, Chapter 1, 7). The difficulty of the language of religion was engaged with in Thomas Wilson’s *Christian Dictionarie, Opening the Signification of the Chiefe Wordes Dispersed Generally through Holie Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, Tending to Increase Christian Knowledge* (1612), of which an eighth edition was published in 1678. This offers a detailed exposition of the vocabulary of the Bible in English, with a marked Calvinist quality, evident even in short entries—to *abstain* from something is not only to turn away from it but to do so “with an hatred of it”—let alone in the longer and more theologically complex such as *judgement*, which is broken down into twenty varieties, or *justifie* and *justification*, which are naturally discussed even more searchingly. The value of this dictionary as a handbook for modern readings of seventeenth-century texts has been sketched by Stanley Stewart (see also Read, Chapter 6, 126–7).

One important class of specialized wordlist comprises guides to the language of medicine and alchemy. A medical glossary of 1598 was, as noted at §2.1, a source for Cawdrey’s *Table Alphabeticall*. Such glossaries continued to appear in the seventeenth century; so, for instance, a seventeen-page “Physical Dictionary” was issued as an appendix (sigs. LIIIr–8r) to the English translation of Lazare Rivière’s *The Practice of Physick*, published in 1655. The first separately published dictionary of English medical terms was the anonymous *A Physical Dictionary, or, An Interpretation of such Crabbed Words and Terms of Arts, as are Deriv’d from the Greek or Latin, and Used in Physick, Anatomy, Chirurgery, and Chymistry* (1657). This is discussed by Jukka Tyrkkö in Chapter 17, with commentary on the dictionary’s audience (empirics who would have been unable to use medical dictionaries whose metalanguage was Latin); its purpose (it was originally intended to be issued as the glossary to a larger work); its sources (these include the glossary of 1655 mentioned above); and its place in a network of London medical publishing. In 1650, John French translated Gerhard Dorn’s *Dictionarium Theophrasti Paracelsi* as “A Chymical Dictionary”, issued as part of his translation of Michael Sandivogius’ *Novum lumen chymicum* as *A New Light of Alchymie*. By the end of the century, the *Lexicon medicum* of Steven Blankaart, published in Latin in Amsterdam in 1679 and first translated into English in 1684 as *A Physical Dictionary*, had run to several editions and was highly regarded.

The specialized vocabulary of different trades and applied sciences was coming to be seen as extensive and difficult by mid-century authors like Edward Phillips, who remarked in the preface to the *New World of Words* that “the Handycrafts ... have their Terms peculiar onely to themselves ... such as are known to few but the several Professours, as the names of Tools and Instruments ... of which to the attaining but of one tenth part, the search of an age would scarce suffice” (sig. C3v). Its registration was inevitably slow. By the end of the century, as

well as Worlidge's agricultural glossary, discussed at §3.4, some of the "words of art" used in the leadmines of the White Peak had been listed, without glosses, in verse by Edward Manlove (see Fox 93). The natural philosopher Sir John Pettus had appended a glossary to his *Fodinae regales* of 1670, a treatise on mines and mining (sigs. Hh1r–Hh1v) and had made a much more ambitious discursive dictionary of "Metallick Words," issued in 1683 as the second part of his translation of a book on assaying by the sixteenth-century German metallurgist Lazarus Ercker or Erckern.<sup>12</sup> "A Dictionary Alphabetically Explaining the Abstruse Words and Phrases that are Used in Typography" had been attempted by Joseph Moxon FRS, who had cut the special characters for Wilkins's *Essay* (Bryden), as the conclusion to the second volume of his *Mechanick Exercises* of 1683–1684 (2:367–94). Finally, "A Dictionary, or Alphabetical Explanation of most Difficult Terms Commonly Used in Merchandize and Trade" was added by Edward Hatton to the second edition of his *Merchant's Magazine* in 1697 (223–39; see Read, Chapter 6, 127–9). On the borders of applied science and academic learning, Moxon also produced a free-standing dictionary of mathematical terminology, *Mathematicks Made Easy, or, A Mathematical Dictionary*, in 1677, and this ran to a third edition in 1700, with additions by his son James (Bryden).

An important aspect of heraldry was its highly technical vocabulary, and printed books on the subject therefore tended to have a lexicological element. This was, however, generally expressed in continuous prose rather than in wordlists, the list of 54 lemmas in Edmund Bolton's *Elements of Armories* on which Blount drew in the *Glossographia* being an exception (sigs. Dd1v–Ee2r; Schäfer, Chapter 11, 218–19; idem, *EMEL* 1: 56). Even the suggestively titled *Armilogia, sive ars chromocritica: The Language of Arms by the Colours and Metals* published in 1666 by the arms painter Sylvanus Morgan is hardly a dictionary. The first substantial alphabetically-ordered wordlist of English heraldic terms appears to be comprised in the first 66 pages of John Gibbon's misleadingly titled *Introductio ad latinam blasoniam: An Essay to a more Correct Blason in Latine than Formerly hath been Used* (1682). It is eclipsed by Randle Holme's *Academie of Armorie*, one of the most extraordinary lexical reference books of the century, of which the first two and a half books were printed in fascicles by Holme at his house in Chester in 1688, over a thousand pages in folio (Alston, *BEL* 3.1: 488).<sup>13</sup> This work is founded on the observation that any object might in theory be used as a heraldic device, and therefore includes, rather than a list of the objects which Holme had actually observed in heraldry, a topically-ordered list of every object he could think of.

The borderline between the lexical dictionary and the encyclopedia is, as this last example suggests, a difficult one to draw: when does a dictionary of plants become a herbal, i.e., an encyclopedia of plants (see e.g., Hüllen, *English Dictionaries* 7–11; Lancashire, "Perils" 229 and 237–40; Considine, "Our Dictionaries Err" 195–8)? The question cannot simply be concluded by saying that a text is a dictionary if it is in alphabetical order: on the one

<sup>12</sup> The latter work was printed by Thomas Dawks, whose lexicographical work was discussed at §2.8 above.

<sup>13</sup> According to ESTC, the book as printed extends in most copies as far as vol. 3, ch. 13. The list of contents describes vol. 3, ch. 14–21, and vol. 4, ch. 1–15, as "ready for the press ... if encouraged by liberal and free contributors." A unique copy in the Royal Library at Windsor contains 191 printed pages of this portion. In 1905 all that could be found of it, namely vol. 3, ch. 14–22, and vol. 4, ch. 4–13, was printed for the Roxburghe Club from BL MSS Harleian 2,033–2,035. See also Alcock and Cox.

hand, there were topical dictionaries, and on the other, a book like Jacob Bobart's *Catalogus plantarum horti medici Oxoniensis sc. latino-anglicus & anglico-latinus, eas alphabetico ordine accurate exhibens* (1648) could be called a Latin–English and English–Latin dictionary of plant-names but would surely be rejected from most histories of lexicography. Nor is the presence of the word *dictionary* in the title of a book a good criterion: the *Ladies Dictionary* of 1694 is an encyclopedia with lexical material added to it. Alphabetically ordered geographical dictionaries, such as the *Villare anglicum* printed in 1656 from materials gathered by Sir Henry Spelman, were widely used in the seventeenth century, and the eleventh volume of Alston's *Bibliography* is devoted to English-language dictionaries of place-names and personal names. They overlap with general proper-name dictionaries such as the etymological *Scripture Names Expounded* of circa 1660 (Starnes, *Robert Estienne's Influence*, 43), or Nicholas Lloyd's revised edition of Charles Estienne's *Dictionarium historicum, geographicum, poeticum* of 1670, and etymologically oriented lists of names such as those in Camden's *Remaines of a Greater Worke concerning Britaine* of 1605 (e.g. 40–88; 131–3), Sir John Dodderidge's slightly later manuscript lexicon of given names (Lancashire, Chapter 1, 11), or Henry Jessey's "Index of All the Proper Names Contained in the New Testament", which was published with the 1661 reissue of Thomas Cokayne's Greek dictionary (sigs. h3r–i3r).<sup>14</sup> Do such dictionaries belong to the history of lexicography as discussed here? I have excluded them, but the decision to do so—and more generally, the decision to see lexicography as centrally concerned with words which are not proper nouns—is an arbitrary one, and much lexicographical practice can be cited in opposition to it. Finally, in addition to the lexical dictionaries which cited proverbs, a number of proverb-collections were produced in the seventeenth century. There does not appear to be a good overview of these, although the English cultural background has been discussed (Fox 112–72, esp. 119–21), a partial bibliography is available (Wilson 62–7), and work has been done on the Scottish tradition (Taylor) and on John Ray's *Collection of English Proverbs* of 1670 (Knappe, *Idioms* 83–9).

#### 4. Polyglot and Bilingual Lexicography

The sixteenth century had seen a flourishing tradition of bilingual Latin–English and English–Latin lexicography; the beginnings of the extensive bilingual and polyglot lexicography of English and the European vernaculars; and the making of the first wordlists which gave English equivalents from languages spoken beyond Europe. Two of these three fields are surveyed in Considine Chapters 18 and 19. The seventeenth-century lexicography of English and the European vernaculars is introduced here; other introductory surveys are those of Janet Bately ("Bilingual" 54–64) and Monique Cormier (65–6, 70–73, 81–3) in the *Oxford History of English Lexicography* edited by A.P. Cowie.

