

“The Most Discriminating Plagiarist”: The Unkindest Cut (and Paste) of All

R. W. McConchie
University of Helsinki

1. Introduction

One of the most misleading and mischievous labels applied to lexicographers by historians of lexicography is that of plagiarist. One sometimes finds it applied indiscriminately wherever some correspondence between dictionaries is found and, worse still, sometimes with the triumphal implication that the harmless drudge in question has been caught out by the eagle-eyed scholar in committing a felony. This accusation has also been used over the centuries as a crude form of *argumentum ad hominem*. The often-quoted suggestion by Starnes and Noyes that “the best lexicographer was often the most discriminating plagiarist” (1946: 183) smacks of being damned with faint praise. Osselton mentions “the plagiarising habits” of the compilers as retarding progress from hard-word dictionaries to more comprehensive works, mentioning as evidence the survival of dictionary ghost-words (1997: 13). Elsewhere he points out that “early dictionaries are known to have proceeded by a process of plagiarism” (1997: 143), which sounds rather like saying that the rise of banking proceeded by a series of holdups. By contrast, Dolezal (1986) makes the eminently reasonable claim that the ‘English dictionary’ represents a coherent and interconnected textual history, an approach which deserves more attention. What has been called ‘dictionary archaeology’ (Ilson 1986), a much more nuanced approach, has more recently supplanted the notion that lexicographers plagiarised each other. Lexicography progressed through the work-a-day activities of lexicographers, and to call it all plagiarism is to deny scholarship the opportunity to assess it objectively. None of this is to deny the obvious truth of Sledd’s remark that “no Renaissance dictionary can safely be studied in isolation; for, just as the dictionaries are intricately related to the technical and general literature of the time, so they are related among themselves and ... to the dictionaries of the fifteenth and earlier centuries” (1949, 135–139); it is just that this does not justify using the charge of plagiarism as a blunt instrument.¹

Not that lexicographers themselves have shied away from using such labels. Blatant self-advertisement practised by rival lexicographers has both exposed plagiarism and attempted to conceal it. Plagiarism has also predictably been the source of legal battles involving accusations of intellectual theft and publishing turf wars. It is not that early dictionaries did not proceed in this way, at least in a rather neutral sense of the word, but that there is far more to it than this and the use of an essentially opprobrious term conceals what dictionary-makers and publishers actually do. Of course plagiarism was practised—the error is not in detecting plagiarism as such, but in assuming that any similarity between texts implies plagiarism, because this obviates the possibility of determining how discriminating, well-informed, and intelligent an adapter the lexicographer might actually have been.

Some adumbration of the historical notion of plagiarism will help in providing a context here. Plagiarism has always been a proscribed activity in some sense. Isaac Disraeli, writing at the end of the eighteenth century, complained with botanical aptness of “persons ... [who] gather, in the gardens of

* My grateful thanks to an anonymous reviewer for insightful comments on this paper.

¹ See Landau 1984: 296–8. Landau makes the usual remark about plagiarism between early dictionaries, but also adds some useful caveats, such as the necessity of representing the lexemes of the language accurately and not becoming involved in tortuous attempts to contrive a definition which is different to the point of oddity. In any case, being downright quirky is hardly a strong selling point. For a bibliography of plagiarism more generally, see Howard 2010. A useful general account of dictionary plagiarism is Green 1966: 19–24.

others, those fruits of which their own sterile grounds are destitute; but so artfully ... gather, that the public shall not perceive their depredations" (1794: 163–64). Two points should be noted here. First, and obviously, that plagiarism is seen as representing an attempt by the uninspired, feckless or downright mercenary to rob the honest labourer of his earnings; second, and more tellingly, that it may be artful and hence difficult to discover. Fraud, it seems, is more reprehensible than a bank hold-up. The notoriety of this felony was certainly increased in the early modern period by the origin of the word in the Latin terms *plagium* ('man-stealing, kidnapping') and *plagarius* ('man-stealer'), for which the OED suggests a "person who abducts the child or slave of another, kidnapper, seducer, also a literary thief (Martial 1. 53. 9)", which served to increase the moral opprobrium the word suggested. The OED's sense 3 also suggests that this kidnapper sense of *plagiary* survived in English into the early eighteenth century. This is exploited by Thomas Pierce (1622–1691):²

It is not certainly for nothing, that the word Plagiary should signifie (in Classick writers) a stealer of other folkes chil|dren, and of other folkes Wit; the fruit of the body, and of the brain. (Pierce 1659: 278)

Thomas Fuller also exploits this notion in explaining that he must use Holyoke as the primary reference for later editions of *Rider*:

I am forced to place this *Child*, rather with his *Guardian* then *Father*, I mean, to mention this *Dictionary* rather under the name of Master *Holyoake* then *Rider* (1662: Warwickshire, 118)

Another easy assumption is that if some part of a work is plagiarised and hence worthless, we may reasonably assume that the rest is, and dismiss it out of hand. We need to have full trust in the probity of our lexicographer. I wish to argue, however, that applying this assumption to dictionaries is unjustified. It is of course essential to ask questions beyond inquiring into the nature and extent of any alleged plagiarism in assessing such charges. Will the accusations advantage the accuser, irrespective of the truth of the charge? More specifically, is the accuser suffering in the marketplace from the commercial depredations of the accused?

