

The First Century of English Monolingual Lexicography

The First Century of English Monolingual Lexicography

By

Kusujiro Miyoshi

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



The First Century of English Monolingual Lexicography

By Kusujiro Miyoshi

This book first published 2017

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2017 by Kusujiro Miyoshi

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-5181-7

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-5181-7

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Original Publications.....	vii
List of Tables.....	x
Preface.....	xi
Acknowledgments.....	xxi
Introduction.....	xxiii
“So Many <i>English Dictionaries</i> in His Study” John Considine	
Chapter One.....	1
Robert Cawdrey’s <i>Table Alphabeticall</i> (1604): Its Driving Force for Early English Lexicography	
Chapter Two.....	10
John Bullokar’s <i>English Expositor</i> (1616) and Henry Cockeram’s <i>English Dictionarie</i> (1623): Their Treatment of Derivatives in the Earliest English Dictionaries	
Chapter Three.....	19
Henry Cockeram’s <i>English Dictionarie</i> (1623)—the “Second Part” (1): His Treatment of Verbs of High Frequency	
Chapter Four.....	32
Henry Cockeram’s <i>English Dictionarie</i> (1623)—the “Second Part” (2): Reconsidering Its Source Material	
Chapter Five.....	42
Henry Cockeram’s <i>English Dictionarie</i> (1623)—the “Second Part” (3): Its Arrangement of Entries, Treatment of Synonyms and Information on Word-Formation	

Chapter Six.....	50
Henry Cockeram's <i>English Dictionarie</i> (1623) and Thomas Blount's <i>Glossographia</i> (1656): Their Anglicization of Foreign Words	
Chapter Seven.....	73
Edward Phillips's <i>New World of English Words</i> (1658): The First Systematic Treatment of English Vocabulary	
Chapter Eight.....	86
Elisha Coles's <i>English Dictionary</i> (1676): His Utilization of English Dictionaries from 1604 to 1658	
Chapter Nine.....	103
Richard Hogarth's <i>Gazophylacium Anglicanum</i> (1689) and J. K.'s <i>New English Dictionary</i> (1702): A Turning Point in the History of the General English Dictionary	
Chapter Ten.....	114
J. K.'s <i>New English Dictionary</i> (1702): Its Traditional and Genuine Innovative Aspects	
Bibliography.....	131
Index.....	139

LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

Eight chapters out of ten, with the exception of Chapters Six and Ten, in this volume are reproduced from the sources listed below, with the titles indicated. Concerning three chapters out of the eight, I wish to express my gratitude to each of the original publishers, who hold their copyrights, for providing me with permission for the reproduction; specifically, they are Verlag Dr. Kovač GmbH (for Chapter Five), Walter de Gruyter GmbH (for Chapter Eight) and K Dictionaries Ltd. (for Chapter Nine). In this regard, I clearly state here that the full credits of the four chapters are ascribed to their relevant original publications and publishers.

Chapter One: “Cawdrey’s *Table Alphabeticall* (1604) reconsidered: Its driving force for early English lexicography” in John Considine (ed.), *Adventuring in Dictionaries: New Studies in the History of Lexicography*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010, pp. 14–22. Copyright © 2010 by John Considine and contributors.

(This paper is based on my presentation “Cawdrey’s *Table Alphabeticall* (1604) reconsidered: its driving force for early English lexicography” at the “Fourth International Conference on Historical Lexicography and Lexicology” (ICHLL-4) (19–21 June, 2008) held in Edmonton, Canada.)

Chapter Two: “Bullokar’s and Cockeram’s interest in word formation: Treatment of derivatives in the earliest English dictionaries” in R. W. McConchie *et. al.* (eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 2012 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 3)*, Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 2013, pp. 120–127. Copyright of the paper © 2013 Kusujiro Miyoshi, as indicated at the bottom of p. 120 in the volume.

(This paper is based on my presentation “Bullokar’s and Cockeram’s interest in word formation: Treatment of derivatives in the earliest English dictionaries” at the “Third international New Approaches in English Historical Lexis Symposium” (HEL-LEX 3) (7–10 March, 2012) held at Tvarminne Zoological Station, Finland.)

Chapter Three: “The historical significance of Cockeram’s treatment of verbs of high frequency” in John Considine (ed.), *Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers, Volume 4: The Seventeenth Century*, Farnham, England and Burlington, USA: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2012, pp. 205–215. Copyright of the paper is ascribed to Kusujiro Miyoshi.

(This paper is based on my presentation “Historical significance of Cockeram’s treatment of high frequency verbs” at the “Dictionary Society of North America [DSNA] XVII Biennial Meeting” (27–30 May, 2009) held at Indiana University in Bloomington, Indiana, USA.)

