

Jurebassos and Linguists: The East India Company and Early Modern English Words for ‘Interpreter’

Samuli Kaislaniemi
University of Helsinki

1. Introduction¹

This paper is a pilot study with two aims: to illustrate the value of the records of the English East India Company for historical linguistics, and to investigate the lexical field of ‘interpreter’ in Early Modern English.

The foundation of the English East India Company (henceforth EIC) in 1600 led to rapidly increasing contacts between England and the East Indies.² The EIC left behind a formidable archive of manuscripts and printed records,³ documenting over 250 years of language contact between English and maritime Asian languages. Considerable portions of the EIC archives — particularly the 17th-century correspondence — have been edited and published in print editions, with new editions appearing to the present day. Joseph Moran’s review of one recent edition, *The English Factory in Japan, 1613–1623* (Farrington 1991), ends with the following comment:

The [*English Factory in Japan*] will be of interest to a wide audience. ... [T]his is an archive which can be mined for information by specialists in various disciplines, for example (now that the documents are available in their original form and spelling) in linguistics. (Moran 1992: 401)

Yet Moran may have been overly optimistic since, as far as I am aware, I am the first to actually “mine” this particular source for linguistic information (see also Kaislaniemi forthcoming). What is more, the only linguistic study making extensive use of EIC sources that I have been able to discover is Minagawa (1974) — which was conducted twenty years before Farrington’s edition came out. This is particularly curious given that texts documenting early English contacts with Asia (and Oceania) can be used to gain valuable insights into language contact situations, as demonstrated by an excellent article on Captain Cook’s voyages by Douglas Gray (1998). Fortunately, there are some studies by historians on the EIC and language, such as Majeed (1995) on the EIC and jargon in 19th-century India, and the discussion of early EIC employees and multilingualism in James Lewis’s doctoral thesis (2004: 104–148). But while the vast EIC archives would be perfectly suited to a topic such as the history of Anglo-Indian linguistic contacts, even such an obvious study remains to be done.

This present paper, then, uses records of the early EIC to look at whether and how the lexis of early EIC employees differed from “normal” Early Modern English. The focus of this study is on Early Modern English words for ‘interpreter’, that is, words used in the following sense:

¹ The research reported here was supported by the Research Unit for Variation, Contacts and Change in English at the Department of English, University of Helsinki. I would also like to thank the Centre for Editing Lives and Letters at Queen Mary, University of London, for access to the full-text version of EEBO, and Teo Juvonen and my anonymous reviewer for their invaluable comments and suggestions for this paper.

² The “East Indies” had vague borders, but usually referred to all of South, South-East and East Asia.

³ The India Office Records at the British Library contain more than 14 shelf kilometres of both published and unpublished works spanning the years 1600–1948 (<http://www.bl.uk/reshelp/findhelpregion/asia/india/indiaofficerecords/indiaofficescope/indiaofficehistoryscope.html>).

- (1) One who translates the communications of persons speaking different languages; spec. one whose office it is to do so orally in the presence of the persons; a dragoman.
(OED, s.v. interpreter 2 b)⁴

In the early 17th century, English did not have a general word for the job category described in the definition above. Instead, a range of near-synonyms existed, some of which had restricted spheres of usage. Since international commerce was multilingual, the use of interpreters was essential, and the fact that Early Modern English did not have a *single* word for ‘interpreter’ led early EIC employees to use several. Of the various words they used to refer to these interpreters, two stand out: *jurebasso*, a borrowing from Malay, is the most common word for ‘interpreter’ in the EIC texts studied in this paper; the native English word *linguist*, on the other hand, gains the new sense of ‘interpreter’ in EIC usage during this period. Neither word seems to have been used for ‘interpreter’ in Early Modern English beyond the circles of the East India Company.

2. Materials and methods

This study looks at Early Modern English words for ‘interpreter’ broadly in the period 1500–1700, but with a focus on the early East India Company, partly since 1600–1640 was the period of its greatest expansion. The first step in investigating the lexical field of ‘interpreter’ was to use the *Historical Thesaurus of English* (HTE) to chart its EModE synonyms. Their definitions were then looked up in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) and the Anglo-Indian dictionary *Hobson-Jobson* (Yule & Burnell 1903). These definitions were then compared to those given in contemporary dictionaries, accessed via the *Lexicons of Early Modern English* (LEME). Finally, dictionary evidence was compared to historical usage in EIC sources and in comparable contemporary material found in the full-text version of *Early English Books Online* (EEBO).

The method used was recursive, in that dictionary evidence and the results of word searches inspired new searches and each affected the interpretation of the other.

2.1. Dictionaries

Both the headwords and the quotations of the dictionaries were searched for occurrences of the relevant words. This was felt to give more indication of contemporary usage and a greater understanding of the search words than reliance on headwords alone, especially in the case of LEME. Most of the early evidence in LEME comes from bilingual dictionaries.

2.2. The East India Company material

In terms of authenticity and accuracy of transcription, the best EIC source used in this study was the Factory collection in the *Supplement to the Corpus of Early English Correspondence* (CEEC). This collection contains 220 letters from *English Factory in Japan, 1613–1623* (Farrington 1991), a printed edition of the 401 surviving documents relating to the EIC factory in Japan. However, this collection alone was too small for the purposes of this study, so it was supplemented with other digitised EIC-related material available online. I found this material to be of two kinds.

A number of copyright-free (or expired) editions of EIC material are held in the *Internet Archive*. A selection of texts related to the Factory collection (being from the same period, and/or including some of the same writers) were chosen: the *Journal of James Lancaster &c.* (in two editions: Markham 1877 and Foster 1940), the *Journal of John Jourdain* (Foster 1905), the *Log-book of William Adams with the Journal of Edward Saris* (Purnell 1916), and the *Calendars of Court Minutes of the East India Company*. The journals and log-book cover the period 1591 to 1619; the court minutes span 1635 to 1649. I downloaded plain text versions of all of these and searched them with WordSmith Tools (Scott 2008).