The life of William Somner (1598–1669) by White Kennet (1693) makes various accusations of plagiarism:

Nothing has been more familiar, than to hear *Holyoak* borrowed most from *Rider*, and he from *Eliot*, and so on ... *Tho. Cooper's Thesaurus Linguae Romanae, &c.* first publisht London, 1565. greatly rais'd the reputation of that writer, and is said to have prefer'd him to his great station in the Church. Yet this mighty work is very little more, than a pure Transcript of the *Dictionarium Latino Gallicum*, by *Charles Stephens* at *Paris*, 1553. (Kennet 1693: 79)

There have been more reasonable voices, as in *The adventurer. In two volumes. By Mr. Hawkesworth.* No. 95, Tuesday Oct. 2, 1753, London, vol. 2:

The allegation of resemblance between authors is indisputably true; but the charge of plagiarism which is raised upon it, is not to be allowed with equal readiness. A coincidence of sentiment may easily happen without any communication, since there are many occasions in which all reasonable men will nearly think alike. (Hawkesworth 1753: 145)

One might well claim that reasonable lexicographers will nearly all define alike.

² Pierce was a divine, controversialist, and musician, as well as a popular preacher and sermon-writer.

2. Plagiology

The tradition of dictionary research established by Starnes and Noyes, and only recently called into question both for its assumptions and for its correctness (ICHLL5 paper by Kusujiro Miyoshi 2010a), has proved resilient, but is now showing its limitations as new research is published (Dolezal 2007; Miyoshi 2010a and b).

This approach has always been fraught with difficulty, despite yielding some very useful early results. The more complex the inter-relationships between dictionaries, the more difficult it is to establish a stemma for their entries, as with the Elyot-Cooper dictionaries and those by and deriving from the Estiennes, a process which can become self-defeating, and which is prone to making assumptions about relationships which it is then all too easy to “prove” by examining only the dictionaries being discussed. We should perhaps join Fredric Dolezal in talking, more circumspectly, about ‘textual affinity’ (1996: 207). There has been a fusion between the idea that all early lexicographers are plagiarists, and the associated notion that comparative detective work will reveal whatever relations may subsist between historical dictionaries. For convenience I will call this ‘plagiology’. In dealing with the cases mentioned here, the comparisons between dictionaries are circumscribed by the actual allegations; that is, I do not look much beyond the two dictionaries in question, as one might do in a longer paper. The time available does not permit me to examine the question of what the ultimate source of allegedly plagiarised material might be.

3. Estienne and Scapula

A notorious case involved the French printer, editor, Greek scholar and probably the greatest sixteenth-century lexicographer, Henri Estienne II (1528 or 31–1598), whose *Thesaurus graecae linguae*, a massive, landmark work in five volumes, appeared in 1572. Johannes Scapula had been apprenticed by Estienne and has been assumed to have worked for him as a corrector, but decided to leave, taking his lexicographical work with him. This was published as the *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum novum* in Basel in 1580, which work is in fact an abridgement of the *Thesaurus*. Scapula’s work proved very popular, going through many subsequent editions and effectively pushing Estienne’s work out of the market, or so it is claimed (see Greswell 1833: ch. 28; Phinney 1965: 224; Considine 2009: 335).³ Scapula alludes to his use of Estienne in his introduction, perhaps not entirely from motives of honest dealing, as Considine suggests; so much so that “Estienne was able to report by 1594 that the plagiarism was notorious” (2008: 95). But then Estienne was the most interested of interested parties. Considine also draws attention to the satire by Joseph Hall (1574–1656) on thievery in his *The discovery of a new world, or, a description of the South Indies* of 1609, which includes an account of the county of Lurtch-wit. The main city of this province is Rigattiera⁴ “nere vnto which is mount (a)Scapula, a very high hill.” The marginal note points out that “(a)Scapula stole his *Greek Lexicon*, from *Steuens*, and yet durst avow this. *Hoc ego contendo Lexicon esse novum*” (Hall 1609: lib. 4 cap. 6, 241). Greswell’s early account is that “as the sheets of the *Thesaurus Graecus* were printed off, he surreptitiously compiled his own abridgment, extracting more particularly such parts as were most upon a level with the capacities of young students” (II, 283). Aikin puts the conventional view of the matter: “The abridgement of this work, published by his domestic Scapula, greatly injured its sale, and defrauded the author of his due recompence” (Aikin 1799, 3, s.v. Henry Estienne II). White Kennet picks up on the accusation of plagiarism in the course of conceding the value of Scapula’s work:

We have been taught at School to honour the *Lexicon of J. Scapula*, and yet *Vogler* has call’d him *the Epitomator of Henry Stephens*: and another eminent writer says, *he cannot be absolv’d from the crime of Plagiarism and concealment.* (78)

³ Scapula also proved to be an influence on subsequent lexicographers; see Nordegraaf 1994: 177–78.

⁴ Modern Italian *rigattiere*, ‘junk dealer’.

While it is pointless to deny that Scapula was “appropriating to his own emolument the most useful part of that great lexicographer’s materials” (Greswell 1833: II, 285–6), we should also inquire whether that was all he had done in producing his volume. Greswell’s account has stood the test of time, and the charge of plagiarism against Scapula has not been seriously contested since to my knowledge, although it has been made with varying degrees of outrage. The disclaimer in Scapula’s preface acknowledging the debt may not be quite so disingenuous as has usually been assumed, at least by the standards of the late sixteenth century, where there were no copyright laws to appeal to. Scapula and his “studied affectation of frankness” (Greswell II, 285) might at least be accorded the courtesy of a fair trial before being fairly hung. After all, “appropriating ... the most useful part” requires editorial and scholarly judgement.

A somewhat different view of the whole matter appears in Hallam:

it has often been complained of, that Scapull who had been employed under Stephens, injured his superior by the publication of his well-known abridgment in 1579. The fact, however, that Scapula had possessed this advantage rests on little evidence; and his preface, if it were true, would be the highest degree of effrontery: ‘it was natural that some one would abridge so voluminous a lexicon. Literature, at least, owes an obligation to Scapula.’ (1882: 27)

The financial ruin this publication brought on Estienne is well-known, but Scapula’s work may simply have exacerbated a situation caused by such a massive commitment of resources in the first place. Could we argue that the accusations of plagiarism were caused as much by financial stress as by a sense of injustice? Perhaps Scapula’s misdemeanour was not plagiarism in the strict sense but a failure to come to an honourable commercial arrangement with Estienne.