Chapter Four: “The ‘Second Part’ of Cockeram’s *Dictionarie* (1623): reconsidering its source materials” in “Oxford Research Archive” at www.ora.ouls.ox.ac.uk (2010). Copyright of the paper is ascribed to Kusujiro Miyoshi.

(This paper is based on my presentation “The ‘Second part’ of Cockeram’s *Dictionarie* (1623): reconsidering its source materials” at the “Fifth International Conference on Historical Lexicography and Lexicology” (ICHLL-5) (16–18 June, 2010) held at St. Anne’s College, University of Oxford, UK.)

Chapter Five: “The significance of the ‘Second Part’ of Cockeram’s *Dictionarie* (1623): Its arrangement of entries, treatment of synonyms and information on word-formation” in Bettina Bock and Maria Kozińska (eds.), *Weiland Wörter-Welten - Akten der 6. Internationalen Konferenz zur Historischen Lexikographie und Lexikologie* (Jena, 25–27. July 2012) / *Whilom Worlds of Words - Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Historical Lexicography and Lexicology* (Jena, 25–27 July 2012), Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovač, 2014, pp. 95–104. Copyright © Verlag Dr. Kovač GmbH, Hamburg 2014.

(This paper is based on my presentation “The significance of the ‘Second Part’ of Cockeram’s *Dictionary*: Its arrangement of entries, treatment of synonyms and information on word-formation” at the “Sixth International Conference on Historical Lexicography and Lexicology” (ICHLL-6) (25–28 July, 2012) held at Friedrich-Schiller-University in Jena, Germany.)

Chapter Seven: “The first systematic treatment of English vocabulary: Phillips’s *New World of English Words* (1658)” in Olga M. Karpova and Faina I. Kartashkova (eds.), *Multi-disciplinary Lexicography: Traditions and Challenges of the XXIst Century*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013, pp. 53–66. Copyright © 2013 by Olga M.

Karpova and Faina I. Kartashkova and contributors.

(This paper is based on my presentation “The first systematic treatment of English vocabulary: Phillips’s *New World of English Words* (1658)” at the “Ninth International School of Lexicography: Multi-disciplinary Lexicography: Traditions and Challenges of the XXIst century” (8–10 September, 2011) held at Ivanovo State University in Ivanovo, Russia.)

Chapter Eight: “The making of Elisha Coles’s ‘linked entries’: His utilization of English Dictionaries from 1604 to 1658” in Rufus H. Gouws *et. al.* (eds.), *Lexicographica: International Annual for Lexicography*, Vol. 28, Berlin and Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2012, pp. 385–397. Copyright © 2012 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston.

(This paper is based on my presentation “The conclusive dictionary in the first century of English lexicography: Elisha Coles’s *English Dictionary* (1676)” at the “18th Annual International Conference of the African Association for Lexicography” (AFRILEX-18) (2–5 July, 2013) held at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University in Port Elizabeth, South Africa.)

Chapter Nine: “*Gazophylacium Anglicanum* (1689), a turning point in the history of the general English dictionary” in *Kernerman Dictionary News*, Number 16 (Tel Aviv: K Dictionaries, Ltd), July, 2008, pp. 4–8. Copyright © 2008 K Dictionaries, Ltd.

(This paper is based on my presentation “*Gazophylacium Anglicanum* (1689), a turning point in the history of the general English dictionary” at the “Seventh International School of Lexicography: Modern Lexicography, Global Problems and National Solutions” (12–14 September, 2007) held at Ivanovo State University in Ivanovo, Russia.)

With regard to Chapter Ten, I wrote it anew, as well as Chapter Six, although the first prototype of its idea can be seen in this paper: “J. K.’s dictionary (1702) reconsidered” in Hannu Tammola *et. al.* (eds.), *EURALEX ‘92 Proceedings I-II: Papers Submitted to the 5th EURALEX International Congress on Lexicography in Tampere, Finland* (Studia Translatologica: Publications of the Department of Translation Studies, University of Tampere, Finland), Part II, Tampere: Tampereen Yliopisto, 1992, pp. 601–606. (The paper is based on my presentation “J. K.’s dictionary (1702) reconsidered” at the “Fifth EURALEX International Congress on Lexicography” (4–9 August, 1992) held at Tampereen Yliopisto in Tampere, Finland.)