The other source for EIC material that I used was the *Calendars of State Papers, Colonial* (CSPC)

⁴ In this paper, ‘interpreter’, in single quotes, refers to this sense; *interpreter* in italics to the lexical item.

on the *British History Online* website. The calendars largely consist of letters, but also include EIC court minutes and other documents. I searched six volumes of the CSPC covering the time period 1513–1660 using the search engine on the website.

2.3. *The comparative material: Early English Books Online*

The findings from the EIC material were compared with more general contemporary usage. My initial plan was to use several EModE corpora, but I soon discovered that only the full-text version of *Early English Books Online* (EEBO) was large enough to produce more than a few scattered hits. The full-text version of EEBO, comprising 14,949 texts, was searched for all the search words using the site's search engine.

2.4. *Problems with the sources*

Since, as a rule, and especially in the case of infrequent items, lexical studies require extensive source materials to search through, a large corpus was required. Unfortunately, while significant portions of the extant early documents of the EIC have been edited and published in printed editions,⁵ a large corpus of digitised EIC material does not exist. Lacking more suitable sources, there was little alternative but to make the best of these admittedly imperfect resources. Aside from the Factory collection, they all had several faults.

For the EIC journals, the plain text versions of the texts downloaded from the *Internet Archive* were unproofread outputs of OCR programmes, and therefore the results of word searches of them contain errors and omissions. This was remedied by searching two different text versions (when available) and comparing the results. A more difficult question is the reliability of the printed editions. Without comparing the editions to the original manuscripts, the authenticity of the texts printed in the editions remains uncertain.

Authenticity is even a greater concern for the calendared material.⁶ First, like the EIC journals, the accuracy of the transcripts in the calendars is uncertain. Secondly, most of the material is paraphrased, and some modernised. Thirdly, since the original documents are rarely given in full, search results are skewed by the choices made by the editors as to what to include in the transcripts, be they excerpted or complete. However, the convenience of having the CSPC available free online with a search engine that accepts wildcards is greater than the unreliability of the sources (the calendars are, after all, only meant to be aids for finding the sources). In the end, despite these problems, the EIC sources were found to be adequate for the purposes of this pilot study.

EEBO presented different kinds of problems. The first was repetition: even among the 15% of the works in EEBO which are available as full-text versions, there are different editions (and translations) of the same work, as well as compendia containing earlier smaller works. In other words, the same texts appear in multiple copies, and word-search results are bloated. Ideally, all search results in EEBO would be sorted according to different works or titles, culling different editions of the same books. Yet sorting is precisely the other problem: search results in EEBO are presented in a rather clumsy way, and investigation of all the hits for a searchword can be a time-consuming process — especially if the results are in the thousands. At present there is no way around this problem and, as EEBO does not aim to be a linguistic corpus, it is unlikely to provide concordance engines in the near future.

However, as a resource for investigating EModE lexis, the sheer size of EEBO makes it peerless. Even the recurrence of texts is not necessarily a problem: the existence of multiple copies of works is a fair representation of the corpus of texts in the Early Modern period.⁷ Since this study investigated EIC-related texts as a subset of EModE texts in general, the inclusion of some EIC material in the corpus of comparative material merely made this corpus more representative.

⁵ One list can be seen at <http://web.archive.org/web/20070917202817/http://www.bl.uk/collections/iorreadg.html>.

⁶ The CSPC volumes used in this study were compiled in the late 19th century; the *Calendars of Court Minutes of the East India Company* were compiled in the early 20th century. For more on the compilation principles of the calendars, see, i.a., the CSPC prefaces at *British History Online*, and Krueger (2006).

⁷ Strictly speaking, since EEBO is based on the *Short Title Catalogue* (STC), it can really only be representative of the corpus of EModE printed books which has survived to the present day, as listed in the STC.

3. Early Modern English words for ‘interpreter’

[I]nterpreting has long been practiced in various regions and periods in history with at least some degree of remuneration, legal standards or special know-how, if not training. On the whole, however, it has not been associated with a fixed (professional) status and ‘job definition’. In a longstanding tradition, a distinction can be made between culturally hybrid ‘dragomans’, serving as local intermediaries in a variety of roles (including those of guide, adviser, trader, messenger, spy or negotiator), and the nation’s own trusted ‘interpreter-secretaries’ involved in the conduct of its affairs of state. (Pöchhacker 2004: 28)

A proper history of interpreters would have to take into account all the “roles” that interpreters “serve in” besides ‘interpreting’, and there are undoubtedly many more one could add to those listed by Pöchhacker. Unfortunately, it is beyond the scope of this paper to trace any of them. But Pöchhacker’s comments on the ambiguity of what exactly the job description of an interpreter was are nicely reflected by the range of synonyms for ‘interpreter’ in English, as we will see in the next section.

3.1. Dictionary evidence: Words for ‘interpreter’

The *Historical Thesaurus of English* (HTE) draws its data from the OED. However, data from the two sources should not be treated as equivalent, as the dates of attestation in the HTE do not always match those in the OED.⁸ The following list of synonyms for ‘interpreter’, together with the periods of their use in English, is taken from the HTE (“Synonyms in category 02.01.10.02.03.03./ 12. ... - n - (.interpreter)”). The list has been cropped to only those words occurring c. 1500–1700.

(2) latimer	OE – 1480
meaner	1387 – 1525
dragoman	<i>a</i> 1400 – [still current]
interpretator	1432/50 – 1621
truchman	1485 – <i>a</i> 1680 – [gap] – 1888
spokesman	1519 – 1556
interpreter	1531 – [still current]
turciman	1562
interpret	1585
decipherer	1587
turgman	1615
trenchman	1632 – 1879
linguister	<i>a</i> 1649 – [still current]
turgeman	1670 – [gap] – 1864
terjiman	1682
renderer	<i>a</i> 1691 – [still current]
dubash	1698 – 1845 – [still current?]
linguist	1711 – 1882

Word searches revealed that nine of these 18 words do not appear in either the EIC material or EEBO in the sense ‘interpreter’, and thus they are not included in the present study. I also found that none of these lexical items — with the notable exception of the polysemous *interpreter* — were very frequent, and therefore decided to lump together *truchman* with five variants borrowed later from the same ultimate source, namely *turciman*, *turgman*, *trenchman*, *turgeman* and *terjiman*. This seemed particularly sensible in the light of Early Modern English spelling variation.⁹

The list given by HTE is not exhaustive, and searches were also made for *translator*, *tongue*, *tongue(s)man*, *language(r)* and *thargum*. However, none of these words were found in the EIC material

⁸ I am not certain why this is, although it may be due to the strict(er) semantic taxonomy imposed on the OED data by the compilers of the HTE. See the HTE website(s), and also Kay (2000).