We might also note that accusations of plagiarism directed against Scapula in subsequent English writings are in fact relatively infrequent.⁵ Indeed there is quite a deal of evidence that Scapula’s dictionary was regarded as a fundamental educational tool. Scapula appears remarkably early in the printed record in England, the earliest mention appearing to be that in *A defense of the sincere and true translations of the holie Scriptures into the English tong* (1583: 83–84) by William Fulke (1538–1589) in the context of a dispute over that meaning of a Greek phrase.

4. Francis Holyoke and Rider’s dictionary

The dispute over Rider’s dictionary as revised by Francis Holyoke was at heart all about monopolizing a market, following the establishment of printing in Cambridge by Thomas Thomas in 1583.⁶ The somewhat gossipy biographer Thomas Fuller reports that

FRANCIS HOLYOAKE ... set forth that staple Book which School-boys called *Riders Dictionary*. This Rider did Borrow (to say no worse) both his *Saddle* and *Bridle* from *Thomas Thomatius*, who ... set forth that *Dictionary* known by his *Name*, then which, Men, have not a *Better* and *Truer*; Children, no *Plainer* and *Briefer*. But *Rider* after *Thomas* his death, set forth his *Dictionary*, the same in effect, under his own *Name*, the property thereof, being but little disguised with any *Additions*.

Such *Plageary ship* ill becometh *Authors* or *Printers*, and the *Dove* being the *Crest* of the *Stationers Armes*, should mind them, not like *Rooks*, to filch copies one from an other. The *Executors* of *Thomas Thomatius* entring an *Action* against *Rider*, occasioned him in his own defence to make those *Numerous Additions*, to his *Dictionary*, that it seems to differ rather in *Kind* then *Degree*, from his *first Edition*. (Warwickshire, 128)

⁵ The relevant proximity searches in EEBO-TCP yielded nothing at all.

⁶ The English Stock was effectively established by Royal letters patent in 1603 which conferred the right to print psalters, psalms, primers, almanacks and prognostications on the Stationers’ Company; see Blagden 1960: 92–3. Time does not permit a fuller account here.

The English Stock, a joint-stock company formed by members of the Stationers' Company of London in 1603, was initially established to purchase a monopoly on particular religious works, although it gradually increased the numbers of texts under its control through the reversion of the estates of deceased publishers and the lapsing of patents.⁷ The English Stock found itself embroiled with Francis Holyoke over the publication of his revision of Rider's dictionary, first published in 1606 by Adam Islip in London. The 1612 edition was brought out in Oxford by Joseph Barnes. The next edition, that of 1617, reverted to Islip's workshop. As late as 1617, a suit for plagiarism was brought against Francis Holyoke, the reviser of Rider, by Thomas's executors. Charges and counter-charges of plagiarism flew, and Holyoke clung fiercely to what he saw as his rights in the dictionary until his death in the middle of the century.

The third accusation of plagiarism I will discuss is the charge brought by Thomas Blount against Edward Phillips. Blount was already incensed at the degree of plagiarism in Phillips's *New World of Words* (1658) and, believing that the author of a new law dictionary based on his own was by Phillips,⁸ eventually brought out a pamphlet in 1673 entitled *A World of Errors discovered in the New World of Words, or a General Dictionary, and in the Nomothetes, or the Interpreter of Law-Words and Terms*. In this work he claims that not only did Phillips borrow a great deal, but borrowed errors as well.⁹

5. The accusers and the accused: The actual case for plagiarism

We need to consider exactly what it is that a lexicographer does in transferring and adapting data from one dictionary to another. This needs examination in detail rather than being the subject of a rank generalisation. This section thus undertakes to look at two of the most notorious cases of plagiarism in dictionary compilation, those of Johannes Scapula and Edmund Phillips, in order to separate what actually happened from what people chose to say about it, especially those who were aggrieved by the alleged theft.

5.1. Estienne and Scapula

Scapula clearly abridged Estienne rather than plagiarised him, unless one accepts the rather loose definition of plagiarism as appropriating the work of another to one's own advantage. He also made additions to the primary word list, as Table 1 shows:

Table 1. A comparative selection from the word lists of Scapula and Estienne: lemmas from ΜΕΝΩ to ΜΗΝΥ'Ω (shared entries in italics)

Scapula	Estienne
ΜΕ'ΝΩ	<i>ΜΕ'ΝΩ</i>
	ΜΕ'ΝΟ
ΜΕ'ΡΔΩ	
ΜΕ'ΡΙΜΝΑ	
ΜΕ'ΡΜΙΑ'ΡΩ	
ΜΕ'ΡΜΙΣ	
<i>ΜΕ'ΣΟΣ</i>	<i>ΜΕ'ΣΟΣ</i>
ΜΕ'ΣΠΙΑΗ	
ΜΕ'ΖΤΟ'Ζ	
ΜΕ'ΣΦΑ	
<i>ΜΕΤΑ'</i>	<i>ΜΕΤΑ'</i>
<i>ΜΕ'ΤΑΛΛΟΝ</i>	<i>Με'ταλλον</i>
ΜΕ'ΤΑΞΑ	

⁷ See Jackson 1957: viii–xi. The struggle over dictionaries dated back to Thomas Thomas's first publications in Cambridge; see McKitterick 1991.

⁸ It was actually Thomas Manley, who revised John Cowell's *The Interpreter* of 1607.

⁹ Starnes and Noyes: 51.