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1: Head-words in the <i>Table</i> and the <i>Expositor</i>	5
Table 2-1: Bullokar’s interest in Derivatives and Cawdrey’s <i>Table</i>	12
Table 2-2: Cockeram’s Interest in Derivatives and Cawdrey’s and Bullokar’s Dictionaries	13
Table 2-3: Cockeram’s Unique Interest in Derivatives	16
Table 6-1: “Length of Life” of the 55 Words in Cockeram’s <i>Dictionarie</i> ...	56
Table 6-2: “Length of Life” of the 69 Words in Blount’s <i>Glossographia</i> ...	59
Table 6-3: “Length of Life” of Cockeram’s 55 Words and That of Blount’s 69	62
Table 6-4: Types of Cockeram’s 55 Words and Those of Blunt’s 69	63
Table 6-5: Cockeram’s Ways of Forming Words	64
Table 6-6: Blount’s Ways of Forming Words	66
Table 6-7: Comparison of Cockeram’s and Blount’s Word-formation	70
Table 8-1: Coles’s Division of Phillips’s Entries	89
Table 8-2: Coles’s Division of Blount’s Entries	90
Table 8-3: Coles’s Integration of Phillips’s Entries	91
Table 8-4: Coles’s Integration of Blount’s Entries	92
Table 8-5: Coles’s Reference to More Than One Dictionary for One Group	97
Table 8-6: Coles’s Use of Phillips’s and Blount’s Entries as Components of the Group	101

PREFACE

At the outset of this preface, I am very delighted and thankful that Honorary Professor Reinhard Hartmann (the University of Birmingham), who has been greatly contributing to the development of research on lexicography worldwide, having organized a number of influential international conferences, provided me with words for this volume. I am highly honoured to quote them here:

Dictionary-making has a long history, and its generators have contributed significantly to our understanding of language and its use(s). However, it has taken some time for us to appreciate the tensions between practical dictionary-compilation and theoretical research to elaborate more general principles.

(Meta-) lexicography is now being developed as an exciting subject field, with 5 constituent specialisations:

- pursuing lexicographic traditions (dictionary history),
- classifying reference genres (dictionary typology),
- specifying component parts (dictionary structure),
- evaluating relative quality (dictionary criticism) and
- observing the consultation process (dictionary use).

A 6th area that has recently emerged is the application of computer support (information technology).

Kusujiro Miyoshi has made a significant contribution to the first of these specialisations, dictionary history, through his M.A. (at Kansai) on Webster, his Ph.D. (at Exeter) on Johnson and Webster, and then through his professional papers which are now being revised and integrated into a volume of 10 chapters, a collection that will further elaborate the connections with other branches of lexicographic research.

RH

Then, in writing the following, I will provide three sections: the “Preamble”, “Purposes of the Volume” and “Outline of Each Chapter”.

1. Preamble

Engagement with the history of dictionaries is an exploration of the history of linguistic ideas. I wonder how much valuable cultural and intellectual heritage, heritage of kinds which are closely associated with humanity, we have received from our predecessors who were called lexicographers. The same engagement is also a philological pursuit, if we follow the first definition of the word *philology* in the *Oxford English Dictionary*: “Love of learning and literature; the branch of knowledge that deals with the historical, linguistic, interpretative, and critical aspects of literature”.

From such a perspective, I have, in this volume, dealt with seven monolingual English dictionaries, all the dictionaries of this kind which were published during the first century of monolingual English lexicography: Robert Cawdrey’s *Table Alphabeticall* (1604), John Bullokar’s *English Expositor* (1616), Henry Cockeram’s *English Dictionarie* (1623), Thomas Blount’s *Glossographia* (1656), Edward Phillips’s *New World of English Words* (1658), Elisha Coles’s *English Dictionary* (1676) and J. K.’s *New English Dictionary* (1702).

The main text of the volume is comprised of ten chapters, eight of which are, although considerably re-written for this volume, based on papers which I presented at international conferences in several countries. In this regard, I am still grateful that the papers were accepted not only by conferences in the United Kingdom, but also by others in the United States, Finland, Russia, Canada, Germany, South Africa and Spain, the fact awakening me to the importance of English dictionaries for quite a few authorities outside of the United Kingdom.

2. Purposes of the Volume

If a major thrill in engaging in the history of lexicography lies in a philological pursuit in search of facts concerning the history of linguistic ideas, one might expect that the attention of historians of lexicography would largely be focused on the lexical or grammatical treatment of words and phrases dealt with in dictionaries. However, in the case of English lexicography, this attitude seems hardly to have been applied to dictionaries before Samuel Johnson’s *Dictionary of the English Language* (1755), leaving a plenitude of historically significant facts undiscovered.

The major scholarly reference works which individually treat early English dictionaries are Henry Wheatley's "Chronological notices of the dictionaries of the English language" (1865), De Witt Starnes and Gertrude Noyes's *English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson: 1604–1755* (1946) and *The Oxford History of English Lexicography* (2009) edited by A. P. Cowie. Of these three reference works, the one which gives the most detailed account of monolingual English dictionaries in the first century is Starnes and Noyes's, and, though published seventy years ago, it has continued to exert overwhelming influence until today, to the extent that the discussion of the dictionaries in the work edited by Cowie seems to be little more than a summary of Starnes and Noyes's.