⁹ Naturally, spelling variation was taken into account when searching the material for this study.

or EEBO in the sense of ‘interpreter’ for the time period in question.¹⁰

The resulting shortlist of the main words for ‘interpreter’ in Early Modern English c. 1500–1700, with the years of their first attestations in this sense (as given by HTE), is limited to just four words:

(3) Dragoman	a1400
Truchman	1485
Interpreter	1531
Linguist	1711

These words have slightly differing meanings and connotations; the following brief definitions, including senses other than ‘interpreter’, are taken from the OED:

(4) **Dragoman**. “An interpreter; strictly applied to a man who acts as guide and interpreter in countries where Arabic, Turkish, or Persian is spoken.” Also used in a transferred sense after 1690.

Truchman. “An interpreter.” Also used figuratively.

Interpreter. The primary senses are 1) “one who interprets or explains”, 2) “one who translates languages”, and 3) “one who makes known the will of another”.

Linguist. The senses given are 1) “One who is skilled in [foreign] languages”, 2) “a student of language”, 3) “an interpreter” (post 1711), and 4) “a master [user] of language”.

Thus, according to the OED, *dragoman* was regionally restricted and *linguist* was not used in the sense of ‘interpreter’ until the eighteenth century. Therefore, in England c. 1600, the likeliest words for ‘interpreter’ were limited to *truchman* and *interpreter*. Of these two, *interpreter* was the more polysemous; although the OED defines *truchman* as simply “interpreter”, it seems to suggest that it was not used in as many senses as *interpreter*.

The *Hobson-Jobson* has entries for two of the words in the above list: *dragoman* (s.v. *druggerman*) and *linguist*. It discusses *truchman* in the same entry as *dragoman*, pointing out their shared etymology back to Arabic *tarjumān*, Aramaic *targemān* and Greek *δραγοῦμανος*. Its discussion of them has little to add to the present paper, however, as most of the quotations are from non-English sources. Its definition of *linguist*, on the other hand, is worth reproducing here (*Hobson-Jobson*, s.v. *linguist*):

(5) LINGUIST, s.

An old word for an interpreter, formerly much used in the East. It long survived in China, and is there perhaps not yet obsolete. Probably adopted from the Port. *lingua*, used for an interpreter.

The first two quotations following this definition are duly from a 1554 Portuguese source; the third is from EIC material from 1612, but the fourth jumps to 1700, leaving the EIC quotation unsupported by further 17th-century evidence. It should in any case be noted that the 1612 quotation antedates the earliest attestation given in the OED by a century. I will return to the possibility of Portuguese influence below.

Definitions in contemporary dictionaries are much less specific than those in the OED or the *Hobson-Jobson*, showing more clearly how complex the lexical field of ‘interpreter’ was, but making it harder to determine when the sense ‘interpreter’ is meant. The first monolingual dictionary entries for our searchwords in LEME are reproduced below.

(6) **interpreter** expounder.

linguist skilfull in tongues.

(Edmund Coote, 1596, *The English School-master*)

¹⁰ Actually, *language* in the sense ‘interpreter’ is found in the EIC material in two letters by William Adams: “langwiges that can speak the Corea and Tartar language” (Farrington 1991: 107) and “in Jappan heer is languagees for Corea and Tartors” (Farrington 1991: 112). However, the OED notes these instances as “plural, transmission error” (s.v. *language*). Since Adams’s English is quite idiosyncratic, *language(r)* was left out of the present paper.

- (7) **interpreter**, expounder
trucheman, an interpreter
 (Robert Cawdrey, 1604, *A Table Alphabetical*)
- (8) **Drogoman** (or **Draguman**) an Interpreter or Truchman, the word is used by the Turks from the Gr. δραγόμενος: The Fr. write it Drogueman. See Truchman.
Truch man or **Teriuman** (Fr. Trucheman, Spa. Truchaman or Truiaman; Ital. Torcimanno) an interpreter, a drogoman.
 (Thomas Blount, 1656, *Glossographia or a Dictionary*)

These definitions are frustratingly short, and it is impossible to say whether *interpreter* and *truchman* in examples (6) and (7) are meant in the sense of ‘interpreter’ or not. The definition of *dragoman* in example (8), on the other hand, while not explicit, at least does suggest it is not meant here as ‘guide’, the other primary sense of the word. In any case, one must look to bilingual dictionaries for more explicit definitions (as well as earlier ones, although we are here only concerned with the earliest instances of the searchwords in the sense of ‘interpreter’). These are usually found in definitions of other headwords, as seen in the next examples.

- (9) **Wealhstod**. An interpretour, a trusshman. He that interpreteth betwix two of sundrie languages. (Laurence Nowell, ca 1567, *Vocabularium Saxonicum*)
- (10) **Internuntius**, tij, m.g. A messenger or meane betweene two parties, a truchman.
Interpres, ĕtis, adiect. An interpretour, expounder, or declarer: a translator: one that is vsed to expound a strange language: a stickler betweene two at variance: a mediatur, a meane, a trouchman: a southsayer, a diuinour.
 (Thomas Thomas, 1587, *Dictionarium Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae*)

Example (9) is the earliest example of both *interpreter* and *truchman* being clearly used in the ‘interpreter’ sense in LEME (example 8 is the closest *dragoman* comes in LEME to being used to mean ‘interpreter’). Example (10) is a more common example of early instances of *interpreter* or *truchman* in LEME, where the polysemy of both words is more evident (note, for instance, the ‘intermediary’ sense). Despite the resulting uncertainty of when ‘interpreter’ is meant, cases like (10) combined with cases like (6–8) help us form a picture of contemporary understandings of the searchwords.