ΜΕΤΕ'ΩΡΟΣ	
ΜΕ'ΤΡΟΝ	ΜΕ'ΤΡΟΝ
ΜΕ'ΧΡΗ	ΜΕ'ΧΡΗ
ΜΗ'	ΜΗ'
ΜΗ̂ΔΟΣ	
ΜΗΚΑ' ΟΜΑΙ	
ΜΗ̂ΚΟΣ	ΜΗ̂ΚΟΣ
ΜΗ'ΚΩΝ	
ΜΗΛΕ'Α	
ΜΗ'ΛΗ	
ΜΗ̂ΛΟΣ	
ΜΗ'Ν	ΜΗ'Ν
Μ'ΗΝΗ	
ΜΗ'ΝΙΓΞ	
ΜΗ̂ΝΙΣ	ΜΗ̂ΝΙΣ
ΜΗΝΥ'Ω	ΜΗΝΥ'Ω

Closer examination shows, however, that the additional words came from Estienne's secondary lemmas, and that far more was left out than was picked up from there. The actual entries show that Scapula not merely excised parts, as one would expect an abridger to do, but that he made selective changes as well. An example is the entry for ΜΗΝΥ'Ω, which reads:

ΜΗΝΥ'Ω, F,υσω, indico, significo, nuntio, certior[e tilde] facio. Plut. in symp. sept. sap. ειτα και παρα κυβερνητου λαθρα πυθοιτο μηνυσαντος, qui clanculum certiozem fecerat. Phil. μηνυοντος δια συμβολων του θεου, Deo significante. Plat. in Phædr. ως ο εμπροσθεν πας μεμηνυκεν ημιν λογος, declarauit.

In this case, Scapula adds the grammatical information, keeps the definition provided by Estienne, shortens the reference to Plutarch and deletes a citation from Thucydides altogether. He goes on to the Philo citation, shortens a preamble to the Plato citation, although he does not delete it completely, restructuring the contextual Latin as well as reducing another quotation from Plato. Abridgement is radical in many cases: ΤΕΡΜΑ, reduced to barely a fifth of its original size, being just one instance.¹⁰ The abridging process requires knowledge and critical judgment, however. This dispute seems to have been more about what we would call intellectual property rights than plagiarism as such.

5.2. Thomas Blount and Edward Phillips

Blount's complaint was put this way:

Must this then be suffered? A Gentleman for his divertisment writes a Book, and this book happens to be acceptable to the World, and sell; a Bookseller, not interested in the Copy, instantly employs some mercenary to jumble up another like Book out of this, with some Alterations and Additions, and give it a new Title; and the first Author's outdone, and his publisher half undone.

Thus it fared with my *Glossographia*, the fruit of above twenty years spare hours ... twelve months had not passed, but there appeared in Print this *New World of Words*... extracted almost wholly out of mine, and taking in its first edition even a great part of my Preface; onely some words were added and others altered to make it pass as the Authors legitimate off-spring. (1656: A2¹)

¹⁰ This survey has been very perfunctory, and is worth pursuing further, but it is beyond the present researcher's competence to do so.

Close scrutiny reveals however that almost no part of Phillips's preface has been borrowed from Blount's, with the possible exception of Phillips's title, found in Blount's allusion on A3^f to "this new world of Words". This is however a title already used in almost precisely the same form by John Florio in 1598.

Blount deals with a longish list of borrowed words from various languages; Phillips expatiates on the origins of English and the history of the various conquests of Britain. About the only points in common are the mention of the ready acceptance of neologisms as a matter of fashion and some mention of borrowed affixes. Phillips's list of borrowings is different from Blount's; even the prefixes mentioned are largely different, only *pseudo* being mentioned by both. Phillips has quite a long passage on verbal style, word choice, and ignorant and well-formed derivation.¹¹ In short, Blount's accusation of wholesale theft of his preface seems entirely unfounded.¹²

What probably offended Blount was the attack which appears in "A brief and familiar Advertisement to the Reader", in which he mentions "such niceties and impertinencies as one of our late Writers hath done, taking notice of hard words promiscuously as they are scattered in English Bookes." Blount had also commented that "To compile a compleat Work of this nature and importance, would necessarily require an Encyclopedie of knowledge and the concurrence of many learned Heads" (A5^r), and proceeds to name some of those he has used. This provokes some mockery from Phillips:

Not to dwell longer on this discourse, it is the expression of Mr. H. B. [sic] in his endeavours tending this way, That a Dictionary for the English tongue, would require an Encyclopedie of knowledge, and the concurrence of many Learned heads. Such an Encyclopedy I present thee Reader with from the Muses, as it was delivered me from the forked top of their Parnassus' (1658: C5^v)

Criticising one's predecessors is of course a familiar prefatory trope in early modern dictionaries, designed to establish one's authenticity, superiority, and currency, and need not be taken at face value. In this instance, however, it is hard to see where anything even remotely resembling plagiarism has occurred. Indeed, William Godwin argues reasonably that accusations of plagiarism in lexicography were difficult to sustain and likely to be specious and querulous. Blount, he argues, may well have been encouraged by the attack on Phillips by Stephen Skinner in the scathing references to his work which appear in Skinner's *Etymologicon* (1671) (Godwin 1815:151–52).

A natural assumption was that in order to create one dictionary the would-be lexicographer needed to begin with another. Phillips makes it clear in his preface to the universities that it is indeed the duty of a lexicographer to work through the productions of his predecessors

nor must he be wanting in his strictest search of most Dictionaries, that he may be able to distinguish the terms, several derivations, differences, definitions, interpretations, proper significations of the words of our Tongue, how borrowed, how mixed with others, how with its own. (A3^v)

Examining what Phillips has actually done as against what Blount alleges against him, however, is revealing. We should look first at the word-list. Table 2 shows the run of head-words from *hydrophoby* to *jambe* (based on Phillips's alphabetization, which has necessitated some minor adjustments).¹³ The shared head-words are shown in italics.