In spite of this situation, when we proceed with reading the dictionaries with primary attention to their provision of lexical information, an array of deficiencies in Starnes and Noyes's account stands out. There are two main reasons for these deficiencies; one is the fact that Starnes and Noyes's analyses of the dictionaries are mainly made in accordance with the contents of their title pages and introductory materials, and the other is that the two authorities are excessively conscious of the external history of the dictionaries they discuss. As to the former, it is quite often, or rather almost usual, that there is a great gulf between the contents of the title page and introductory material of the historical dictionary and that of its body. With regard to the latter, one example is that Edward Phillips is regarded as having committed plagiarism on the basis of Thomas Blount's attack in his *World of Errors Discovered* (1673), with entire disregard for Phillips's creative use of Blount's *Glossographia*, as well as his highly distinctive provision of lexical information; quite conversely, the presentation of head-words in Coles's *Dictionary*, which is based on far more utilization of the preceding dictionaries, is acclaimed as highly innovative, without a slightest reference to its making.

It follows that Starnes and Noyes's analyses of monolingual English dictionaries are almost totally devoid of reference to the lexical information on words and phrases which the dictionaries actually more than amply provide. In a sense, it may be said that the results of Starnes and Noyes's analyses are reflected well in *The Oxford History of English Lexicography*. In this work, monolingual English dictionaries in the first century are divided into three categories simply in terms of the words treated — the hard-word dictionary, the encyclopedic dictionary and the universal dictionary — only two to three pages being allocated for each of the dictionaries from that viewpoint; this may indicate the fact that research on the early monolingual English dictionaries has been conducted almost consistently in line with Starnes and Noyes's work.

My way of investigating the dictionaries is greatly different from, or nearly diametrically opposed to, that of Starnes and Noyes. Through it, various facts, which have been unnoticed for centuries, have come to be revealed, which are not only an array of historically significant methods for the lexical treatment of words and phrases, but also the highly creative use of other dictionaries in one specific dictionary, as well as the previously unrecognized direct and indirect influence of one dictionary on others. My method, although simple, yields results: it is to dive directly into the contents of the dictionaries, relying little on descriptions in their title pages and introductory materials; it therefore tends to reveal the gulf between the front matter of dictionaries and their actual content.

In conducting my analysis, I have adopted a sampling method, choosing sometimes head-words for verbs of high frequency and sometimes those for function words. However, in order to know the general tendencies in the dictionaries, I basically and usually analyzed entries for words which begin with the letter *L*. This is the method which Joseph Reed (1962) adopted in his analysis of Noah Webster's *American Dictionary of the English Language* (1828), concerning which Reed (1962: 95) says that "This was a sample of convenient size and had the added virtue of its position in the book: Webster had by this time settled down to a regular *modus operandi*". The same may be assumed to apply to other lexicographers of historical dictionaries.

I have treated all the dictionaries which I investigate in this book as, in effect, general English dictionaries; treating a given dictionary as, for instance, simply a hard-word dictionary or an encyclopedic dictionary would have risked disregarding its most important function, the provision of lexical information on words and phrases.

Here, I think I should remark on the *Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers Volume 4: The Seventeenth Century* (2012) edited by John Considine, in which one of my papers in this volume is also included. From my perspective, having been writing papers on the history of monolingual English dictionaries since 1980, its publication was very encouraging: it can undoubtedly be positioned as the breakthrough for overcoming the traditional limitation of research on early English dictionaries which was formed by Starnes and Noyes's work.

Having said all this, let me close on a different note. In his *Science as a Vocation (Wissenschaft als Beruf)* (1919), Max Weber stated that "Every scientific 'fulfilment' raises new 'questions'; it asks to be 'surpassed' and outdated". Seventy years after the publication of Starnes and Noyes's historic work, an indubitably splendid work in its own time, although I have a sincerely respectful attitude to it, I hope this volume of mine may

contribute to opening a new horizon of research on the founding century of English lexicography.

3. Outline of Each Chapter

Before outlining the contents of each chapter of the volume, I want to enumerate, in chronological order, the English monolingual dictionaries I have dealt with and the dictionaries of other kinds which provide necessary context for them. They are as follows:

English Monolingual Dictionaries

- 1604 Robert Cawdrey's *Table Alphabeticall*.
 1616 John Bullokar's *English Expositor*.
 1623 Henry Cockeram's *English Dictionarie*.
 1656 Thomas Blount's *Glossographia*.
 1658 Edward Phillips's *New World of English Words*.
 1676 Elisha Coles's *English Dictionary*.

Other Types of Dictionaries

- 1587 Thomas Thomas's *Dictionarium Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae*.
 1589 John Rider's *Bibliotheca Scholastica*.
 1596 Edmund Coote's *English School-master*.
 1617 Francis Holyoke's 4th edition of *Riders Dictionarie*, the revised edition of John Rider's *Bibliotheca Scholastica* (1589).
 1662 Nicaise Le Fèvre's *Compendious Body of Chymistry*.
 1670 Thomas Blount's *Nomoxikon*.
 1671 Stephen Skinner's *Etymologicon Linguae Anglicanae*.