To sum up: LEME shows clearly how the various meanings of words in the lexical field of ‘interpreter’ are intertwined. In defining *dragoman*, *truchman* and *interpreter* as each other, contemporary dictionaries seem to treat these words as interchangeable synonyms, with *interpreter* being arguably the most general word. *Linguist*, however, is not given as a lexical alternative for ‘interpreter’.

Table 1 compares the results from the OED, HTE and LEME, giving the first dates for the searchwords as supplied by the dictionaries, as well as their first attestations in the sense of ‘interpreter’.

Table 1. Words for ‘interpreter’ in Early Modern English: Dictionary evidence compared.

	OED	HTE (OED)	LEME	LEME
	First date for word	First attestation in the ‘interpreter’ sense	First date for word	First attestation in the ‘interpreter’ sense
Dragoman	a 1400	a 1400	1611	(1656)
Truchman	1485	1485	1567	1567
Interpreter	1382	1531	1499	1567
Linguist	1591	1711	1596	–

The lag between OED/HTE and LEME dates seen in table 1 is not surprising, reflecting the much larger scope of the OED, as well as the added benefit of hindsight. The earliest dictionary in LEME dates from 1480; *interpreter* appears in 1499, and recognisably as ‘interpreter’ in 1567 (as seen in example 9). *Linguist* makes it into contemporary dictionaries soon after its first recorded appearance in the

language, and follows the OED in not appearing in the sense of ‘interpreter’ in LEME (the last dictionaries included in LEME are from 1702). That *truchman* does not appear earlier is perhaps surprising, more so as it does not feel like a loanword in example (9). (Indeed, in LEME, *interpreter* and *truchman* are most commonly used to define words for ‘interpreter’ — including each other.) The two-hundred-year gap between the first attestation of *dragoman* and its appearance in contemporary dictionaries is peculiar. Perhaps it was felt to be a loanword, being mainly “used by the Turks”; this idea may be supported by the fact that it appears in only four entries in LEME, of which example (8) is the longest.¹¹

Let us now turn to evidence from contemporary sources, and see which of these words were in fact used by the EIC merchants, and which by writers in England more generally.

3.2. Early East India Company usage

3.2.1. Encountering “*jurebassos*”

The words for ‘interpreter’ used by early EIC employees differ markedly from those suggested by the dictionary evidence. In fact, the most frequent word used by them, *jurebasso*, is unrecorded by the HTE; this paper was inspired by encounters with this word in the correspondence of the early East India Company:¹²

(11) Mr Wickham and W^m Eaton [are to go] to Sorongo and Ozacka, wth each of them a cargazon and **jurebasso** w^{ch} wilbe suffityent, and by advice of sailes so to shifte places or continew so you shall see fitting.

Letter from John Saris to Richard Cocks, 5 December 1613. (Farrington 1991: 119)

Since specialised terminology formed a large part of the vocabulary of Early Modern international merchants, and much of it consisted of borrowings,¹³ many terms are not transparent to the modern reader. Example (11) comes from the correspondence of EIC merchants in Japan mentioned in section 2.2, above. In the glossary of the source edition, *jurebasso* is defined as “interpreter, Malayo-Javanese *jurubahasa*, ‘language master’” (Farrington 1991: 1599). A search of the OED reveals that, while *jurebasso* is not given as a headword, it makes a sneak appearance in the quotations under *whetstone* 2c (s.v.):

(12) Something that sharpens the wits, desires, etc., or incites to action.

[...]

1617 R. COCKS *Diary* (Hakl. Soc.) I. 240, I am of opinion that Goresano, our late *jurebasso*, is a whitston to egg hym on against us.

This example is from the diary of Richard Cocks, head of the EIC factory in Japan (see also example 11). Example (12) gives us no indication of what the word *jurebasso* means, however. A full definition is to be found in the *Hobson-Jobson* (s.v. *juribasso*):

(13) JURIBASSO, s.

This word, meaning ‘an interpreter,’ occurs constantly in the Diary of Richard Cocks, of the English Factory in Japan, admirably edited for the Hakluyt Society by Mr. Edward Maunde Thompson (1883). The word is really Malayo-Javanese *jurubahāsa*, lit. ‘language-master,’ *juru* being an expert, ‘a master of a craft,’ and *bahāsa* the Skt. *bhāshā*, ‘speech.’ [Wilkinson, *Dict.*, writes *Juru-bēhasa*; Mr. Skeat prefers *juru-bhasa*.]

Although this definition does not mention Portuguese, the quotations following it are from both Portuguese and EIC sources, all dating from between 1603 and 1615.

In the early seventeenth century, Malay was a South-East Asian *lingua franca*, and thus its word for ‘interpreter’ would have been one of the first words learned by newcomers in the region.

¹¹ *Linguist* appears in eight works in LEME, *truchman* in twelve, and *interpreter* in more than fifty.

¹² My emphases in examples are given in **bold**.

¹³ For an investigation of borrowings in East India Company texts, see Kaislaniemi (forthcoming).

Additionally, following a century of Portuguese presence in the East Indies, Portuguese influence remained strong and the Portuguese language had also become a *lingua franca*.¹⁴ Did the English merchants in the East Indies borrow *jurebasso* from Malay, and/or were they following Portuguese usage? But in either case, why would they do this in the first place — why had Saris not written: “w’th each of them a cargazon and *interpreter*”?

One clue is provided by the EIC Japan factory correspondence already referred to. In the correspondence, *jurebasso* occurs 47 times, but *interpreter* not once. In other words, in this material — for these writers — *interpreter* was not a lexical alternative for ‘interpreter’. This could be seen to suggest that ‘interpreter’ did not exist in Early Modern English as a job category: its absence would explain the need for a range of terms indicating ‘interpreter’ with specific additions or restrictions. In this case, *jurebasso* could be analogous to *dragoman*, a borrowing for ‘interpreter’ which was regionally restricted.