¹¹ Indeed, there is quite a lot in Phillips's preface which would not be out of place in a twentieth-century textbook on the history of English and English word-formation.

¹² Closer dependent relationships have been pointed out, such as that between Henry Hexham and the Rider-Holyoke dictionaries; see Osselton 1997: 63–66.

¹³ This applies to all the following tables as well.

Table 2. Head-words in Phillips and Blount from *hydrophoby* to *jambe*, (shared expressions in italics).¹⁴

Phillips	Blount
<i>Hydrophoby</i>	<i>Hydrophoby</i>
	Hydrophobical
<i>Hydropick</i>	<i>Hydropick</i>
	Hyemation
<i>Hyemal</i>	<i>Hyemal</i>
<i>Hyena</i>	<i>Hyena</i>
<i>Hymen</i>	<i>Hymen</i>
Hymne	
	Hymniferous
	Hymnigrapher
	Hymnist
<i>Hypallage</i>	<i>Hypallage</i>
	Hyperbole
<i>Hyperbolical</i>	<i>Hyperbolical</i>
<i>Hyperboreans</i>	<i>Hyperboreans</i>
	Hypercritick
<i>Hyperion</i>	<i>Hyperion</i>
<i>Hypermeter</i>	<i>Hypermeter</i>
Hypermnestra	
<i>Hyperphysical</i>	<i>Hyperphysical</i>
	Hypocondriack
<i>Hypocondriacal</i>	<i>Hypocondriacal</i>
	Hypocrisy
	Hyper
	Hypocrite
<i>Hypocritical</i>	<i>Hypocritical</i>
	Hypocras
<i>Hypogastrick</i>	<i>Hypogastrick</i>
<i>Hypoge</i>	<i>Hypoge</i>
	Hypogram
	Hyospadians
<i>Hypostatical</i>	<i>Hypostatical</i>
	Hypothecary
	Hypothenusal
Hypothenusal line	
	Hypothesis
<i>Hypothetical</i>	<i>Hypothetical</i>
Hypsicratea	
Hypsiphile	
Hyrcania	
Hyreus	
Hyrse	
Hysterical	
	Hysterology
	Hysteron
<i>Hysteron Proteron</i>	<i>Hysteron Proteron</i>

¹⁴ This is not always an accurate way of representing the relation, however, since such things as elisions are not shown explicitly, and an elision plus an inversion of word order will look like direct copying when in fact it is not, so that “stark naked in their Synagogues” under *Adamites* in Blount will be marked as “*Synagogue stark naked*” in Phillips.

Hyttania	
Iacchus	
	Jacent
<i>Jacynth</i>	<i>Jacinth</i>
<i>Jacob</i>	<i>Jacob</i>
<i>Jacobins</i>	<i>Jacobins</i>
	Jacobius
<i>Jacobites</i>	<i>Jacobites</i>
Jacobs Staff	Jacobs Staff
	Jacobs Ladder
Jactancy	
	Jactator
	Jaculable
Jaculation	
	Jaculatory
<u>Jambes</u>	<u>Jambes</u>

In this set, 23 out of 62 are shared (37%). Are the definitions also the same? The shared words plus their definitions are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Shared head-words plus definitions in Phillips and Blount from *hydrophoby* to *jambes* (repeated part of Phillips definition in italics; other italics original)

Phillips	Blount
<i>Hydrophoby</i> , (Greek) a certain disease <i>caused by melancholy</i> , which causeth in those that are affected with it, an extream dread of waters.	Hydrophoby (<i>hydrophobia</i>) an extream fear of water and of every kind of liquor; caused by melancholy or by the biting of a mad dog.
<i>Hydropick</i> (Greek) <i>troubled with</i> a certaine disease call the Dropsie.	Hydropick (<i>hydropicus</i>) pertaining thereto, or that is troubled with that fear. Dr. <i>Charleton</i> .
<i>Hyemal</i> (lat.) <i>bleak or winterly</i> .	Hyemal (<i>hyemalis</i>) belonging to to Winter, winterly.
Hyena (lat.) <i>a beast like a wolf</i> , which som say, <i>changeth Sex often</i> , and counterfeiteth the voice of a man.	Hyena , a beast like a woolf having a main, and long hairs over all the body. It is the subtillest (as some say) of all beasts, and will counterfeit the voice of a man, to draw shepherds out of their houses in the might, to the end he may kill them. It is written that he changeth sex often, being sometimes male, and sometimes female. <i>Bull</i> .
<i>Hymen</i> , or <i>Hymenæus</i> , son of <i>Bacchus</i> and <i>Venus</i> , he was the first that instituted Marriage, and therefore by some called <i>the god of Marriage</i> , he hath that name from a thin skin (called in Greek <i>hymen</i>) which is within the secret parts of a woman, and is said to be a note of Virginity.	Hymen (Gr.) the God of marriages, or a song sung at marriages. The Greeks at their marriages were wont to sing <i>Hymen, Hymenæ</i> ; as the Romans did <i>Talassio, Talassio</i> .
<i>Hypallage</i> (Greek) <i>a certain figure</i> wherein the order of words is contrary to the meaning of them in construction.	Hypallage (Gr.) a figure when words are understood contrariwise.
<i>Hyperbolical</i> (Greek) spoken by way of Hyperbole, <i>i. a figure</i> wherein an expression goes <i>beyond truth</i> , either by way of excess or diminution.	Hyperbolical (<i>hyperbolicus</i>) that passeth all likelihood of truth; beyond belief.
<i>Hyperboreans</i> , a certain Northern people; some say, dwelling under the North Pole; others say they are a <i>people of Scythia</i> .	Hyperboreans (<i>hyperborei</i>) a people of Scythia so called, because the North wind called Boreas, blows over them. <i>Servius</i> .