1689 Richard Hogarth's
Gazophylacium Anglicanum.

1702 J. K.'s *New English Dictionary.*

The chapters of this volume are as follows.

Chapter One, "Robert Cawdrey's *Table Alphabeticall* (1604): Its Driving Force for Early English Lexicography": I have collated Cawdrey's *Table* with Bullokar's *Expositor*. On the one hand, the former ceased to be published thirteen years after its first edition, the fourth edition, which was published in 1617, being the last; on the other hand, the latter went through nineteen editions until 1775, more than one and a half centuries after the first edition. In the context of this remarkable contrast, the *Table* has often been estimated as if it had been a starting-point for English monolingual lexicography and no more. However, Bullokar, in his *Expositor*, incorporated well over half of the head-words in the *Table*, using its definitions in more than 43% of the entries in his own dictionary. Cockeram was also strongly influenced by the *Table*, both directly and also indirectly via the *Expositor*. Analyzing thus, I have aimed to clarify the significance of the *Table* as the driving force for early English lexicography.

Chapter Two, "John Bullokar's *English Expositor* (1616) and Henry Cockeram's *English Dictionarie* (1623): Their Treatment of Derivatives in the Earliest English Dictionaries": Although obscured by a high number of hard words, lexicographical techniques for offering linguistic information developed considerably during the first century of monolingual English dictionaries. One subject on which information came to be offered with increasing sophistication is the formation of derivatives. In this chapter, I discuss the earliest development of the treatment of derivatives in English monolingual lexicography, investigating Cawdrey's *Table*, Bullokar's *Expositor* and Cockeram's *Dictionarie*. My purpose is to clarify how Bullokar and Cockeram creatively used the dictionaries of the lexicographers who preceded each of them, uniquely developing new aspects, at the same time, for the provision of information on derivatives. Their efforts in this respect were to be succeeded by lexicographers after them, whose results led to an incremental enhancement of this aspect of the monolingual dictionary tradition.

Chapter Three, "Henry Cockeram's *English Dictionarie* (1623) - the 'Second Part' (1): His Treatment of Verbs of High Frequency": Cockeram's *Dictionarie* is comprised of three parts, of which the "Second Part" is, according to Cockeram himself, meant to provide readers with information on how "vulgar" words and phrases can be replaced by "refined" terms. However, this part actually reflects Cockeram's keen interest in the

notions and significations of the conjugated forms of verbs of high frequency, as well as in idiomatic phrases, especially phrasal verbs, which are related to such verbs. For this reason, he may be worthy to be called a very early forerunner of Samuel Johnson. In treating such words and phrases, Cockeram basically worked from the “First Part” of his *Dictionarie* and Bullokar’s *Expositor*, sometimes referring to Cawdrey’s *Table*, but, at the same time, he often used derivatives in a unique way to define them.

Chapter Four, “Henry Cockeram’s *English Dictionarie* (1623) - the ‘Second Part’ (2): Reconsidering Its Source Material”: The “Second Part” of Cockeram’s *Dictionarie* is regarded as the first monolingual English dictionary of daily words, and as having no precedent. For this reason, it has been usual for authorities to identify its source as two English–Latin bilingual dictionaries, the first and second editions of Rider’s *Bibliotheca*; they also propose that Cockeram anglicized a great many Latin words, introducing them into the English vocabulary as “refined” terms. This perspective is, I argue, faulty, proposed with insufficient reflection on the history of English words. The fact is that approximately 90% of the “refined” terms are seen in the “First Part” of the *Dictionarie*, and that approximately 67% of these are already seen in Cawdrey’s *Table* and Bullokar’s *Expositor*. Almost the same applies to head-words and head-phrases of the “Second Part”.

Chapter Five, “Henry Cockeram’s *English Dictionarie* (1623) - the ‘Second Part’ (3): Its Arrangement of Entries, Treatment of Synonyms and Information on Word-formation”: If the head-phrases and “refined” terms in the “Second Part” of Cockeram’s *Dictionarie* are heavily based on the dictionaries which preceded it, what is left in it that can be regarded as noteworthy? From a holistic viewpoint, the “Second Part” is historically innovative in three respects. Firstly, in terms of arrangement of entries, it gives special attention to the root word of derivatives and the infinitive of verbs, the set of entries being provided; this is especially notable when homographs are treated. Secondly, it is often the case that more than one “refined” term is provided for one “vulgar” word or phrase, Cockeram having exercised his ingenuity, which makes the “Second Part” a prototype of an English thesaurus. Thirdly, it is designed for English word-formation to be grasped comprehensibly, with the help of the arrangement of entries.