##### 4.1 Polyglot Lexicography including English

A number of sixteenth-century polyglot dictionary traditions which included English continued into the seventeenth century (see e.g., Stein, "Emerging Role" 48–57, and Alston,

<sup>14</sup> For Lloyd's and Jessey's works, see Considine, Chapter 18.

BEL 2: 70–99). Their publication overlapped with that of more innovative work. In 1603, Hieronymus Megiser produced his *Thesaurus polyglottus*, a tool for the comparative study of language on a grand scale, which included English-language equivalents (Considine, *Dictionaries* 291–3; W. Jones nos. 832–3; Alston, BEL 2: 101). English forms were cited with forms from eight other languages in one important European dictionary, Georg Henisch's unfinished *Teütsche Sprach und Weißheit* of 1616 (Stein, "Emerging Role" 60–61; Hüllen, Chapter 2, 16). They would appear with nine other languages—each opening has parallel columns in, from left to right, German, Polish, Czech, Dutch, English, Latin, French, Spanish, Italian, and Hungarian—in a more obscure text of the end of the seventeenth century, Kristof Warmer's *A & Ω: Gazophylacium decem linguarum europaearum apertum*, published in 1691 in what is now Košice in Slovakia.

The first English polyglot dictionary was the 'Ἠγημων εἰς τὰς γλῶσσας: *id est, ductor in linguas, The Guide into Tongues* of John Minsheu, published in 1617, with a revised second edition in 1625 (W. Jones, nos. 851–2; Alston, BEL 2: 103–7). This was a strikingly ambitious work, a folio of 562 pages, whose English headwords were followed by forms in Welsh, Dutch, German, French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. Material from other languages appeared in it as well, for instance Arabic, supplied by William Bedwell (F. Williams 768n15; for Bedwell see Considine, Chapter 18). Its sources included a variety of Continental dictionaries (see Rosier 70–72). It was intended, according to its title page, both as an etymologicon and as a polyglot dictionary for the purposes of language learning, and the epistle to the reader begins with the claim that the knowledge of etymological affinities will help one to learn multiple languages. Making the dictionary was expensive, particularly since Minsheu used a number of research assistants to gather

all Wordes in all these languages, as much as many Scholers (some Englishmen, some Welsh, some high Dutch-men, low Dutch, French, some Italians, &c. all learned in the Tongues) for diuers yeeres could find out, by reading the best Authors in all these languages ... and all at his [i.e. Minsheu's] great charges and expences. (quoted in F. Williams 757)

The first edition was therefore supported by a number of gifts from well-wishers, and the second was actually published by subscription, the first English book to be financed thus. A prospectus for the work was printed in 1611—the earliest printed English book prospectus—and a list of eminent persons who had bought copies survives in no fewer than twelve successively updated variants (STC2 17947.5 and 17944a; F. Williams 758). No earlier documents make the financial, as opposed to the cerebral, side of lexicography as clear as these. Minsheu's labours as a lexicographer were not confined to research and the formulation of definitions, but also included a great deal of weary work in pursuit of essential funding.

In Chapter 22, Jürgen Schäfer begins with the statement that "More than any other work of the period the *Ductor in Linguas* reflects linguistic research and speculation at home and abroad and represents an important link in the beginnings of modern English lexicography" (397). Schäfer goes on, however, to point out what Minsheu did *not* achieve, with particular reference to the inconsistency of his etymological method, and the extent and importance of his borrowings from Cowell's *Interpreter*. The picture which emerges is most interesting, but it is unjustly negative: compiling a large reference work of a kind previously unattempted

deserves higher praise than the final verdict of “scholarly poseur.” Minsheu himself closed his second preface to the reader with the observation that “for the contenting of some ... that make sleight account of making of a Dictionary, I striue not, but *appeale to those that haue laboured in this kind*” (sig. A5r). It is a fair point—and it is true that Schäfer, though he was one of the best historians of lexicography of the twentieth century, was not a lexicographer. Minsheu’s dictionary was in fact seriously read and influential, for instance on Blount’s *Glossographia* and Skinner’s *Etymologicon* (Rosier 69). William Somner’s heavily annotated copy survives at Canterbury, and that of Matthew Wren, bishop of Ely, marked up in the mid-seventeenth century apparently with a view to producing a new edition, at University College, London (Alston, “Bibliography and Historical Linguistics” 190). As late as the nineteenth century, it was a favourite source for correspondents to *Notes and Queries*, and was cited more than five hundred times in the *Oxford English Dictionary*.

The other large polyglot dictionary to be produced in seventeenth-century England was James Howell’s *Lexicon tetraglotton: An English–French–Italian–Spanish Dictionary of 1660* (Hüllen, *English Dictionaries* 202–43). This 840-page compendium included a four-language alphabetical dictionary, a four-language topical dictionary identified on the title page as “a large NOMENCLATURE of the proper Terms ... belonging to several Arts and Sciences, to Recreations, to Professions both Liberal and Mechanick, &c. Divided into Fiftie two SECTIONS,” and a collection of “the Choicest PROVERBS in all the said Tounes,” also including some Welsh ones; this last part had been separately issued in the previous year. Like Minsheu, Howell claimed that his dictionary would make speedy language-learning possible: as the reader surveyed the four languages it registered, there would be “a great advantage to Memory in regard of the affinity and consonance they have one with another in thousands of words” (sig. \*\*2r). Howell notes that his English wordlist is up to date, including “*stumming of wine, clover grasse, regalos, treatment, punch ...*” and “*Quakers, Seekers, Levellers, Trepanners, piqueering, plundring, storming, Excise &c.* and other which got in during the reign of the Long Parlement” (sig. \*\*2v); the great majority of these words were indeed new, or recently used in new senses, in 1660, suggesting that Howell had a good ear for lexical change. The alphabetical part of his dictionary is indebted to Sherwood’s English–French dictionary (see §4.2.2 below), which he had edited ten years earlier, and therefore ultimately to Cotgrave, to whom a number of its rare words—for instance *abolishable, balzan, erective, machinator*—can be traced. The topical part is largely taken from an earlier topical dictionary of Italian, French, and Spanish, the addition of English being Howell’s main contribution, though he does make some further additions, for instance from Smith’s *Sea-Grammar* (Hüllen, *English Dictionaries* 218–21; 230–31). The *Lexicon tetraglotton* is, then, a compilation rather than a major work of scholarship, one of the many achievements of a busy writing career. Anthony Wood remarked with characteristic biliousness that “his writings having been only to gain a livelihood, and by their dedications to flatter great and noble persons, are very trite and empty, stoln from other authors without acknowledgment, and fitted only to please the humours of Novices” (2, col. 265); this particular writing was dedicated to Charles II on 4 May 1660, three days after the Lords’ declaration that government should be by king and parliament. It was not reprinted after 1660. By the end of the century, the age of polyglot lexicography in England was at an end. The fifteenth- and sixteenth-century traditions were all exhausted, and no polyglot tradition as fruitful as theirs, nor any polyglot dictionary as adventurous

as Minsheu's or even Howell's, appeared in eighteenth-century England (cf. Alston, *BEL* 2: 112–38).

#### 4.2 Bilingual Wordlists of English and European Languages

The *annus mirabilis* of seventeenth-century English lexicography is 1611, when the two most spectacular dictionaries of the century appeared: Randle Cotgrave's *Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues*, and John Florio's *Queen Anna's New World of Words*. Since Florio's dictionary has its origins in the sixteenth century, it will be treated first, together with the other Italian dictionaries of seventeenth-century England; then Cotgrave's dictionary and its French–English and English–French successors; then dictionaries of other Romance, Germanic, Celtic, and miscellaneous European languages.

##### 4.2.1 Italian

John Florio's *Worlde of Wordes* of 1598 had included 43,428 entries.<sup>15</sup> In its preface, Florio was already announcing his plans for an improved second edition, which would include French and Latin equivalents and cite new authors (sig. b2r). Seventeenth-century writers were good at planning new works which never actually appeared, but Florio duly produced his new dictionary, sensibly dropping the scheme of making it tetraglot, and concentrating on a great enhancement of its Italian-language content. It appeared as *Queen Anna's New World of Words* in 1611 (for it, see O'Connor 37–44). This dictionary had over 70,000 entries and drew on 252 cited sources (entry count from O'Connor 37; Yates 265 makes the entry-count “nearly 74,000”). These included Dante, whom Florio had overlooked in 1598 (cf. Yates 267). Even if some of the source citations give a false impression of the extent of Florio's reading, the sheer scale of the achievement is, for the seventeenth century, quite extraordinary. The dictionary is notably rich in Italian dialect forms, although these are not labelled, just as authorities—and the gender of nouns—are not indicated. It is also, like its predecessor, a very rich source of English lexical items. At the time of writing, *OED* cites the *Worlde of Wordes* as its first evidence for 553 English lexical items, from *abortively* via *main street* to *yarn-beam*, and the *New World of Words* as its first evidence for 417 more, from the verb *abee-cee* “to say one's alphabet” onwards. If Lewis Carroll's riddle had asked “why are ravioli like a writing-desk?” it would have had the simple answer that the *New World of Words* provides the first English lexical evidence for both.