<i>Hyperion</i> , the son of <i>Cælus</i> , and brother of <i>Saturn</i> , he is thought by some to be the first that found out the motion of the stars, and is oftentimes mentioned in Poetry for the same with <i>the Sun</i> .	Hyperion. The Sun.
<i>Hypermeter</i> , (Greek) a <i>Verse</i> that hath a <i>syllable</i> above its ordinary <i>measure</i> .	Hypermeter (Lat.) a verse having a redundant syllable, or one syllable above measure; called by some a feminine Verse.
<i>Hyperphysical</i> , (Greek) <i>supernaturall</i> .	Hyperphysical (from <i>hyper</i> and <i>physicus</i>) that is above physick, supernaturall.
<i>Hypocondriacal</i> , (Greek) subject to melancholy, because under the hypocondria or sides of the upper part of the belly, lie the liver and Spleen which are the seat of melancholy.	Hypocondriacal (<i>hypocondraicus</i>) of or pertaining to the forepart of the belly and sides about the short ribs, and above the Navel, under which lyeth the Liver or Spleen. Also that is troubled with a windy Melancholy in those parts.
<i>Hypocritical</i> , (Greek) belonging to a <i>Hypocrite</i> , i. e. a <i>dissembler</i> , or one that maketh a false shew of Piety or holinesse.	Hypocritical pertaining to an Hypocrite, dissembling, counterfeit.
<i>Hypogastrick</i> , (Greek) belonging to the Hypogastrium or lower part of the belly.	Hypogastrick (from <i>Hypogastrium</i>) belonging to that part of the belly, which reacheth from the Navel to the privy members.
<i>Hypoge</i> , (Greek) a <i>cellar</i> or place under ground.	Hypoge (<i>hypogeum</i>) a vault or cellar, or such like underground room arch'd over head.
<i>Hypostatical</i> , (Greek) belonging to a Hypostasis or Personal subsistence.	Hypostatical (from <i>hypostasis</i>) belonging to suppositality, subsistence or personality. The <i>Hypostatical Union</i> is the union of humane nature with Christs divine person.
<i>Hypothetical</i> , (Greek) belonging to a Hypothesis, i. e. a supposition, also a <i>Hypothetical Syllogism</i> in Logick, is that which begins with a conditionall conjunction.	Hypothetical (<i>hypotheticus</i>) In Logick, those Propositions, which have a Conjunction in them, and so consist of two parts, are called <i>Hypothetical Propositions</i> ; as in saying, <i>If the Sun be in our Hemisphear, it is day</i> .
<i>Hysteron Proteron</i> , (Greek) a <i>preposterous</i> manner of speaking or writing, expressing that first which should be last.	Hysteron Proteron (Gr.) the same with <i>Hysterology</i> , it is sometimes used in derision of that which is spoken or done preposterously or quite contrary. The common phrase is; <i>The Cart before the horse</i> .
<i>Jacynth</i> , the name of a certain pretious stone of a blewish colour, also a flower called <i>Hyacinthus</i> , see <i>Hyacinthus</i> .	Jacinth (<i>hyacinthus</i>) a precious stone found in <i>Æthiopia</i> , whereof there are two kinds, the one of a pale yellow colour, the other of a cleer bright yellow, which is accounted the better. It is cold of nature, comfortable to the body, and provokes sleep.
<i>Jacob</i> , (Hebr.) a <i>supplanter</i> , or beguiler.	Jacob (Heb. <i>i.</i> a tripper or supplanter) whose name (because he had no power with God, that he might also prevail with men) was changed into <i>Israel</i> by God. See <i>Genesis cap. 32 Philo de nominibus mutatis</i> .
<i>Jacobins</i> , certain Friars of the Order of <i>St. Dominick</i> .	Jacobins , the Fryers of <i>St. Dominicks</i> Order are called <i>Jacobins</i> in <i>France</i> , either because their Monastery in <i>Paris</i> is dedicated to <i>St. James</i> , or because it is seated in the street of <i>St. James</i> , called <i>Rue St. Jacque</i> .

<i>Jacobites</i> , a sort of Hereticks instituted in the year 530. By one <i>Jacobus Syrus</i> , they used circumcision, and <i>acknowledge but one nature in Christ</i> .	Jacobites (so called from <i>Jacobus Syrus</i> , who lived Anno 530.) a sort of Heretiques, who (1) acknowledge but one Will, Nature and Operation in Christ. 2 Use Circumcision in both sexes. 3 Signe their children with the sign of the Cross, imprinted with a burning iron. 4. Affirm Angels to consist of two substances, fire and light, &c. The Patriarch of this Sect is always called <i>Ignatius</i> , and a Monk of S. <i>Anthonies</i> Order, he keeps his residence at <i>Co[a?]rami</i> in <i>Mesopotamia</i> , and is said to have 160000 families under his jurisdiction. [Bi?]ddulph.
<i>Jacobs Staff</i> , a certain Geometrical instrument so called, also a staff that <i>Pilgrims</i> use to walk with to <i>James Compostella</i> .	Jacobs Staff , a Pilgrims staff, so called from those who out of devotion go on pilgrimage to the City of St. <i>Iago</i> , or St. <i>James Compostella</i> in <i>Spain</i> , where some of S. <i>James</i> his Reliques are. It is sometimes taken for a staff that hath a dagger or little sword in it. Also an Instrument in Geometry so called. Min.
<i>Jambes</i> , (French) <i>the side-posts of a door</i> .	Jambes (Fr.) It is with us used for the Posts sustaining both sides of the door, the side posts of a door.

Of the 106 entries compared so far (*ajudication-ad octo* (not shown) and *hydrophoby-jambes*), only 32% of the first set are shared, and 37% of the second set. In the third set (*turbary –Valdombreux*) the total is 37 shared out of 89 = 41%.