Chapter Six, “Henry Cockeram’s *English Dictionarie* (1623) and Thomas Blount’s *Glossographia* (1656): Their Anglicization of Foreign Words”: Monolingual English dictionaries in the seventeenth century are generally regarded as belonging to the “hard-word tradition”, the “hard

words” in this context being words used in scholarly discourse and those which proved to be formidable obstacles in reading for people at large. However, according to the 3rd edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary* (2000-), 12.9% of head-words in Cockeram’s *Dictionary* (the “First Part”) and 18.2% of head-words in Blount’s *Glossographia* can be regarded as having first appeared in the dictionaries, respectively, in English literature. This may suggest a strong possibility that Cockeram and Blount also treated quite a few words coined by themselves in their dictionaries, not limited to such “hard words”. I, based on this recognition, investigated their probable ways of coining words and the probable “length of life” of such words, as well as their types.

Chapter Seven, “Edward Phillips’s *New World of English Words* (1658): The First Systematic Treatment of English Vocabulary”: It has almost been a consensus view among authorities that Phillips’s *New World* was deeply indebted to Blount’s *Glossographia*, having very little uniqueness. The fact is, however, that the two dictionaries are of different types from each other; while Blount compiled the *Glossographia* seeing naturalized foreign words as the primary object of English-language lexicography, when compiling the *New World*, Phillips thought that what mattered was the systematic treatment of the vocabulary of English. In line with this point of view, Phillips very frequently amalgamated and replaced entries in the *Glossographia*. He had three criteria for this: (1) disregarding the etymons of head-words, especially of their derivative suffixes, (2) emphasising the root forms of English words in choosing head-words, and (3) prioritising the nouns over adjectives and verbs, also in the choice of head-words.

Chapter Eight, “Elisha Coles’s *English Dictionary* (1676): His Utilization of English Dictionaries from 1604 to 1658”: In the compilation process of his *Dictionary*, Coles invented a lexicographical technique, that of “linked entries” or “concatenated entries”, which has been acclaimed as historically significant for treating a great number of derivatives in groups. However, little research on its origins has been undertaken. Actually, Coles developed the technique, extensively using all preceding monolingual English dictionaries for his; in approximately 85% of the linked entries, we can see the traces of his frequent use of four dictionaries, from Bullokar’s *Expositor* to Phillips’s *New World*. And he performed this practice basically in four ways: (1) dividing one entry in one dictionary; (2) integrating more than one entry in one dictionary; (3) integrating more than one entry in more than one dictionary; and (4) turning a word from a definition in one dictionary into a head-word in a group of linked entries.

(I wrote a paper following from Chapter Eight under the title “Elisha Coles and the group of entries: His use of linking phrases and search for derivatives and their root forms”, which is to be published in the *Lexicographica: International Annual for Lexicography*, Vol. 32, 2017. In this paper I have investigated two points concerning Coles’s linked entries: how he developed the technique of holding entries together with linking phrases, and how he searched for the numerous words which appeared in the linked entries for the first time in the monolingual tradition. With regard to the former, Coles’s technique is a development from the unsystematic use of linking phrases in English monolingual dictionaries before his; he systematically used such phrases, like contrasting a derivative adjective with the noun from which it is derived and contrasting a derivative noun with the adjective from which it is derived. As to the latter, he proceeded in four ways: (1) starting with a root form and giving a derivative; (2) starting with one derived form and giving another; (3) starting with a derived form and giving its root; and (4) starting with a compound word and giving one of its elements.)

Chapter Nine, “Richard Hogarth’s *Gazophylacium Anglicanum* (1689) and J. K.’s *New English Dictionary* (1702): A Turning Point in the History of the General English Dictionary”: It has generally been agreed that J. K.’s *New English Dictionary*, or *NED*, is a monolingual English dictionary which marked a turning point in English lexicography in that it treated plenty of daily words, and that it made a sudden appearance, owing little to the dictionaries which preceded it. However, when it is collated with Hogarth’s *Gazophylacium*, an English–Latin dictionary which has been harshly criticized as almost worthless, it is found that J. K. introduced more than 70% of the head-words of the *Gazophylacium*, using quite a few definitions from the same source, into the *NED*. In this regard, it may safely be said that the *Gazophylacium* is worthy to be called a driving force which has brought about a historical innovation in the field of English monolingual dictionaries.

Chapter Ten, “J. K.’s *New English Dictionary* (1702): Its Traditional and Genuine Innovative Aspects”: As discussed in Chapter Nine, the *Gazophylacium* is the most important of the sources from which J. K. compiled his *NED*. At the same time, the prevailing perspective that the *NED* is divorced from the monolingual English dictionaries which preceded it is a fallacy based on the deep-rooted misunderstanding that they exclusively treated hard words. Actually, approximately 30% of entries of the *NED* are also listed in Bullokar’s *Expositor* and Coles’s *Dictionary*, J. K. vividly leaving the traces of his indebtedness to them. If we are to seek the genuine innovative aspects of the *NED*, they lie in J. K.’s direct

reference to a historic etymological dictionary, Skinner's *Etymologicon*, which is the source of the *Gazophylacium*, and his provision of information on the structure and formation of the pseudo-adjective and complex word, as well as in his spelling of words, more than in his treatment of daily words.