Florio prepared a third edition of his dictionary for the press, bequeathing the manuscript to the Earl of Pembroke with the request that he “giue Way and faurable assistance that my Dictionarie and Dialogues may bee printed and the proffitt thereof accrue unto my wife” (Yates 313). The manuscript actually came into the hands of a teacher of Italian called Giovanni Torriano, who had lived in London since about 1620 and published it with his own additions and an English–Italian section as *Vocabolario Italiano & Inglese, a Dictionary Italian & English* in 1659 (for it, see O'Connor 45–59). This dictionary drew on the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca*, which had been published in the year after the *New World of Words*, and on Cotgrave's French–English dictionary. Torriano also added material from his own experience of Italy—as well as, under the headword *Florio*, already present as the name of

<sup>15</sup> I owe the entry count to Ian Lancashire.

a kind of bird to which horses feel violent antipathy, the words “also the name of this Italian Dictionary from *Florio*, the first compiler of it.” His English–Italian section was based on Sherwood’s English–French complement to Cotgrave’s dictionary, which is discussed below (cf. Bately, Chapter 23). A second edition appeared in 1688, prepared by one John Davis; and the language teacher Pietro Paravicino produced a *Short Italian Dictionary* in 1666 which excerpted 3,000 nouns of confusable gender from Torriano’s wordlist and identified their genders.<sup>16</sup> Anglophones in need of an Italian dictionary were therefore almost certain to be using a book derived from the work of Florio throughout the seventeenth century.

#### 4. 2. 2 French

The publication of Randle Cotgrave’s *Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* in 1611 made a second dictionary as rich and fascinating as Florio’s *New World of Words* available to the English reader. Cotgrave presented 47,310 entries, but his very generous provision of synonyms and of phraseological, proverbial, and encyclopedic material makes his dictionary as big a book as Florio’s, a folio of 980 pages (for the proverbs in general, see Pinnavaia, and for their reuse in an Irish publication, see Stewart, Chapter 21, discussed in §4.2.5).<sup>17</sup> His English vocabulary appears to be even richer than Florio’s, and at the time of writing, the *OED* cites him as the first authority for 1,391 words. His turns of phrase are often lively and distinctive: *gobequinaut*, for example, is “A greedie feeder, a rauinous, and ouglie deuourer; one that makes bricke-walls of his chaps, or hastily swallowes whole, and vnchawed gobbets,” followed immediately by *gober* “To rauine, deuoure; feed greedily, swallow great morsells, let downe whole gobbets,” and the imperative *gobe quinault*, “Sup her vp tis cold ynough, downe with it whoresonne” He identified a number of forms as regional, or as occurring in the works of Rabelais (for the latter group, see Schmidt-Küntzel, and Baldinger).

The first entry for Cotgrave’s dictionary in the *Stationers’ Register* suggests that it was originally meant as an expanded version of the sixteenth-century work of Claudius Holyband: it is called “Dictionarie in Frenche and Englishe Collected first by C. Holyband and sythenc Augmented or Altered by Randall Cotgrave” (Arber 3: 381). However, Cotgrave’s eventual achievement was in a different class from Holyband’s. The question of the origins of his French words was addressed in an important monograph by V.E. Smalley, *The Sources of A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues by Randle Cotgrave* (1948), which concluded that Nicot’s *Thresor de la langue francoyse* of 1606 was his most important source. In his papers of 1983 and 1985, “Le ‘Dictionarie’” (Chapter 20) and “Les Essais de Montaigne,” Peter Rickard gives an overview of Cotgrave’s work, with discussion of its sources, and examines the specific problem of his possible indebtedness to Montaigne. There have been a number of other studies of his sources (as well as those cited in Rickard’s essay in this volume, see Schmitt).

Cotgrave’s was the standard French dictionary for English readers for half a century, in a series of editions. The first of these was edited by Robert Sherwood in 1632, with an English–French second part added by Sherwood. In Chapter 23, Janet Bately discusses the procedures of reversal, abridgement, and supplementation of Cotgrave which Sherwood followed in the

<sup>16</sup> For Paravicino, see Szoc para. 2; for his dictionary, O’Connor 60–61 and Alston, *BEL* 12.2: 115–16 and 117.

<sup>17</sup> I owe the entry count to Ian Lancashire.

making of the English–French part (412–22), and the use of Sherwood’s English–French wordlist by subsequent lexicographers. Sherwood’s edition was followed by one revised by James Howell (cf. §4.1 above), published in 1650, and further editions in 1660 and 1672–1673 (Alston, *BEL* 12.1: 624–34; see also Cormier and Fernandez “For the Better Understanding”).

The first serious challenge to the Cotgrave–Sherwood tradition was the work of Guy Miège, a Swiss-born teacher of French and geography, who published a *New Dictionary French and English and English and French* in 1677, basing its wordlist on François Antoine Pomey’s *Dictionnaire royal des langues françoise et latine*, of which the first edition had been published in 1664 (Franceœur).<sup>18</sup> In his preface, Miège argued reasonably that the French language had developed sufficiently since 1611 for revisions of Cotgrave’s dictionary, whose own sources belonged for the most part to the sixteenth century, to be inadequate representations of modern courtly usage. Two years later, he responded to the strong residual English affection for Cotgrave’s wordlist by adding *A Dictionary of Barbarous French, or, A Collection, by Way of Alphabet, of Obsolete, Provincial, Mis-Spelt, and Made Words in French, Taken out of Cotgrave’s Dictionary*, as an annexe to a second edition of the *New Dictionary*; it may also have been issued as an independent work (Alston, *BEL* 12.1: 636; see Rickard, Chapter 20). In 1684, he produced an abridgement of his work of 1677, *A Short Dictionary English and French, with Another French and English*, which ran to three editions in England and four in continental Europe (Alston, *BEL* 12.1: 637–46; Lambley 384). He then enlarged and revised the *New Dictionary* as the *Great French Dictionary*, published in folio in 1687–1688 (Alston, *BEL* 12.1: 647). Janet Bately (Chapter 26) discusses the lexicographical and lexicological scope of this revised dictionary, commenting in particular on Miège’s use of earlier English works such as Blount’s *Glossographia*, the Cowell–Manley *Nomothetes*, William Walker’s Latin phraseological dictionary *Idiomatologia*, and Adam Littleton’s general Latin dictionary (for the latter two, see Considine, Chapter 18, and for the phraseological material in Miège, see Knappe, *Idioms* 298–307). It has been suggested that his work was itself influential on subsequent dictionary-making in France (see Franceœur 153).

Miège’s fine, handsome *Great French Dictionary* only ran to a single edition because a rival was published in quarto in 1699, namely Abel Boyer’s *Royal Dictionary*. This, together with an abridgement of 1700, was extremely successful: more than forty editions of the unabridged Boyer and more than fifty of the abridged followed, printed in the British Isles, continental Europe, and the United States, well into the nineteenth century. Miège distributed an anonymous single-sheet *Impartial Animadversions upon Monsieur Boyer’s Royal Dictionary, Exposing Plainly the Injustice of his Attempt, and Weakness of his Performance* (see the contemporary account, favourable to Boyer, in *History of the Works of the Learned* 1.5 [May 1699]: 314–16), but to no avail: Boyer’s dictionary held the field. As Monique Cormier and Heberto Fernandez show (Chapter 27), Boyer drew heavily on Miège’s work, although he tended not to take entries over from it unaltered, and made a number of improvements to it such as the provision of functional labels and usage marks, and the clarification of some entries for polysemous words (see also Knappe, *Idioms* 310–16). In the same article, Cormier and Fernandez cite some of their earlier work on Boyer’s antecedents.

<sup>18</sup> Like Pettus’s dictionary of mining terms (§3.7), this work was printed by Thomas Dawks, for whom see §2.8 above.

Smaller French wordlists doubtless circulated, for instance the classed English–French wordlist appended to the *Vocabularium analogicum* of Jacob Villiers of Nottingham (1680) after a French grammar (sigs. O1r–O6r); this book also includes a longer list of those sets of English, French, and Latin words which are evidently related, discussed briefly in Considine, Chapter 18.

#### 4. 2. 3 Other Romance Languages

The Spanish language was included in a four-language edition of the *Ianua linguarum* of William Bathe, discussed in Considine, Chapter 18, and there was a vocabulary in Lewis Owen's *The Key of the Spanish Tongue* of 1605 (138–206). Minsheu, who had edited Perceval's Spanish dictionary in 1599, returned to Spanish in 1617, appending "A most copious Spanish dictionarie, with Latine and English (and sometime other languages)" to the *Ductor in linguas* so that Spanish lexical items could be readily looked up in it, even though the entries were in the alphabetical order of the English headwords. This "dictionarie" was a very considerable wordlist, of some 55,000 items, with brief Latin glosses and page-references to the main work (Steiner 52–4). Minsheu may at one stage have thought of issuing it independently, and he appears to have financed it separately from the *Ductor in Linguas*, but the two were issued together (see F. Williams 760–61). In 1623, a paginal reprint of a dictionary of 1599, produced by Minsheu on the basis of work by Richard Perceval, was published (Alston, *BEL* 12.2: 172–5; Steiner 55–7). After that, although Howell included Spanish words in the *Lexicon tetraglotton*, there was no bilingual dictionary of English and Spanish until the first decade of the eighteenth century.<sup>19</sup> Portuguese had appeared in the first edition of Minsheu's *Ductor in linguas*, though it was omitted from the second, and it was treated briefly in a Portuguese–English–French vocabulary included in La Molliere's *Portuguez Grammar* of 1662.<sup>20</sup> However, no dictionary of the language appeared in England until the eighteenth century; nor were the other Romance languages handled by seventeenth-century English lexicographers.