This view is supported by the discovery that *jurebasso* does in fact also appear once in LEME, in an English-Malay wordlist appended to a Dutch travel text published in English in 1601:

(14)Some words, of the Malish speech, which language is vsed throughout the East Indies, as *French is in our Countrie, wherewith a man may trauell ouer all the Land. The Portugals speech is apt and profitable in these Islands, for there are many Interpreters which speake Portugall.*

[...]

an Interpreter Iorbissa

(Jacob Cornelissoon van Neck, 1601, *The Journal or Daily Register of the Voyage from Amsterdam the First Day of March, 1598*)

In other words, while the OED does not consider *jurebasso* to have been one of the EModE words for ‘interpreter’, its existence as a possible borrowing can be documented using contemporary sources. Those who needed to know what the word for ‘interpreter’ was in the East Indies — such as EIC merchants heading thither — were in a position to find out from published sources.

3.2.2. Findings in the early East India Company texts

The results of word searches of the EIC material — with *jurebasso* added to our four searchwords — are seen in table 2.

Table 2. Occurrences of words for ‘interpreter’ in the East India Company sources.

	Calendared sources (1581–1637)	Journals and letters (1591–1623)	EIC totals
Dragoman	2	17	19
Truchman	0	0	0
Interpreter	54	9	63
Linguist	23	3	26
Jurebasso	10	73	83
Totals	89	102	191

These numbers, of course, mean little in themselves, but they do tell us something about the EIC and vocabulary choice. Perhaps the most surprising feature is the complete absence of *truchman*. This seems unexpected, and the reasons for it are not clear; *interpreter*, on the other hand, is quite frequent in the EIC material. However, the dominant form in these sources is *jurebasso*, which is particularly favoured in the non-calendared sources. Finally, contrary to the evidence from the OED/HTE and LEME, *linguist* is in use in the sense ‘interpreter’ by this time.

The data in table 2 is divided according to (presumed) level of editorial intervention (see section 2.4, above). However, the great difference in the distribution of occurrences between the two categories

¹⁴ See e.g. van Neck (1601: 59), or example (14) below. Other *linguae francae* encountered by the EIC included Persian (in Persia and Mughal India) and Arabic (used in the sphere of Islamic influence around the Indian Ocean).

is more likely to have been caused by the presence of different text types (see sections 2.2 and 2.4, above) and contexts. To see how much region affects vocabulary choice, I divided the data according to where the source document was written. The results appear in table 3.

Table 3. Regional distribution of words for ‘interpreter’ in EIC documents.

	Ottoman Empire and Persia	East Indies (incl. India and Japan)	Africa (incl. the Comoros)	England
Dragoman	19	0	0	0
Interpreter	7	7	6	43
Linguist	8	17	0	1
Jurebasso	0	83	0	0
Totals	34	107	6	44

Table 3 gives us slightly more information on the use of the searchwords. Before proceeding, a comment on the distribution of the data: 77 of the hits for the East Indies are from non-calendared sources; all of the hits for England are from calendared sources. This partly explains the contrasting figures in table 2.

As can be seen in table 3, *dragoman* obeys the regional constraints predicted by dictionaries. The distribution of *interpreter* supports the notion that it is the most general term for ‘interpreter’ by occurring across the board, but it is particularly prominent in documents written in England (this may also be a feature of text type: see section 2.2). *Linguist* occurs for the most part in the East — a fact which gives some support to the suggestion of Portuguese influence made in the *Hobson-Jobson* (see above, example 5). Finally, *jurebasso* also shows a regional constraint, being restricted to the East Indies. This, combined with its frequency, would suggest that it was an established borrowing along the lines of *dragoman*.

Let us next look at some examples to illustrate how these words were used. Example (15) comes from a passage in the journal of James Lancaster in which the English are trying to buy cattle from natives in South Africa, and shows that interpreters were not always necessary.

- (15)[F]or he spake to them in the cattels language (which was never changed at the confusion of Babell), which was *moath* for oxen and kine, and *baa* for sheepe; which language the people understood very well without any **interpreter**.

Journal of James Lancaster, 1601 (Markham 1877: 63)

Once the English ships reached the shores of Arabia, however, they found the office of interpreter to be an established one, as seen in example (16).

- (16)[B]efore his departure, because he would not bee stopped, he sent his **drogoman**, alias his **enterpreter**, which was an Italian benegado [renegado], servannt to the Captaine of the Gallyes of Moucha[.]

Journal of John Jourdain, 1613 (Foster 1905: 65)

This example also nicely shows how the terms used for the job category ‘interpreter’ did not imply anything about the interpreter’s background, since dragomans could be Italian. This is corroborated by the next two examples.

- (17)Sir Henry Middleton haveinge in the meane time fitted the shipps and made his comission to mee [...] appointed for my assistance Georg Cockayne, Nicholas Bangham, and a Spaniard as **juribasse** and our pilott for the countrie, beinge well acquaynted;

Journal of John Jourdain, 1613 (Foster 1905: 243–4)

- (18)Per Zanzabrow the Dutch **jurabasso** or **linguest**.

Endorsement/postscript in a letter from Richard Wickham to Richard Cocks, 22 May 1614
(Farrington 1991: 159)

Examples (16) and (17) are from the same source, which documents John Jourdain’s voyage to the East Indies via the Red Sea. They show beautifully how the word used for ‘interpreter’ is *dragoman* in Arabia, and *jurebasso* in the East Indies. Again, the examples show how the nationality of the interpreter did not affect vocabulary choice. In example (17), it is a Spaniard who is called the “juribasse”, whereas in example (18), the *jurebasso* is a local Japanese servant of the Dutch.

Besides being used in the sense of ‘interpreter’, *linguist* is also found in the EIC material in its older and more common sense, ‘skilled in languages’, as well as in an intermediate sense, something like ‘the person used as interpreter’. All three senses are illustrated by the following examples.

(19) Gratuity of 5l. to Edward Powell, who went out without wages, and is recommended by the President and Council as a good **linguist**.

East India Company court minutes, 22 December 1627 (CSPC vol. 6: 431)

(20) [I am in] great want of a sufficient **linguist**, those in Persia being so wholly addicted to drunkenness.¹⁵

Letter from Thomas Barker to Thomas Kerridge, 28 April 1618 (CSPC vol. 3: 340)

(21) And pro Mr Adames, he is onely fitting to be m’r of the junke & to be used as a **linguist** at corte when you have no employment pro him at sea.