4. Convention for Citing Dictionary Entries

Early English dictionaries had various typographical conventions. Cawdrey has head-words in roman type and definitions in black-letter; Bullokar, Phillips, and Coles have head-words in italic and definitions in roman, with some words picked out in italic; Cockeram follows Bullokar in his "First Part" but reverses the typefaces in his "Second Part"; Blount and Hogarth have head-words in black-letter and definitions in roman with some words picked out in italic; J. K. has head-words in roman and definitions in italic, with some words picked out in roman. In order to present entries from the different dictionaries side by side in such a way that like elements in different entries can readily be compared with each other, all of these different typographical schemes have been normalized as follows: head-words are in bold, the main text of entries is in roman, and words picked out in the original are in italic.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The project of publishing this volume started from Professor John Considine's recommendation. For more than ten years, since 2006 when we first met at an international conference in Italy, I have been given quite a few invaluable academic suggestions from him on many occasions; if I have grown as a researcher in these years, it is greatly owing to them. This time, in editing the volume, he not only gave me inspiring suggestions anew but also very favourably contributed the "Introduction" which is profoundly significant in research on the history of lexicography (although I blush at his words concerning me); I am happy that his "Introduction", which is independently highly valuable, is included in the volume. From the very beginning to the very end, Professor Considine always assisted me and encouraged me, offering precious advice to me, for the publication of this volume. I now, remembering his recommendation in 2015, want to express my deepest and sincerest gratitude to Professor Considine.

At the same time, when I feel a sense of such a gratitude to Professor Considine, I am gratefully reminded of my indebtedness I owe to Honorary Professor Reinhard Hartmann, who provided me with words which I cite at the beginning of the "Preface", congratulating me for the publication of the volume. As my supervisor when I was a student of a Ph.D. course at the University of Exeter, he continuously and patiently instructed me from a broad perspective of the lexicographical studies as a whole, helping me overcome various problems I faced in my research. It was due to his persistent tutelage that I became able to make presentations once, or sometimes twice, a year at internationally notable conferences from 2006, the year following my graduation from the University and the year when I met Professor Considine for the first time. (Looking back further, I believe I had a "seed of wisdom for research" sown in me by the late Professor Haruo Kozi, my supervisor when I was a master's course student studying the history of lexicography in Osaka (part of Kansai), Japan, having the "seed" nurtured by Honorary Professor Hartmann.)

If the publication of this volume is actualized by the favour of Professor Considine and Honorary Professor Hartmann, as it actually is, I cannot pass over the fact that I have been beholden to persons related to my college, especially Dr. Daisaku Ikeda, Founder of Soka Women's College, where I have been working for twenty-six years, and Soka

University, who provided me with occasions to study in Exeter and to go outside of Japan annually for making presentations. Dr. Ikeda's moral support which emphasizes the importance of research for education of our students has been a source of encouragement to me. (I, as well as other persons concerned, am proud that the founding principles of the University put forth by him are vividly alive among us: "Be the highest seat of learning for humanistic education", "Be the cradle of a new culture" and "Be a fortress for the peace of humankind".)

In addition to Professor Considine, Honorary Professor Hartmann and Dr. Ikeda, I will be happy if I am allowed, on this occasion, to express my appreciation to other persons who are leading authorities on the history of lexicography from whom I was given academic suggestions at the conferences where I made presentations. Besides, I thank Ms. Victoria Caruthers, an author liaison, and other staff members of Cambridge Scholars Publishing for helping me to publish the volume. (My thanks to other publishing companies which very kindly gave me permissions to reproduce their relevant papers in the volume is as expressed in the "List of Original Publications".) And, last but not least, I am also thankful to my family and friends for kind understanding of and assistance for editing the volume. I sincerely thank each of them here.

INTRODUCTION

“SO MANY *ENGLISH DICTIONARIES* IN HIS STUDY”

JOHN CONSIDINE

1. The seventeenth-century monolingual English dictionary tradition

In 1691, the publisher and miscellaneous writer John Dunton brought out the second volume of his *Voyage Round the World*, which opened with an imaginary debate between himself and critics of the first volume. One of the criticisms voiced in this debate was that *voyage* seemed not to be the right title for a book in which no journey by sea was being made. Dunton's rejoinder (1691: 17) was that it was absurd to criticise the use of English of a writer such as himself, one “Who has so many *English Dictionaries* in his Study, and another in his Head *bigger* than all together”. Other texts of the last decade of the seventeenth century likewise referred to English dictionaries, as authorities or as texts to be challenged. So, for instance, in his *Discourse Concerning the Nature of Man*, the philosopher and clergyman James Lowde explained that he would use the words *vice* and *virtue* “according to the acceptation of our old English Dictionaries” (1694: sig. a3r), and in her “Treatise Concerning Enthusiasm,” the Quaker Anne Docwra remarked of people who use the word *enthusiasm* in a negative sense that “Their English Dictionaries says, that the word *Enthusiasm*, or *Enthysiasm*, signifies an *Inspiration*, or a *Ravishment*, of the *Spirit*, *Divine Motion*, *Poetical Fury*” (1700: 40).