#### 4. 2. 4 Germanic Languages

Seventeenth-century English lexicographers only treated one Germanic language in detail, namely Dutch. In the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, contact between speakers of Dutch and English was extensive, but the only dictionaries to cover both languages were polyglot publications (cf. Osselton, *Dumb Linguists* 1–22, esp. 14–17). By the late 1630s, a market for a Dutch–English language guide had been identified, and phrasebook material from these two languages only from an earlier polyglot tradition was published with a Dutch–English vocabulary (sigs. F6r–H7r) as *Den grooten vocabulaer* in 1639 and reprinted or reissued in 1644 (Alston, *BEL* 13: 83–5). The 1639 title page identifies this in Dutch as newly overseen and corrected, referring to the superiority of the edition over either its polyglot predecessors or a lost two-language predecessor. In 1647, the soldier and translator Henry Hexham published

<sup>19</sup> Further material on these dictionaries is in Fernandez Urdaneta 2010, esp. 187–247; this study reached me too late to be used in the present introduction.

<sup>20</sup> The author is a shadowy figure, and the grammar is rare; three copies are known to me, in the British Library, the Bibliothèque Nationale, and the University of Liverpool. The online catalogue of the last of these identifies the author as Étienne Amar de la Mollière.

an English–Dutch *Copious English and Netherduytch Dictionarie*, following it in the next year with a Dutch–English *Groot woorden-boeck*, both of which went into two further editions by 1678 (Alston, *BEL* 13: 86–93; Osselton, *Dumb Linguists* 114; 54–7). Considering that it was the first dictionary of English and Dutch, Hexham’s was surprisingly extensive, running to 31,000 entries (word count from Osselton, *Dumb Linguists* 35). This is because it drew on earlier dictionaries for its wordlists. As Noel Osselton shows in Chapter 24, its English wordlist is based on that of a late edition of Rider, supplemented from Hexham’s personal knowledge, and its Dutch wordlist on that of an anonymous Dutch–French dictionary of 1618 (see also Osselton, *Dumb Linguists* 44–49; 51–53; Knappe, *Idioms* 291–94). Revised editions of Hexham’s dictionary held the field until the last decade of the seventeenth century, though a number of Dutch–English grammars also included vocabularies, and these might be substantial; Edward Richardson’s *Anglo-Belgica* of 1676–1677, for instance, has a wordlist of some 3,300 items (Osselton, *Dumb Linguists* 33; Alston, *BEL* 2: 501–17). The only other attempt at a free-standing dictionary of English and Dutch was the work of Johannes Gosens van Heldon, who published an English grammar for Dutch-speakers and an *English and Nether-Dutch Dictionary*, both in 1675 (Alston, *BEL* 2: 513–14 and 13: 94; cf. Osselton, *Dumb Linguists* 33n33). The latter was divided into sections by number of syllables and arranged alphabetically within each section, like the spelling-books discussed at §2.8 above. It has prefatory notes on pronunciation, and its title page puts an interesting emphasis on “the present proper pronunciation of the [English] language in Oxford and London,” perhaps following Elisha Coles’s *Compleat English Schoolmaster* of 1674 (see Mugglestone 14). In 1691, the Anglo-Dutch writer Willem Sewel, who translated books from six languages and wrote a major early history of the Quakers, produced *A New Dictionary English and Dutch*. His aim was to supersede Hexham’s work, and he succeeded; his dictionary ran to five or six further editions in the eighteenth century (Alston, *BEL* 13: 95–101; Osselton, *Dumb Linguists* 75–99 and 114–16). Sewel’s dictionary arose partly from his experiences as a translator. For his English wordlist, he also made use of the *English Dictionary* of Elisha Coles and of a Latin–English dictionary, probably William Robertson’s *Phraseologia generalis*, and appears to have taken some legal and other entries over from Philips’s *New World of Words* (Osselton, *Dumb Linguists* 64–71; Knappe, *Idioms* 308–10; see §2.6–7 and Considine, Chapter 18). His Dutch wordlist was, like Hexham’s, from a Dutch–French dictionary, supplemented by a Dutch seaman’s dictionary (Osselton, *Dumb Linguists* 72–5).

As Inge Kabell and Hanne Lauridsen (Chapter 25) were the first to observe, an English–Danish dictionary of 128 pages, with a wordlist adapted intelligently from an English–Latin dictionary in the Rider tradition, was produced as early as 1678. No other attempt at a dictionary of English and a living continental Scandinavian language was made until the eighteenth century (cf. Alston, *BEL* 13: 109ff). A 36-page Old Norse–Latin vocabulary with etymological material including Gothic cognates was published as “*Dictionarium islandicum*” in George Hickeys’s *Institutiones grammaticae* in 1688–1689 (part 2, 97–130; cf. §3.5), and some Old Norse forms, and forms from other medieval Germanic languages, appeared in etymological treatments of English, particularly those of Franciscus Junius. Junius published an extensive Gothic–Latin glossary in his edition of the Gothic and Old English gospel-translations of 1664–1665, but this work, published at Dordrecht by a Dutch scholar who divided his time between the Netherlands and England, is scarcely within the scope of the present study (for it,

see Considine, *Dictionaries* 225). Finally, Norn, the only Scandinavian language of the post-medieval British Isles, survived in Shetland until the eighteenth century, and some lexical items from it were registered in “An Explication of some Norish Words used in Orkney and Zetland” in James Wallace’s *Description of the Isles of Orkney*, published in 1693 (90–94).

No dedicated dictionary of English and German was available before the eighteenth century, although there was a long bilingual list of idioms in the first grammar of German for English-speakers, *The High Dutch Minerva* of Martin Aedler, published in 1680 (Knappe, *Idioms* 196–206; Van der Lubbe). Anglophones who needed more help in their reading of German than Aedler offered would have had to resort to such polyglot dictionaries as included both languages, or to German–Latin dictionaries.

#### 4. 2. 5 Celtic Languages

As has already been noted, Minsheu’s *Ductor in linguas* included some Welsh-language material, and Howell’s *Lexicon tetraglotton* included Welsh proverbs. The story of the seventeenth-century lexicography of Welsh is complex: a number of manuscript dictionaries were compiled (see Bell 22 and 32–3 and Lancashire, Chapter 1, 6), and the relationships between these, the principal printed dictionaries, and incidental treatments such as Minsheu’s and Howell’s are not always clear. An important Welsh–Latin and Latin–Welsh *Dictionarium duplex* was published in 1632 by John Davies of Mallwyd. Its former part, according to Anthony Wood, draws on the Welsh–Latin dictionary of Henry Salesbury, probably written after 1593 and preserved in one principal manuscript and one which derives from it (Wood I, cols. 226–7; cf. Jarvis). Its latter part is, as Davies himself acknowledged, based on the Latin–Welsh dictionary of Thomas Wiliems, preserved in three quarto volumes of manuscript dated 1604–1607 (J. Williams). Wood also reports Davies’ use of a manuscript “Brittish Dictionary” compiled, probably in the first decades of the seventeenth century, by one Henry Perry (1 col. 252, and see also 1 col. 519). The *Dictionarium duplex* was a learned work, the natural first resort of learned readers such as Thomas Blount in England or Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn on the Continent (for the latter’s use of Davies, see Droixhe 128). By the end of the seventeenth century, Thomas Jones yr Almanaciwr, “the key figure in developing a commercial trade in popular Welsh books” (P. Jones731), had compiled the first cheap Welsh–English dictionary, published in 1688: *The British Language in its Lustre, or, A Copious Dictionary of Welsh and English, Containing many more British Words than are in Dr. Davies’s Antiquae linguae britannicae dictionarium duplex; First Explaining the Hard British Words, by more Familiar Words in the same Tongue: very Useful for all such as Desire to Understand what they Read in that Language; Secondly, Shewing the Proper English to every British Word*. The lasting prestige of Davies’s dictionary is evident here. More remarkable, though, is the fact that this is a hard-word dictionary for Welsh-speakers as well as a bilingual dictionary.