Turning to the definitions, none of the shared entries is a case of outright plagiarism in the modern sense. In most cases it is difficult to see that Philips was doing any more than what a responsible lexicographer could be expected to do. It is difficult to define *hypogastric* without mentioning the lower part of the belly, or *adeption* without using the words *getting* and/or *obtaining*. The closest I have found to apparently outright plagiarism so far are *turbary*,

<i>Turbary</i> , an interest to dig Turfs upon a Common.	Turbarie , is an interest to dig turves upon a Common, <i>Kitchin fol. 94 old Natura brevium. Fol. 70.</i>
--	---

an abridgement, and *typographer*, *vacive*, *vacuity* and *vafrous*, all of which are one- or two-word glosses, thus lending themselves to an appearance of plagiarism.¹⁵ It must also be remembered, however, that *turbary* depends in turn on John Cowell’s *The interpreter* of 1607: “*Turbarie* (Turbaria) is an interest to digge turves vpon a common.” (*Kitchin, fol. 94. old nat. br. fol. 70.*)¹⁶ It is certainly possible to establish some degree of dependence between these dictionaries, but it is also possible to argue that where Phillips uses Blount, the result is often an improvement in concision.

All of the foregoing depends on the assumption that there is indeed a relation between these two dictionaries and, specifically, that one plagiarises the other. As we see, however, had Blount never complained, it would be hard to mount a convincing case for this—in other words, the accusation itself is sufficient to predispose the reader/user/scholar to believe that it must be true. This is an unsatisfactory state of affairs.

¹⁵ Other verbatim entries are hard to find, but they include *excavation*. Words which are almost verbatim but shortened include *excussion*, *fissure*, *paradoxology*, and *pregression*. The first part of *file* is almost verbatim, and likewise *first-fruits*, but they diverge thereafter.

¹⁶ *Turbary* had also appeared in the 1636 edition of Rastell’s law dictionary: “*Turbary* is an interest of digging turves vpon a common”. My thanks to the reviewer for pointing this out. I have not found it in an earlier edition of Rastell.

6. Conclusion

It is perhaps worth noting that the OED's definition of plagiarism as "The action or practice of taking someone else's work, idea, etc., and passing it off as one's own; literary theft" could be refined a little. The options here are to accuse Blount of rather mischievous misrepresentation, or to consider whether the sense of the word has perhaps shifted a little in the intervening three and a half centuries. That is, for Blount, and perhaps for Estienne as well, the plagiarism is not specifically the use of the words verbatim, but some less defined reliance on their work—perhaps even simply the grievance produced by having stolen not their words, but their market. I am unsure which is correct—Blount peevish, Philips a thief, or the word itself a deceiver. It does at least seem that we may be able to exonerate Philips.

While I would not wish to deny that there have been and are egregious examples of dictionary plagiarism, this label can hardly be usefully applied to dictionary practice in general, as has often been done, or at least implied. Neither Scapula nor Philips were outright plagiarists, and their accusers were more aggrieved at the loss of profits than of lemmas. I want to argue that, in spite of the appearance of plagiarism, lexicographers are by and large thoughtful compilers and collators of dictionary material, and that we need a more powerful and incisive method of describing their activities. But that is the subject of another paper.

References

Primary sources

- Blount, Thomas. 1656. *Glossographia: or A dictionary, interpreting all such hard vvords, whether Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, French, Teutonick, Belgick, British or Saxon; as are now used in our refined English tongue* London: Thomas Newcomb.
- Cowell, John. 1607. *The interpreter: or Booke containing the signification of vvords wherein is set fourth the true meaning of all, or the most part of such words and termes, as are mentioned in the lawe vvriters, or statutes of this victorious and renowned kingdome, requiring any exposition or interpretation* Cambridge: John Legat.
- Estienne, Henri. 1572. *Thesaurus graecae linguae* [Lutetiae Parisiorum]: Henricus Stephanus.
- Florio, John. 1598. *A worlde of wordes, or most copious, dictionarie in Italian and English* London: A. Hatfield for E. Blount.
- Fulke, William. 1583. *A defense of the sincere and true Translations of the holie Scriptures into the English tong against the manifolde cauils, friuolous quarels, and impudent slaunders of Gregorie Martin, one of the readers of Popish diuinitie in the trayterous Seminarie of Rhemes* London: Henry Bynneman.
- Fuller, Thomas. 1662. *The history of the worthies of England who for parts and learning have been eminent in the several counties: together with an historical narrative of the native commodities and rarities in each county* London: Printed by J. G. W. L. and W. G. for Thomas Williams.
- Fuller, Thomas. 1642. *The holy state* Cambridge: Roger Daniel for John Williams.
- Hall, Joseph. 1609. *The discovery of a new world, or, A description of the South Indies Hetherto vnknowne by an English Mercury* [London]: Imprinted for Ed. Blount, and W. Barrett.
- Kennet, White. 1693. 'The Life of Mr Somner' in Somner, William, *A treatise of the Roman ports and forts in Kent by William Somner; publish'd by James Brome ... to which is prefixt, The life of Mr. Somner* Oxford: Printed at the Theater, 1–118.
- Manley, Thomas. 1672. *Nomothetes, the interpreter containing the genuine signification of such obscure words and termes used either in the common or statute lawes of this realm first compiled by ... Dr. Cowel* London: J. Streater for H. Twyford, G. Sawbridge, J. Place and T. Basset.
- Pierce, Thomas. 1659. *The new discoverer discover'd by way of answer to Mr. Baxter his pretended discovery of the Grotian religion, with the several subjects therein conteined : to which is added an appendix conteining a rejoynder to diverse things both in the Key for Catholicks, and in the book of disputations about church-government and worship, &c. : together with a letter to the learned and reverend Dr. Heylin, concerning Mr. Hickman and Mr. Bagshaw* London: Printed by J.G. for Richard Royston.
- Phillips, Edward. 1658. *The new world of English words: or, a general dictionary: containing the interpretations of such hard words as are derived from other languages; whether Hebrew, Arabick, Syriack, Greek, Latin, Italian, French, Spanish, British, Dutch, Saxon, &c. their etymologies and perfect definitions* London: E. Tyler for Nath. Brooke.
- Rastell, John. 1636. *Les termes de la ley: or Certaine difficult and obscure words and termes of the common lawes*

and statutes of this realme now in vse expounded and explained London: [Miles Flesher, John Haviland and Robert Young] the assignes of John More.