Letter from John Saris to Richard Cocks, 5 December 1613 (Farrington 1991: 120)

As can be seen from examples (15)–(21), early EIC employees were aware of the various synonyms of ‘interpreter’. Borrowings were occasionally glossed with other synonyms, as in examples (16) and (18), but the use of binomials is a known rhetorical device, and the evidence shows that *jurebasso*, for instance, rapidly became an established loan. In sum, for early EIC employees, four of our five searchwords were possible choices for referring to the ‘interpreter’ job category.

Finally, a word on first attestations and seventeenth-century usage of *jurebasso* and *linguist*. In the EIC material, *jurebasso* occurs between 1613 and 1622, but the latter date seems to be an artefact caused by the fact that the primary EIC material used in this study runs out in 1623. The first occurrence of *linguist* in the sense of ‘interpreter’ is from 1610, and this word continued to be used throughout the period under study.

3.3. Findings in the comparative texts

The comparative texts show a different distribution of words for ‘interpreter’ to the EIC material, but also differ somewhat from that suggested by the dictionary evidence.¹⁶

Table 4. Words for ‘interpreter’ in EEBO.

	Occurrences
Dragoman	165
Truchman	94
Interpreter	c. 2,000 ¹⁷
Linguist	29
Jurebasso	24

¹⁵ Unreliable interpreters are a constant complaint in EIC correspondence — another twist on the old adage, “traduttore, traditore” (‘translator, traitor’). See also example (22) below.

¹⁶ For the record, a search of a 3m-word subcorpus covering the period 1500–1700 extracted from the *Corpus of Early English Correspondence* (CEEC) produced three hits for *interpreter*, and a search of the entire works of Shakespeare produced eight hits for *interpreter*. None of the other synonyms occurred in these sources, and these few hits were felt to add little to the present discussion.

¹⁷ Since EEBO doesn’t allow for easy sorting of results and I was faced with 14,000+ hits in three thousand records for various spellings of *interpreter*, this figure is an estimate based on sampling. However, as exact figures in fact convey little information, it is enough to see that *interpreter* is by far the most common word for ‘interpreter’.

The most striking feature of the results shown in table 4 is the overwhelming dominance of *interpreter* over the other words. *Dragoman* is not infrequent, followed by *truchman*, but *linguist* and *jurebasso* seem very scarce.

A look at the kinds of works the searchwords occur in in EEBO reveals that *interpreter* seems to occur in works of all genres, but is particularly common in religious texts. It is not surprising that there is a correlation between genre (or topic of text) and the occurrence of words for ‘interpreter’; they seem to be most frequent in historical (or geographical) and travel texts. For example, *dragoman* occurs in various sources in EEBO, but since most of these are travel texts or histories of Turkey, *dragoman* obeys its regional constraint. The majority of the instances of *linguist*, and all of the instances of *jurebasso*, come from the 1625 travel compendium *Purchas his Pilgrimes*. Many collections of travel texts, and *Purchas his Pilgrimes* in particular, reproduced EIC-related letters and journals — in fact, all of the instances of *jurebasso* in the EEBO data ultimately come from the same sources as those in the EIC material used in this study.¹⁸

One example of *linguist* from EEBO is worth reproducing here:

(22)9. Instruct and cause to be instructed all the Young Merchants and Youths, resorting unto this Factory, not onely to keep their books exactly, but also to buy and sell all home and East-India Commodities, with the knowledge of Weights, Measures, Moneys, and Coins used thereabouts, and other needfull parts to be performed in this Employment, let the Youths and other the Young Merchants which are best able, learn the Sundry languages, be instructed to speak, read, and write the same language, that hereafter all businesses may be done and performed by them, without fear of being deceived by the cozening Brokers and false **Linguists**, let me yearly be informed of the ability of every one, not only in the Country language, but also in his books and industry in dealing with the Countrey People, and dispatching of businesse, thereby to know who may be preferred upon all occasions.

George Carew, *Fraud and violence discovered and detected* (Carew 1662: 132)

Example (22) comes from a list of suggested instructions for merchants trading in the East Indies (namely, the EIC). It is another example showing not only that multilingualism was considered an asset and working with interpreters was inevitable, but also that there were systematic plans to train young Englishmen sent to the East Indies in local languages so that they could function as the EIC’s own interpreters. With the exception of the EIC, judging by the evidence from EEBO, Early Modern English seems to have had little use for *linguist*.

Finally, it is worth having a look at *truchman*, despite the fact that it does not appear in EIC-related texts. Considering the status attributed to it by dictionaries as apparently equal to *interpreter*, it is not very frequent in EEBO. One reason for this may be that many of the works it occurs in are translations from other European languages, as in the case of examples (23) and (24)

(23)Then~ sayd parys. vndersto~deth he mourisshe / & they say nay: but that not withstondyng yf he wold speke to hym / that they shol fynde **tourcheme~** ynough.

Pierre de la Cépède, *Thystorye of the right noble and worthy knyght parys* (Cépède 1492: 37)

(24)[A]nd casting downe at their feet, the armour and weapons of the Gaules, hee demaunded of them by a **truchman**, or an **interpreter**, Which of them [...] would enter into combat, and fight at the utterance, for his life.

Livy, *The Romane historie* (Livy 1600: 417)

In any case, while *truchman*, like *dragoman*, is borrowed from Turkish or Arabic, it does not seem to have any regional constraints on its use, as seen in examples (23) and (24) — or at least the constraints are not related to the sphere of Arabic or Islamic influence.

4. Conclusions

This study was conducted as a pilot, the aims being on the one hand to investigate the lexical field

¹⁸ The recurrence of texts is not a problem for this study: see above, section 2.4.

of ‘interpreter’ in Early Modern English, and on the other to carry out a preliminary study on whether and how the lexis of early EIC employees differed from “normal” Early Modern English. The results are promising, and although the sources used in this study leave much to be desired, the records of the East India Company clearly have much to offer to historical linguistics.