Irish had been a learned language in the early middle ages, and the Irish-language lexicography which was undertaken in the seventeenth century belonged to a very long native tradition. Its most significant printed product was the monolingual Irish dictionary *Foclóir nó sanasán nua* of the great historian Míchél Ó Cléirigh (Michael O’Clery), one of the eponymous Four Masters of the *Annals of the Four Masters*, printed with Irish types in Louvain in 1643 (for a translation of the preface, see Crowley 72–3). The major unpublished seventeenth-century dictionary of Irish is that of Richard Plunkett (McGettigan). A seventeenth-century

collection of proverbs in English with Irish equivalents, numbering 248 items, drawn from Withals's sixteenth-century Latin dictionary, Minsheu's revision of Perceval's *Spanish Grammar*, and an edition of Cotgrave, survives in manuscript and is discussed by James Stewart in Chapter 21. Lionel Wafer's *New Voyage and Description of the Isthmus of America* of 1699, which I mention in Chapter 19, includes a list of Gaelic numerals as a curiosity after a list of numerals in a central American language (185–6; cf. 181–2), which suggests how exotic Irish must have seemed to many seventeenth-century Anglophones. The manuscript collector John Madden left an unpublished Irish–Latin wordlist (Evans), as did the settler Sir Matthew de Renzy (Mac Cuarta); only the former is extant. Edward Lhuyd would collect lexical items from several Irish dialects at the turn of the century, but no Irish–English dictionary would be printed until 1732.

Of the four other Celtic languages, Scottish Gaelic was registered in a vocabulary included in a Bible translation of 1690, *An Biobla Naomhtha*, and in a manuscript wordlist of a south Argyllshire dialect made by Edward Lhuyd in 1700. Both of these were produced by translating the English words in Ray's *Dictionariolum trilingue* into Gaelic with the help of bilingual informants (see Campbell and Thomson 91–218 and, for Ray's dictionary, Considine, Chapter 18). Lhuyd was to obtain more dialect material, and to print some of his vocabulary in his *Archaeologia Britannica* in 1707, but no separately published dictionary of Scots Gaelic would appear until Alexander Macdonald's of 1741. An English–Cornish wordlist of twenty-four nouns, the numbers from one to twenty-one, and four brief phrases was recorded in the notebook of the soldier and antiquary Richard Symonds in 1644 (Berresford Ellis 78–9). By the end of the century, the antiquaries William Scawen and William Hals were at work on their Cornish wordlists. Manx and Breton do not appear to have been recorded in seventeenth-century English wordlists, although both would be handled by Lhuyd at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the former with the aid of another wordlist based on Ray's *Dictionariolum trilingue* (Ifans and Thomson).

#### 4. 2. 6 Other Languages of Europe

A number of European languages were not handled at any length by seventeenth-century English lexicographers, for instance Hungarian (although a few Hungarian words do appear in Edward Bernard's etymologicon, and Hungarian and English are both included in Warner's *Gazophylacium*: see §§3.5, 4.1). One language which was treated at quite a high level was Russian, of which a vocabulary of about 2,500 words, a high proportion of them being technical or specialized, was drawn up by Richard James from personal observation, especially in northern Russia, between 1618 and 1620, and is preserved as Bodleian MS James 43\*; it was edited for Russian readers in 1959 (Simmons and Unbegaun 123–5; Unbegaun 239–54). This text contains much of interest: for instance, it gives the first reference in any language to the discovery of mammoth bones, and is rich in the vocabulary of roguery and card-play (for the latter, see Unbegaun 255–61). An English–Russian dictionary is reported as preserved in a seventeenth-century manuscript made by a Russian-speaker and containing other wordlists and linguistic material (Stankiewicz 128). In the latter part of the century, Edward Bernard drew up a Latin vocabulary with equivalents in English, Russian, and Polish, now Bodleian MS lat. misc. e. 13 (see Alston, *BEL* 3.1: 6n), which must be related to the Slavonic material in his *Etymologicum Britannicum*. Finally, a short comparative wordlist of Saami and Finnish

with English equivalents was given in Johannes Scheffer's *History of Lapland* as translated by Acton Cremer in 1674; a less sophisticated Saami wordlist had been printed by Hakluyt in the previous century (see Abercromby and Genetz).

## 5. Conclusion

The story of seventeenth-century English lexicography is one of uneven progress. Non-specialized monolingual dictionaries of English became increasingly elaborate from Cawdrey to the 1650s, a development which would, after a slack period in the second half of the century, be continued after 1700. None of them attempted wide coverage of common words, and as Noel Osselson has remarked, significantly more than half of the words which they did register came from the first half of the alphabet—their compilers suffered from what may be called “alphabet fatigue.”

Specialized monolingual dictionaries multiplied, and although some traditions, such as that of lexicography directed towards universal-language schemes, came to an end in the seventeenth century, others, such as that of dialect lexicography, began to flourish and would bear further fruit in the future. Significant advances were made in the lexicography of Old English and in etymology, both of which would stagnate from the late seventeenth century until the new philology of the nineteenth. Bilingual lexicography proceeded erratically. In the cases of French and Italian, some of the most innovative work was done early in the century, and Spanish and Russian were likewise documented as well by 1625 as they would be by 1700. By contrast, the best Dutch dictionary belongs to the 1690s, and wordlists of English and the Celtic languages other than Welsh only appear at the end of the century. An increasing number of languages were registered in one form or another by English lexicographers.

How was all this lexicographical activity reflected in English collections of books? A London auction catalogue of 1699, listing 2,306 books from the libraries “of a Person of Eminent Quality, and a Learned Divine deceased” (*Catalogue* title page), offers one glimpse of the dictionary holdings which might be found in good private libraries in England by the end of the seventeenth century. Forty-seven of the books, by my count, are dictionaries or evidently contain major glossarial material. Fourteen of these are dictionaries of Greek printed on the Continent in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.<sup>21</sup> Another six are dictionaries of Latin printed on the Continent, the earliest being an incunabular edition of the Biblical Latin dictionary of Bersuire.<sup>22</sup> Other European dictionaries are three editions of Comenius, none

<sup>21</sup> Guillaume Budé, *Commentarii linguae graecae*, 1529 (1 no. 9); *Dictionarium latino-graeco-gallicum*, 1551 (2 no. 11); Jacques Toussain, *Lexicon graecolatinum*, 1555, 2 copies (2 no. 45; 5 no. 8); Henri Estienne, *Dictionarium medicum*, 1564 (26 no. 16); Robert Constantin et al., *Lexicon graecolatinum*, editions of 1562 (1 no. 8) and 1566 (2 no. 6: identified in catalogue as Lond., but this is an error for Lugd., actually the false Lyons imprint of a Genevan book); Scapula, *Lexicon*, editions of 1598 (2 no. 32), 1609 (5 no. 2), and 1628 (7 no. 66); Wolfgang Seber, *Index vocabulorum in Homeri ... poëmatis*, 1604 (sig. π1v, no. 19); Georg Pasor, *Lexicon graeco-latinum in novum ... testamentum*, 1626 (4 no. 83); Louis Coulon, *Lexicon homericum*, 1643 (3 no. 20); Charles du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae graecitatis*, 1688 (6 no. 12).

<sup>22</sup> Pierre Bersuire, *Dictionarium* ed. Conrad Heinfogel, 1500 (8 no. 91); Robert Estienne, *Thesaurus latinae linguae*, 1536 (7 no. 59); Mario Nizolio, *Thesaurus Ciceronianus*, editions of 1563 (7 no. 45) and

of which include English (3, no. 24; 25, nos. 6 and 7); a geographical dictionary (8, no. 79); Schindler's *Lexicon pentaglotton* (9, no. 116); Franciscus Junius' edition of the Gothic version of the Gospels, with its Gothic glossary (10, no. 37); and the letters of Busbecq, with their Crimean Gothic wordlist (25, no. 5). These amount to more than half of the total. Of the dictionaries which register English words or were made in England, four are lists of place-names.<sup>23</sup> There are two copies of Symson's Greek dictionary (2, no. 44; 5 no. 6). Seven deal with historical material: Meric Casaubon's *De Quatuor Linguis*, in which the Old Dutch glossary by Somner appears (19, no. 243); Spelman's *Glossarium Archaiologicum* (27, no. 31); Verstegan's *Restitution* (32, no. 95); a *Works* of Chaucer with its glossary (42, no. 23); Somner's Anglo-Saxon dictionary (27, no. 36); and two copies of Skinner's etymologicon *Etymologicon* (7, no. 62; 27, no. 33). Two are specialized wordlists: Skene on old law terms (47, no. 94) and Ray on dialect (36, no. 206). There are copies of Minsheu's and Howell's polyglot dictionaries (43, no. 97, and 42, no. 64), of Minsheu's Spanish dictionary (43, no. 98), and of an edition of Torriano's Italian dictionary (44, no. 153). The only general dictionary of English is a copy of the fourth edition of Blount's *Glossographia* (48, no. 34). This is only one piece of evidence, and it is compromised by the fact that the catalogue has only a truncated listing of octavos and duodecimos in English, but it is suggestive. If this catalogue is to be trusted, the dictionaries circulating in seventeenth-century England were often of continental European origin, and the monoglot dictionaries of English which have often been privileged by historians of lexicography were an inconspicuous minority among them.