Scapula, Joannis. 1580. *Lexicon Graecolatinum novum in quo ex primitivorum & simplicium fontibus derivata atque composita* Basileæ: ex officina Herguagiana, per Eusebium Episcopium.

Secondary sources

- Aikin, John, et al. 1802. *General biography; or lives, critical and historical, of the most eminent persons of all ages, countries, conditions, and professions, arranged according to alphabetical order*. Vol. 3. London: for G. G. and J. Robinson, G. Kearsley, Fleet-Street; R. H. Evans and J. Wright.
- Blagden, Cyprian. 1960. *The Stationers' Company: A History 1403–1959* London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Considine, John. 2008. *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe and the Making of Heritage* Cambridge: CUP.
- Considine, John. 2009. 'Ancient Greek among the eighteenth century languages of science: Linnaeus, Dillenius, and the lexicographical record' *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 16.3–4, 330–343.
- Disraeli, Isaac. 1794. *Curiosities of literature. Consisting of anecdotes, characters, sketches, and observations, literary, critical, and historical* vol. 2. London: H. Murray.
- Dolezal, Fredric. 1996. 'Review: Tracing the Early History of English Lexicography' *American Speech* 71.2, 205–210.
- Dolezal, Fredric. 2007. 'Writing the History of English Lexicography: Is there a History of English Lexicography after Starnes and Noyes?' *Words and Dictionaries from the British Isles in Historical Perspective* ed. Considine, John and Iamartino, Giovanni. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 1–13.
- Godwin, William. 1815. *Lives of Edward and John Philips: nephews and pupils of Milton. Including various particulars of the literary and political history of their times* London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown.
- Green, Jonathon. 1966. *Chasing the Sun: Dictionary Makers and the Dictionaries They Made* New York: Henry Holt.
- Greswell, W. P. 1833. *A View of the Early Parisian Greek Press; Including the Lives of the Stephani* 2 vols. Oxford: S. Collingwood.
http://www.archive.org/stream/ofearlyparisview02gresrich/ofearlyparisview02gresrich_djvu.txt, accessed 12.11.10.
- Hallam, Henry. 1882. *Introduction to the literature of Europe, in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries* London: J. Murray.
- Hartmann, Reinhard R. K. Ed. 1986. *The History of Lexicography: Papers from the Dictionary Research Centre Seminar at Exeter, March 1986* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hawkesworth, John. 1753. *The adventurer. In two volumes*. No. 95, Tuesday Oct. 2, 1753, London, vol. 2.
- Howard, Rebecca Moore. 2010. *Literary (and other) theories of plagiarism: A bibliography for composition and rhetoric*. <http://wrt-ho.syr.edu/Bibs/PlagLiterary.htm>.
- Ilsou, Robert F. 1986. 'Lexicographic Archaeology: Comparing Dictionaries of the Same Family' Hartmann, 1986, 128–36.
- Jackson, William A. 1957. *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company 1602–1640* London: Bibliographical Society.
- Landau, Sidney I. 1984. *Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography* New York: The Scribner Press.
- McKitterick, David. 1991. Textbook printing at Cambridge *Paradigm* 7, December.
<http://faculty.ed.uiuc.edu/westbury/paradigm/McKitterich.html>, accessed 20.6.12.
- Miyoshi, Kusujiro. 2010a. 'The "second part" of Cockeram's Dictionarie (1623): reconsidering its source materials' unpublished paper delivered at ICHLL 5 Oxford, June 17.
- Miyoshi, Kusujiro. 2010b. 'Cawdrey's Table Alphabeticall (1604) Reconsidered: Its Driving Force for English Lexicography' *Adventuring in Dictionaries: New Studies in the History of Lexicography* ed. Considine, John. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Noordegraaf, Jan. 1994. 'Women and grammar: the case of Johanna Corleva' *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 16.2, 169–190.
- Osselton, Noel E. 1997. *Chosen Words: Past and Present Problems for Dictionary Makers* Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- OED Online*. 2012. Oxford: Clarendon Press. <http://www.oed.com/>.
- Phinney, Edward, Jr. 1965. 'Continental Humanists and Chapman's Iliads' *Studies in the Renaissance* 12, 218–226.
- Sledd, James. 1949. Review of *The Sources of "A dictionarie of the French and English Tongues" by Randle Cotgrave (London, 1611)* by Vera E. Smalley *Journal of Modern Philology*, 47.2, 135–139.
- Starnes, De Witt T. and Noyes, Gertrude. 1946. *The English dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson 1604–1755* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Selected Proceedings of the 2012 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 3)

edited by R. W. McConchie,
Teo Juvonen, Mark Kaunisto,
Minna Nevala, and Jukka Tyrkkö

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2013

Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 2012 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 3)
© 2013 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-455-3 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, 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:

McConchie, R. W. 2013. "The Most Discriminating Plagiarist": The Unkindest Cut (and Paste) of All. In *Selected Proceedings of the 2012 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 3)*, ed. R. W. McConchie et al., 107-119. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2840.