As we have seen, Early Modern English did not have a single word for the job category of ‘interpreter’, but instead used several words, the lexical choice primarily depending upon the context. Pöchhacker’s comments, reproduced at the beginning of section 3 above, seem to reflect the ways in which the EIC, for its part, helped to develop English words for ‘interpreter’: *dragomans* and *jurebassos* were “local intermediaries”, and the Company had an interest in training its own trusty *linguists*. Of course, the reality was more complex: as seen in examples (16) and (17), and in contrast to the situation implied by Pöchhacker, *dragoman* and *jurebasso* could just as easily indicate non-locals being used simply as interpreters. What is certain is that the EIC needed both interpreters and words to describe them.

It was not alone in this — since other Europeans in the East Indies faced many of the same problems, the suggestion that the English were influenced by Portuguese usage seems convincing (see examples 5, 13 and 14). Additionally, as suggested by examples (19)–(21), *linguist* might also have developed naturally — following, in part, EIC hiring policies, which favoured those with language skills (as seen in example 19) — so that “linguist” meaning ‘skilled in languages’ shifted towards “(our) linguist” meaning ‘the person used as interpreter’, and so fully to ‘interpreter’.¹⁹

Portuguese influence probably also played a part in the adoption of *jurebasso*. This term established itself very quickly — it remains to search later records in order to establish when it disappeared from English usage — and I believe that as a borrowing it is analogous to *dragoman*, a theory supported by the fact that, like *dragoman*, it was strictly constrained by region. Whether *jurebasso* should be considered part of EIC jargon remains to be seen, but it is an excellent example of the borrowing behaviour of English merchants in the East Indies and of the relative ease with which they adopted and adapted foreign words (see also Kaislaniemi forthcoming). If the “discovery” of *jurebasso* has shown us the value of the EIC records in investigating language contact situations, the early use of *linguist* in the sense of ‘interpreter’ (antedating the earliest attestation given by the OED by a century) in turn suggests that the EIC may have played a not insignificant part in the development of parts of the English lexicon, and not only mercantile terminology.

The regional constraint and precise meaning of *dragoman* may have hindered it from becoming a more generic word for ‘interpreter’.²⁰ Even when used in the sense ‘interpreter’, it retained a strong link to another primary sense, that of ‘guide’ (or, really, all the senses listed by Pöchhacker in the quotation in section 3 above). Of the words investigated in this paper, it is perhaps the one that comes closest to referring to a defined job category, but the ‘dragoman’ job category is broader than that of ‘interpreter’ (for an excellent discussion, see Bernard Lewis 2004). Ideally, an investigation of words for ‘interpreter’ in Early Modern English should also take into account their other senses, particularly those of ‘intermediary’ and ‘guide’; these senses certainly play a major part in the development of English words for ‘interpreter’, and may explain the behaviour of words such as *truchman*.

Indeed, the behaviour of *truchman* remains puzzling: given that its primary definition in the OED and LEME is “interpreter”, why was it not used by the EIC employees? Similarly, given that *interpreter* was clearly the most general word for ‘interpreter’ in the period studied, its infrequency in the non-calendared EIC material calls for further investigation. While this study has brought to light new evidence on the lexical field of ‘interpreter’ in Early Modern English — even with such disparate sources — it seems that more questions have been raised than answered.

I hope to have shown that the results of this pilot study are encouraging enough to merit further investigation of both the lexical field of ‘interpreter’ in Early Modern English and linguistic features in EIC records in general. For historical and corpus linguists of the English of this period, perhaps the biggest obstacle has been the absence of an “East India Company Corpus”; this, of course, hindered the present study as well. Nonetheless, I intend to continue working in this broad, unexplored field, and hope eventually to compile, or be involved in the compilation of just such a corpus.

¹⁹ This may well be what happened in the case of *jurubahasa*, judging from its etymology of ‘language master’. See example (13) above.

²⁰ Until recently, in any case: see example (1), where the OED defines *interpreter* as *dragoman*!