## 6. Acknowledgements and References

Some of my work on this collection was supported by a Standard Research Grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, for which I am most grateful. I am also grateful to the reading room staff of the British Library and the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and to the interlibrary loan staff of the University of Alberta library system. Jukka Tyrkkö introduced me to the British Book Trade Index, by the help of which the list of works cited which follows this introduction has been greatly improved. Monique Cormier and Rod McConchie kindly sent me copies of articles. The editors of other volumes of the *Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers* series, Christine Frantzen and Rod McConchie, shared their ideas with me in a number of very helpful email exchanges. Erika Gaffney of Ashgate Publishing has been generous in her support of the project, and unfailingly friendly and professional in her management of it. Ian Lancashire, its general editor, shared his useful bibliography of critical studies of pre-modern dictionaries at the beginning of the project, and has made many suggestions since. His database *Lexicons of Early Modern English* has been a valuable resource. Everyone who works on dictionaries in pre-1800 England owes a very great debt of gratitude to R.C. Alston, whose series of

---

1580 (18 no. 199); Sethus Calvisius, *Thesaurus latini sermonis* [1610 or 1666] (19 no. 240); Charles du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae latinitatis*, 1681 (6 no. 13).

<sup>23</sup> Spelman, *Villare anglicum*, [1656 or 1678] (47 no. 96); *Book of the Name of all Parishes ... in England and Wales*, [1657 or later] (30 no. 9); Thomas Gore, *Nomenclator geographicus*, 1667 (29 no. 24); *Index villaris angliae*, undated but 1680 or 1690 (sig. π2v, no. 55).

facsimiles *English Linguistics 1500–1800* is the most important primary research tool in the field, by no means superseded by online resources, just as his great bibliography is the most important secondary one.

## Works Cited

### *Pre-1800 Works*

- Aedler, Martin. *The High Dutch Minerva A-La-Mode*. London: [for the author], 1680. Wing H1961.
- Bathe, William. *Ianua linguarum, sive modus maxime accommodatus, quo patefit aditus ad omnes linguas intelligendas*. Trans. William Welde. London: excudebat H[umphrey] L[ownes], impensis Matthaei Lownes, 1615. STC 14466.
- Beck, Cave. *The Universal Character, by which All the Nations in the World May Understand One Another's Conceptions, Reading out of One Common Writing in their Own Mother Tongues*. London: printed by Tho[mas] Maxey for William Weekley, and are to be sold at his shop in Ipswich, 1657. Wing B1647.
- . *Le caractere universel par lequel toutes nations peuvent comprendre les conceptions l'une de l'autre en lisant par une esriture commune à toutes leur propre langage maternelle*. London: imprimé chez A Maxey for Guillaume Weekly, libraire en Ipswich, 1657. Wing B1646.
- Blankaart, Stephen. *A Physical Dictionary*. Trans. anon. London: J[ohn] D[arby] for J[ohn] Gellibrand, 1684. Wing B3164A.
- Blount, Thomas. *Glossographia, or, A Dictionary, Interpreting all Such Hard Words, Whether Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, French, Teutonic, Belgick, British, or Saxon, as are Now Used in our Refined English Tongue*. London: printed by Tho[mas] Newcomb, and are to be sold by Humphrey Moseley and George Sawbridge, 1656. Wing B3334.
- . *Glossographia, or, A Dictionary, Interpreting all Such Hard Words, of Whatsoever Language, Now Used in our Refined English Tongue*. 2nd ed. London: printed by Tho[mas] Newcomb for George Sawbridge, 1661. Wing B3335.
- . *Glossographia, or, A Dictionary, Interpreting the Hard Words, of Whatsoever Language, Now Used in our Refined English Tongue*. 3rd ed. London: printed by Tho[mas] Newcomb, and are to be sold by John Martyn, 1670. Wing B3336.
- . *Νομο-Λεξικον [Nomo-lexikon]: A Law-Dictionary*. London: Tho[mas] Newcomb for John Martin and Henry Herringman, 1670. Wing B3340.
- . *A World of Errors Discovered in The New World of Words, or General English Dictionary, and in Nomothetes*. London: T[homas] N[ewcomb] for Abel Roper, John Martin, and Henry Herringman, 1673. Wing B3345.
- Bobart, Jacob. *Catalogus plantarum horti medici oxoniensis sc. latino-anglicus, et anglico-latinus*. Oxford: excudebat Henricus Hall typographus academiae, 1648. Wing B3376.
- Bolton, Edmund. *Elements of Armories*. London: printed by George Eld, 1610. STC 3220.
- Boyer, Abel. *The Royal Dictionary, in Two Parts: First, French and English, Secondly, English and French*. London: for R[obert] Clavel, [et al.], 1699. Wing B3917.
- Bullokar, John. *An English Expositor; Teaching the Interpretation of the Hardest Words Vused in our Language*. London: printed by John Legatt, 1616. STC 4083.

- Camden, William. *Remaines of a Greater Worke, Concerning Britaine, the Inhabitants thereof, their Languages, Names, Surnames, Empreses, Wise speeches, Poësies, and Epitaphes*. London: G[eorge] E[ld] for Simon Waterson, 1605. STC 4521.
- A Catalogue of Valuable and Choice Books, being the Collections of a Person of Eminent Quality, and a Learned Divine Deceased*. London: sold at Howson's coffee-house [etc], 1699. Wing C1413.
- Cawdrey, Robert. *A Table Alphabeticall, Conteyning and Teaching the True Writing and Vnderstanding of Hard Vsuell English Wordes, Borrowed from the Hebrew, Greeke, Latine, or French*. London: I[ames] R[oberts] for Edmund Weauer, 1604. STC 4884.
- Cockeram, Henry. *The English Dictionarie, or; An Interpreter of Hard English Words*. London: printed [by Eliot's Court Press] for Nathaniel Butter, 1623. STC 5461.
- . *The English Dictionarie, or; An Interpreter of Hard English Words*. London: printed [by Eliot's Court Press] for Edmund Weauer, 1623. STC 5461.2.
- C[okayne], T[homas]. *An English–Greek Lexicon Containing the Derivations and Various Significations of All the Words in the New Testament, with a Compleat Alphabetical Table*. London: printed for Lodowick Lloyd, 1661. Wing C753.
- Coles, Elisha. *The Compleat English Schoolmaster; or, the Most Natural and Easie Method of Spelling English*. London: printed for Peter Parker, 1674. Wing C5067A.
- . *An English Dictionary: Explaining the Difficult Terms that are Used in Divinity, Husbandry, Physick, Phylosophy, Law, Navigation, Mathematicks, and Other Arts and Sciences*. London: printed for Samuel Crouch, 1676. Wing C5070.
- Coote, Edmund. *The English Schoole-Maister Teaching all his Scholers, the Order of Distinct Reading and True Writing our English Tongue*. London: printed by the widow Orwin for Ralph Iackson and Robert Dextar, 1596. STC 5711.
- Cotgrave, Randle. *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues*. London: printed by Adam Islip, 1611. STC 5830.
- , and Robert Sherwood. *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues, Whereunto is also Annexed a Most Copious Dictionarie, of the English Set before the French*. London: printed by Adam Islip, 1632. STC 5831.
- Cowell, John. *The Interpreter, or, Booke Containing the Signification of Words*. Cambridge: printed by John Legate, 1607. STC 5900.
- . *The Interpreter, or, Booke Containing the Signification of Words*. London: [Augustine Mathewes] for William Sheares, 1637. STC 5901.
- . *The Interpreter, or, Booke Containing the Signification of Words*. London: [R[ichard] Hodgkinson] for William Sheares, 1637. STC 5902.
- . *The Interpreter, or, Book Containing the Signification of Words*. London: printed by F[rancis] Leach, and are to be sold by Hen[ry] Twyford [et al.], 1658. Wing C6644.
- Dalgarno, George. *Ars signorum, vulgo character universalis et lingua philosophica*. London: excudebat J[ohn] Hayes, sumptibus authoris, 1661. Wing D128.
- Davies, John. *Antiquae linguae britannicae ... et linguae latinae dictionarium duplex*. London: in aedibus R[oberti] Young, impensis Joan[is] Davies, 1632. STC 6347.
- Dekker, Thomas. *Lanthorne and Candle-Light, or; The Bell-Mans Second Nights-Walke*. London: printed [by George Eld] for John Busby, 1608. STC 6485.
- Den grooten vocabulaer Engels ende Duyts: dat zijn ghemeyne spraken op alderhande manieren, oock brieven ende obligatien te schrijven, met eenen dictionarium, ende de conjugatie. / The great*

- vocabuler, in English and Dutch: that is to say common speaches of all sorts, also lettres and obligations to write, with a dictionarie and the conjugation.* Rotterdam: by Pieter van Waes-berge, 1639. STC 24869.
- E., B. *A New Dictionary of the Terms Ancient and Modern of the Canting Crew.* London: printed for W[illiam] Hawes, P[ercival] Gilbourne, and W[illiam] Davis, [1699?]. Wing E4.
- Ellis, Tobias. *The English School, Containing a Catalogue of All the Words in the Bible.* 5th ed. London: printed by John Darby for the author, 1680. Wing E607.
- Ercker, Lazarus, and Sir John Pettus. *Fleta minor: The Laws of Art and Nature, in Knowing, Judging, Assaying, Fining, Refining and Inlarging the Bodies of Confin'd Metals, in two parts: The First Contains Assays of Lazarus Erckern; the Second Contains Essays on Metallick Words, as a Dictionary to Many Pleasing Discourses.* London: printed for the author, by Thomas Dawks, 1683. Wing P1906.
- Florio, John. *A Worlde of Wordes, or, Most Copious and Exact Dictionarie in Italian and English.* London: printed by Arnold Hatfield for Edward Blount, 1598. STC 11098.
- . *Queen Anna's New World of Words, Or, Dictionarie of the Italian and English Tongues.* London: Melch[ior] Bradwood [and William Stansby] for Edw[ard] Blount and William Barret, 1611. STC 11099.
- . *Vocabolario Italiano e Inglese: A Dictionary Italian and English.* Revised and enlarged by Giovanni Torriano. London: T[homas] Warren for Jo[hn] Martin [et al.], 1659. Wing F1368.
- Gabelkover, Oswald. *The Boock of Physicke.* Trans. [via a Dutch version of the original German] A. M. Dordrecht: Isaack Gaen, 1599. STC 11513.
- Gibbon, John. *Introductio ad latinam blasoniam: An Essay to a More Correct Blason in Latine than Formerly Hath Been Used.* London: J[ohn] M[acock] for the author, 1682. Wing G650.
- Gil, Alexander. *Logonomia anglica.* London: excudit Iohannes Beale, 1619. STC 11873.
- . *Logonomia anglica.* 2nd ed. London: excudit Iohannes Beale, 1621. STC 11874.
- Greenwood, James. *Essay Towards a Practical English Grammar.* London: printed by R[obert] Tookey, and are sold by Samuel Keeble [et al.], 1711.
- Hatton, Edward. *The Merchant's Magazine.* London: J[ohn] Heptinstall for Chr[istopher] Coningsby, 1697. Wing H1148.
- Head, Richard. *The Canting Academy ... to which is added a Complete Canting-Dictionary.* London: F[rancis] Leach for Mat[thew] Drew, 1673. Wing H1243.
- Henisch, Georg. *Teutsche Sprach vnd Weißheit / Thesaurus linguae et sapientiae germanicae.* Augsburg: typis Davidis Franci, 1616.
- Hexham, Henry. *A Copious English and Netherduytch Dictionarie Composed out of our Best English Authours.* 2 vols. Rotterdam: gedrukt by Aernout Leers, 1647–8. Wing H 1648, H1653.
- Hickes, George. *Institutiones grammaticae anglo-saxonicae et moeso-gothicae.* Oxford: e theatro Sheldoniano, 1689.
- The History of the Works of the Learned, or, An Impartial Account of Books Lately Printed in All Parts of Europe, With A Particular Relation of the State of Learning in Each Country.* Vol. 1. London: printed for H[enry] Rhodes, J[ohn] Harris, T[homas] Bennet, A[ndrew] Bell, D[aniel] Midwinter, and T[homas] Leigh, 1699.
- Holme, Randle. *The Academy of Armory, or, A Storehouse of Armory and Blazon Containing the Several Variety of Created Beings, and how Born in Coats of Arms, both Foreign and Domestick, with the Instruments Used in All Trades and Sciences, together with their Terms of Art; also the Etymologies,*

- Definitions, and Historical Observations on the Same, Explicated and Explained According to our Modern Language.* Chester: printed for the Author, 1688. Wing H2513.
- Howell, James. *Lexicon tetraglotton: An English–French–Italian–Spanish Dictionary.* London: printed by J[ohn] G[rismond] for Samuel Thomson [et al., in various issues], 1660. Wing H3088.
- Jones, Thomas. *The British Language in its Lustre, or, a Copious Dictionary of Welsh and English / Y Gymraeg yn ei disgleirdeb, neu helaeth eir-lyfr cymraeg a saesnaeg.* London: sold by Lawrence Baskerville and John Marsh, 1688. Wing J997.
- Junius, Franciscus. *Etymologicum anglicanum.* Ed. Edward Lye. Oxford: e teatro Sheldoniano, 1743.
- Kersey, John. *A New English Dictionary, or, Compleat Collection Of the Most Proper and Significant Words, Commonly used in the Language, With a Short and Clear Exposition of Difficult Words and Terms of Art.* London: printed for Henry Bonwicke and Robert Knaplock, 1702.
- The Ladies Dictionary, Being a General Entertainment of the Fair-Sex, a Work Never Attempted Before in English.* London: printed for John Dunton, 1694. Wing H99.
- La Molliere, [Étienne Amar?] de. *A Portuguez Grammar, or, Rules Shewing the True and Perfect Way to Learn the Said Language.* London: Da[vid] Maxwel for Samuel Brown, 1662. Wing L297A.
- Leigh, Edward. *A Philologicall Commentary, or, An Illustration of the most Obvious and Usefull Words in the Law.* London: T[homas] Mabb for Charles Adams, 1652. Wing L997.
- Lightbody, James. *The Mariners Jewel, or, A Pocket Companion for the Ingenious, Being of More General Use for Officers, Seamen, Carpenters, Boatswains, Pursers, and Stewards, then Any Thing yet published: Containing an Alphabetical Dictionary of all the Naval Terms [etc.].* London: printed for Robert Whitledge, and sold by Alexamder Sims, 1695. Wing L2049A.
- Lloyd, Nicholas, ed. *Dictionarium historicum, geographicum, poeticum, authore Carolo Stephano, editio novissima.* Oxford: ex officina Guilielmi Hall, impensis ejusdem & Guilielmi Downing, prostant venales apud Joh[annem] Williams, 1670.
- Lodwick, Francis. *A Common Writing.* London: printed for the author, 1647. Wing L2814.
- Manley, Thomas. Νομοθετης: *The Interpreter, Containing the Genuine Signification of such Obscure Words and Terms Used either in the Common or Statute Lawes of this Realm.* London: printed by J[ohn] Streater for H[enry] Twyford [et al.], 1672. Wing C6645.
- Manlove, Edward. *The Liberties and Customes of the Lead-Mines Within the Wapentake of Wirksworth in the County of Derby.* London: [s.n.], 1653. Wing M453.
- Mainwaring, Sir Henry. *The Sea-Mans Dictionary, or, An Exposition and Demonstration of all the Parts and Things Belonging to a Shippe, Together with an Explanation of all the Termes and Phrases used in the Practique of Navigation.* London: printed by G. M. [George Miller?] for John Bellamy, 1644. Wing M551.
- Megiser, Hieronymus. *Thesaurus polyglottus vel dictionarium multilingue.* Frankfurt am Main: [Joachim Brathering?] sumptibus authoris, 1603.
- Meriton, George. *The Praise of York-Shire Ale, to which is Added a York-Shire Dialogue, and after All, a Clavis Explaining the Meaning of All the York-Shire Words in the Dialogue.* York: J[ohn] White for Francis Hildyard, 1684–5. 79–113 [really 115]. Wing M1809.
- Miège, Guy. *The Great French Dictionary in Two Parts: The First, French and English, the Second English and French.* London: J[ohn] Redmayne for Thomas Basset, 1687–8. Wing M2012.
- [—.] *Impartial Animadversions upon Monsieur Boyer's Royal Dictionary, Exposing Plainly the Injustice of his Attempt, and Weakness of his Performance.* [London: for the author, 1699.]

- . *A New Dictionary French and English with another English and French, According to the Present Use and Modern Orthography of the French*. London: printed by Tho[mas] Dawks, for Thomas Basset, 1677. Wing M2016.
- . *A New Dictionary French and English with another English and French, According to the Present Use and Modern Orthography of the French, to which is added, a Collection of Barbarous French, or, of Obsolete, Provincial, Mis-Spelt, and Made Words for the Satisfaction of Such as Read Old French Authors*. London: printed for Thomas Basset, 1679. Wing M2017. [What may be a separate issue of “Dictionary of Barbarous French” is also entered as Wing C6373.]
- . *A Short Dictionary English and French, with Another French and English, According to the Present Use and Modern Orthography*. London: printed for Tho[mas] Basset, 1684. Wing M2026.
- Minsheu, John. Ἡγημῶν εἰς τὰς γλώσσας; *id est, Ductor in linguas, the Guide into Tongues*. London: [printed by William Stansby and Eliot’s Court Press], to be sold at John Brownes shop, 1617. STC 17944.
- Morgan, Sylvanus. *Armilogia, sive ars chromocritica: The Language of Arms by the Colours and Metals*. London: printed by T[homas] Hewer for Nathaniel Brook and Henry Eversden, 1666. Wing M2738.
- Moxon, Joseph. *Mathematicks Made Easy, or, A Mathematical Dictionary Explaining the Terms of Art and Difficult Phrases Used in Arithmetick, Geometry, Astronomy, Astrology, and Other Mathematical Sciences wherein the True Meaning of the Word is Rendred, the Nature of Things Signified Discussed, and (where Need Requires) Illustrated with Apt Figures and Diagrams*. London: printed for J[oseph] Moxon, 1677. Wing M3006.
- Mechanick Exercises, or, The Doctrine of Handy-Works*. 2 vols. London: printed for Joseph Moxon, 1677–80 and 1683–84. Wing M3013–14.
- Nicot, Jean. *Thresor de la langue francoyse, tant ancienne que moderne*. Paris: chez David Douceur, 1606.
- Ó Cléirigh, Míchél (Michael O’Clery). *Foclóir nó sanasán nua*. Louvain: [s.n.], 1643. Wing O128B.
- Owen, Lewis. *The Key of the Spanish Tongue*. London: imprinted by T[homas] C[reede] for W[illiam] Welby, 1605. STC 18995.
- Paravicino, Pietro. *A Short Italian Dictionary, Expounded Into English*. London: printed for Thomas Clark, 1666. Wing P344.
- Pettus, Sir John. *Fodinae regales, or, The History, Laws, and Places of the Chief Mines and Mineral Works in England, Wales, and the English Pale in Ireland, as also of the Mint and Mony, with a Clavis Explaining Some Difficult Words Relating to Mines, &c.* London: printed by H.L. & R.B. for Thomas Basset, 1670. Wing P1908.
- Phillips, Edward. *The New World of English Words: or, A General Dictionary*. London: printed by E[van] Tyler for Nathaniel Brooke, 1658. Wing P2068.
- . *The New World of English Words: or, A General English Dictionary*. London: printed by W R for Obadiah Blagrove, 1678. 4th ed. Wing P2072.
- “Philomusus.” *The Academy of Complements, wherein Ladyes, Gentlewomen, Schollers, and Strangers May Accomodate their Courtly Practice with Most Curious Ceremonies, Complementall, Amorous, High expressions, and Formes of Speaking, or Writing; with Additions of Witty Amorous Poems and a Table Expounding the Hard English Words*. 2nd ed. London: printed by T[homas] B[adger] for H[umphrey] Mosley, 1640. STC 19883.