References

Primary Sources

- A Calendar of the Court Minutes, etc., of the East India Company: Volumes 1–3, 1635–1649. 1907–1912.* Ed. by Ethel Bruce Sainsbury. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Digitised versions available at <<http://www.archive.org/>>, accessed 14 April 2008.
- Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: Volumes 1–4, 6 & 8: America, West Indies, East Indies, China, Japan and Persia, 1513–1660.* 1860–1892. Ed. by W. Noel Sainsbury. London. Available online at <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/>>, accessed April 2008.
- Carew, George. 1662. *Fraud and violence discovered and detected, or, A remonstrance of the interested in the ships Bona Esperanza and Henry Bona Adventura of London with a narrative of the proceedings in the case (depending before the States General of the Seven United Provinces) between the assignes of William Courten and the East-India Company of the Netherlands: also, several reasons and arguments for the speedy decision of differences (by amicable conferences of state) arising upon depredations and spoils.* London. *Early English Books Online*. Bodleian Library. <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com/>>, accessed 20 October 2008.
- de la Cépède, Pierre. 1492. *Thystorye of the right noble and worthy knyght parys and of the fayre vyenne the dolphyns doughter of vyennoys.* Translated by William Caxton. *Early English Books Online*. Trinity College Library, Dublin. <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com/>>, accessed 20 October 2008.
- Corpora of Early English Correspondence (CEEC).* Compiled by the CEEC project team under Terttu Nevalainen at the Department of English, University of Helsinki. For more information, visit <<http://www.helsinki.fi/variang/CoRD/corpora/CEEC/>>.
- Early English Books Online (EEBO).* University of Michigan, Oxford University and ProQuest Information and Learning. Available to subscribers at <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>>.
- Farewell, Christopher. 1633. *An East-India colation; or a discourse of travels set forth in sundry obseruations, briefe and delightful; collected by the author in a voyage he made unto the East-Indies, of almost foure yeares continuance.* London. *Early English Books Online*. British Library. <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com/>>, accessed 20 October 2008.
- Farrington, Anthony. 1991. *The English Factory in Japan, 1613–1623.* 2 vols. London: The British Library.
- Foster, William (ed.). 1905. *The Journal of John Jourdain, 1608–1617, describing his Experiences in Arabia, India, and the Malay Archipelago (= Hakluyt Society Second Series 16).* London: Hakluyt Society. Digitised version available at <<http://www.archive.org/>>, accessed 14 April 2008.
- Foster, William (ed.). 1940. *The Voyages of Sir James Lancaster to Brazil and the East Indies, 1591–1603 (= Hakluyt Society Second Series 85).* London: Hakluyt Society. Digitised version available at <<http://www.archive.org/>>, accessed 14 April 2008.
- Historical Thesaurus of English (HTE).* Directed by Christian J. Kay. University of Glasgow. Homepage at <<http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/SESL/EngLang/thesaur/homepage.htm>>; interface prototype available at <<http://libra.englang.arts.gla.ac.uk/historicalthesaurus/>>.
- Lexicons of Early Modern English (LEME).* 2006. Ed. by Ian Lancashire. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Library & University of Toronto Press. <<http://leme.library.utoronto.ca/>>.
- Livy. 1600. *The Romane historie vvritten by T. Livius of Padua. Also, the Breviaries of L. Florus: with a chronologie to the whole historie: and the Topographie of Rome in old time.* Translated by Philemon Holland. London. *Early English Books Online*. Huntington Library. <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com/>>, accessed 27 October 2008.
- Markham, Clements R. (ed.). 1877. *The Voyages of Sir James Lancaster, Kt., to the East Indies, with Abstracts of Journals of Voyages to the East Indies, during the Seventeenth Century, preserved in the India Office. And the Voyage of Captain John Knight (1606), to seek the North-West Passage (= Hakluyt Society First Series 56).* London: Hakluyt Society. Digitised version available at <<http://www.archive.org/>>, accessed 14 April 2008.
- van Neck, Jacob Cornelissoon. 1601. *The Journall, or Daily Register, Contayning a true manifestation, and Historicall declaration of the voyage, accomplished by eight ships of Amsterdam, under the conduct of Jacob Corneliszen Neck Admirall, & Wybrande van Warwick Vice-Admirall, which sayled from Amsterdam the first day of March, 1598.* Translated by William Walker. London. *Early English Books Online*. Huntington Library. <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com/>>, accessed 20 October 2008.
- Oxford English Dictionary Online (OED).* Oxford University Press. <<http://dictionary.oed.com/>>.
- Purnell, Christopher James (ed.). 1916. *The Log-book of William Adams, 1614–19, with the Journal of Edward Saris, and Other Documents Relating to Japan, Cochin China, etc. (= Transactions of the Japan Society of London 13).* London: Privately printed. Digitised version available at <<http://www.archive.org/>>, accessed 14 April 2008.
- Yule, Henry & Arthur C. Burnell. 1903 [1886]. *Hobson-Jobson: A Glossary of Colloquial Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases, and of Kindred Terms, Etymological, Historical, Geographical and Discursive.* Revised ed. by William Crooke. London: J. Murray. Available online at <<http://dsal.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/hobsonjobson/>>.

Secondary Sources

- British History Online*. <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/>>.
- Gray, Douglas. 1998 [1983]. “Captain Cook and the English vocabulary”. Reprinted. *A Reader in Early Modern English* (= *Bamberger Beiträge zur Englischen Sprachwissenschaft* [University of Bamberg Studies in English Linguistics] 43.) ed. by Mats Rydén, Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade & Merja Kytö, 237–253. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Internet Archive*. <<http://www.archive.org/index.php>>.
- Kaislaniemi, Samuli. 2009. “Encountering and appropriating the Other: East India Company merchants and foreign terminology”. *The Language of Daily Life in England 1450–1800* (= *Pragmatics and Beyond New Series* 183) ed. by Arja Nurmi, Minna Nevala & Minna Palander-Collin, 219–251. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kay, Christian. 2000. “Historical semantics and historical lexicography: Will the twain ever meet?”. *Lexicology, Semantics, and Lexicography: Selected Papers from the Fourth G.L. Brook Symposium, Manchester, August 1998* (= *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* 194) ed. by Julie Coleman & Christian Kay, 53–68. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Krueger, Christine L. 2006. “Mary Anne Everett Green and the Calendars of State Papers as a genre of history writing”. *CLIO* 36:1, 1–22.
- Lewis, Bernard. 2004 [1999]. “From Babel to Dragomans”. *From Babel to Dragomans: Interpreting the Middle East*, 18–32. New York: OUP. [Reprinted from *Proceedings of the British Academy* vol. 101: *1998 Lectures and Memoirs*, 37–54. The British Academy, 1999.]
- Lewis, James. 2004. ‘*Nifon catange or Japon fation*’: *A Study of Cultural Interaction in the English Factory in Japan, 1613–1623*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Sheffield.
- Majeed, Javed. 1995. “‘The jargon of Indostan’: An exploration of jargon in Urdu and East India Company English”. *Languages and Jargons: Contributions to a Social History of Language* ed. by Peter Burke & Roy Porter, 182–205. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Minagawa, Saburō. 1974. *Erizabesu-chō Nichi-Ei Kankei Bunken to Gengo* (*A Linguistic Study of Elizabethan Anglo-Japanese Relations*). Tokyo: Shinozaki Shorin.
- Moran, Joseph. 1992. Review of Anthony Farrington, *The English Factory in Japan 1613–1623*, London: British Library, 1991. *Japan Forum* 4:2, 399–402.
- Pöchhacker, Franz. 2004. *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London & New York: Routledge
- Scott, Mike. 2008. WordSmith Tools version 5. Liverpool: Lexical Analysis Software. <<http://www.lexically.net/wordsmith/>>.

Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 2)

edited by R. W. McConchie,
Alpo Honkapohja, and Jukka Tyrkkö

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2009

Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 2)
© 2009 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-430-0 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, e-mail: sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Kaislaniemi, Samuli. 2009. *Jurebassos and Linguists: The East India Company and Early Modern English Words for 'Interpreter'*. In *Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 2)*, ed. R. W. McConchie, Alpo Honkapohja, and Jukka Tyrkkö, 60-73. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

or:

Kaislaniemi, Samuli. 2009. *Jurebassos and Linguists: The East India Company and Early Modern English Words for 'Interpreter'*. In *Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 2)*, ed. R. W. McConchie, Alpo Honkapohja, and Jukka Tyrkkö, 60-73. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2167.