- A Physical Dictionary, or, An Interpretation of such Crabbed Words and Terms of Arts, as are Deriv'd from the Greek or Latin, and Used in Physick, Anatomy, Chirurgery, and Chymistry.* London: printed by G[ertrude] D[awson] for John Garfield, 1657. Wing P2143.
- Poole, Jos[h]ua. *The English Parnassus, or, A Helpe to English Poesie.* London: printed for Tho[mas] Johnson, 1657. Wing P2815.
- Ray, John. *A Collection of English Words not Generally Used, with their Significations and Original in Two Alphabetical Catalogues, the One of Such as are Proper to the Northern, the Other to the Southern Counties.* London: printed by H[enry] Bruges for Tho[mas] Barrell, 1674. Wing R388.
- . *A Collection of English Words not Generally Used, with their Significations and Original in Two Alphabetical Catalogues, the One of Such as are Proper to the Northern, the Other to the Southern Counties.* 2nd edn. London: printed for Christopher Wilkinson, 1691. Wing R389.
- Rid, Samuel. *Martin Mark-All, Beadle of Bridewell, his Defence and Answere to the Belman of London*. London: printed [by John Windet] for Iohn Budge and Richard Bonian, 1610. STC 21028.5.
- Rivière, Lazare. *The Practice of Physick, in Seventeen Several Books; with these Books is bound a Physical Dictionary, Explaining Hard Words Used in these Books and Others.* Trans. Nicholas Culpeper, Abdiah Cole, and William Rowland. London: printed by Peter Cole, and are to be sold at his shop, 1655. Wing D1559.
- Sandivogius, Michael, et al. *A New Light of Alchymie, to which is Added a Treatise of Sulphur; Also Nine Books of the Nature of Things, Written by Paracelsus; Also a Chymicall Dictionary Explaining Hard Places and Words met Withall in the Writings of Paracelsus, and Other Obscure Authors.* London: printed by Richard Cotes, for Thomas Williams, 1650. Wing S2506.
- Scheffer, Johannes. *The History of Lapland, Wherein are Shewed the Original, Manners, Habits, Marriages, Conjurations, &c. of that People.* Trans. Acton Cremer. Oxford: printed at the Theater, and are to be sold by George West and Amos Curtein, 1674. Wing S851.
- Sewel, Willem. *A New Dictionary English and Dutch wherein the Words are Rightly Interpreted, and their Various Significations Exactly Noted. / Nieuw woordenboek der Engelsche en Nederduytsche taale, waar in de woorden eygentlyk vertaald, en de verscheydenereyete betekenissen der zelve naauwkeuriglyk aangerweezen zyn.* Amsterdam: by de Weduwe van Steven Swart, 1691. Wing S2825.
- Skinner, Stephen. *Etymologicon linguae anglicanae, seu, explicatio vocum anglicarum etymologica ex propriis fontibus.* Ed. Thomas Henshaw. London: typis T[homas] Roycroft, et prostant venales apud H[enry] Brome, R[obert] Clavel, B[enjamin] Tooke, et T[homas] Sawbridge, 1671. Wing S3947.
- . *Gazophylacium anglicanum.* Ed. and trans. Richard Hogarth. London: E. H. and W. H. for Randall Taylor, 1689. Wing G426.
- Smith, John. *An Accidence, or, The Path-way to Experience, Necessary for all Young Sea-Men, or those that are Desirous to Goe to Sea, Briefly Shewing the Phrases, Offices, and Words of Command, Belonging to the Building, Ridging, and Sayling a Man of Warre, and how to Manage a Fight at Sea.* London: printed [by Nicholas Okes] for Ionas Man, and Benjamin Fisher, 1626. STC 22784.
- . *A Sea Grammar, with the Plaine Exposition of Smiths Accidence for Young Sea-Men, Enlarged.* London: printed by John Hauiland, 1627. STC 22794.
- Somner, William. *Dictionarium saxonico-latino-anglicum.* Oxford: excudebat Guliel[mus] Hall, pro autore, prostant Londini, apud Danielem White, 1659.

- Speght, Thomas. "The Old and Obscure Words in Chaucer Explained." *The Workes of our Ancient and Learned English Poet, Geffrey Chaucer*. London: printed by Adam Islip, 1598. Sigs Ttt1r– Uuu6r. STC 5080.
- Spelman, Sir Henry, comp. *Villare anglicum, or, A View of the Townes of England*. London: printed by R[ichard] Hodgkinsonne, 1656. Wing S4932.
- Urquhart, Sir Thomas. *Εκσκυβαλιουρον, or, The Discovery of a Most Exquisite Jewel, More Precious then Diamonds In chased in Gold*. London: printed for Ja[mes] Cotterel, and are to be sold by Rich[ard] Baddely, 1652. Wing U134.
- Van Heldoren, Johannes Gosens. *An English and Nether-Dutch Dictionary, Composed out of the Best English Authors, with a Most Natural and Easie Method of Spelling English, According to the Present Proper Pronunciation of the Language in Oxford and London / Een Engels en Nederduits woortboek, by een gevoegt uyt de beste Engelse schryvers, met een natuurlijk en gemaklijk berigt om Engels te spellen, over een komende met de tegenwoordige uytspreek der taal in Oxford en Londen*. Amsterdam: gedrukt by de weduwe Mercy Bruyning, 1675. Wing H1372A.
- Verstegan, Richard. *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence in Antiquities Concerning the Most Noble and Renowned English Nation*. Antwerp: printed by Robert Bruney, and to be sold at London by Iohn Norton and Iohn Bill, 1605. STC 21361.
- Villiers, Jacob. *Vocabularium analogicum, or, The English Man Speaking French, and the French Man Speaking English, Plainly Shewing the Nearness or Affinity Betwixt the English, French, and Latin, Alphabetically Digested*. London: printed by J. D. for Jonathan Robinson and George Wells, 1680. Wing V392.
- Vindex Anglicus, or, The Perfections of the English Language, Defended, and Asserted*. [Oxford: Henry Hall], 1644. Wing V461.
- Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca*. Venice: appresso Giovanni Alberti, 1612.
- Wafer, Lionel. *A New Voyage and Description of the Isthmus of America, Giving an Account of the Author's Abode there, the Form and Make of the Country ... the Indian Inhabitants, their Features, Complexion, &c., their Manners, Customs, Employments, Marriages, Feasts, Hunting, Computation, Language, etc*. London: printed for James Knapton, 1699. Wing W193.
- Wallace, James. *A Description of the Isles of Orkney*. Edinburgh: printed by John Reid, 1693. Wing W492.
- Warner, Kristof. A & Ω: *Gazophylacium decem linguarum europaearum apertum / Das ist: Neu-eröffneter Schatz-Kasten der fühnehmsten zehen Sprachen in Europa*. Košice: excudebat Johannes Klein, 1691.
- Wilkins, John. *An Essay towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language*. London: printed for Sa[muel] Gellibrand and for John Martyn, printer to the Royal Society, 1668. Wing W2196.
- Wilson, Sir Thomas. *The Arte of Rhetorique for the Vse of All Suche as are Studious of Eloquence*. [London] : Richardus Graftonus, typographus regius, excudebat, 1553. STC 25799.
- Wilson, Thomas. *Christian Dictionarie, Opening the Signification of the Chiefe Wordes Dispersed Generally through Holie Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, Tending to Increase Christian Knowledge*. London: printed by W[illiam] Iaggard, 1612. STC 25786.
- Wood, Anthony. *Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of all the Writers and Bishops who have had their Education in the most Ancient and Famous University of Oxford, from ... 1500 to the End of the Year 1690*. 2 vols. London: printed for Tho[mas] Bennet, 1691–92.