Dunton, Lowde, and Docwra could imagine the possession and consultation of multiple dictionaries of English much more readily than earlier writers. This was because they were writing towards the end of the first century of monolingual English lexicography. As recently as 1661, the schoolmaster Charles Hoole had imagined that among the books in the schoolroom might be “A little English Dictionary”: one single English

dictionary, which he interestingly specified should be in sextodecimo format (Hoole 1661: 184). In fact, no English dictionary was issued in a smaller format than octavo, and Hoole's specification suggests that he had a sense of the English dictionary as a tiny, and anonymous, book.¹ By contrast, a dictionary owner in 1700 might have one of the folio editions of Edward Phillips's *New World of Words* on her shelves, the most recent having been published in 1696, and one or more of the smaller English dictionaries. She might, for instance, have one of the stout octavo editions of Thomas Blount's *Glossographia*, from which Docwra took her definition of *enthusiasm*, the most recent of which had appeared in 1681. She might well have a copy of Elisha Coles's compactly printed *English Dictionary*, a smaller and less attractive book than the *New World* or the *Glossographia*, but claiming to offer "some thousands more" words than they did (Coles 1676: sig. A3r). She might have a late edition of John Bullokar's little *English Expositor*, the "Ninth time revised" in 1695, or a copy of Henry Cockeram's *English Dictionarie*, of which the last edition had appeared in 1670.² She would very probably not have one of the few surviving copies of Robert Cawdrey's long-superseded *Table Alphabetical*, of which there had been four editions from 1604 to 1617, but some of its contents had been carried over into later dictionaries, so she might unknowingly consult a dictionary entry which went back to Cawdrey. These six monolingual English dictionaries can be seen as forming a coherent tradition.

2. Studying the tradition: before and after Starnes and Noyes

The tradition from Cawdrey to Coles has only been studied as such since the end of the nineteenth century, because before then, Robert Cawdrey was almost unknown as a lexicographer. Edmond Malone owned the unique extant copy of the first edition of the *Table Alphabetical*, and cited it in his edition of Shakespeare (e.g. at Shakespeare 1790: VIII. 102, 508, 559) and in his debunking of William Henry Ireland's Shakespeare forgeries

¹ For a helpful practical glimpse of the smallness of a seventeenth-century sextodecimo, see Smith 2010: 87–9.

² Then as now, a dictionary some decades old might be in current use: as it happens, the copy of Cockeram 1670 at the Harry Ransom Center in Austin, Texas (call number Ah C645 623el), of which images are available through *Early English Books Online*, has an ownership inscription of 1700 on the recto of its front endpaper.

(Malone 1796: 76, 81, 257).³ In 1815, after Malone's death, it passed to the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and although its presence there was recorded in printed catalogues (Bodleian Library 1836: 7 and Bodleian Library 1843: 486), it entered more than half a century of obscurity. The earliest accounts of the history of English dictionaries, such as that of Henry Wheatley (1865), do not mention Cawdrey. In 1881, however, Wheatley published some supplementary notes to his account, and by that date he had inspected the Malone copy of the first edition of the *Table* in the Bodleian. In these notes, he referred to the *Table* only as "a collection of hard words" (Wheatley 1881: 269), not as a dictionary, so that he did not clearly communicate its significance for the history of lexicography. Perhaps this is why Cawdrey was not the subject of an entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography* when its volume 9, *Canute–Chaloner*, appeared in 1886.

A reader for the *New English Dictionary* (the dictionary which is now called the *Oxford English Dictionary*) was contributing quotations from the third edition of the *Table Alphabeticall* to it in time for the first of them to appear in the first fascicle of the dictionary, published in 1884 (the first entry in which it was cited seems to have been **allevate**), but these were identified in the printed dictionary as from "R. C. *Table Alph.*", suggesting that neither the reader nor the editor, James Murray, knew Cawdrey's name.⁴ A contributor to the *NED*, the antiquary G. L. Apperson, mentioned Cawdrey as a lexicographer in an article four years later, calling the *Table* "the first real English dictionary" (Apperson 1888: 184; the article draws on Wheatley 1881), and the first narrative history of early English dictionaries which treats the *Table* as a starting point was, I believe, that of the American lexicographer Ralph Olmstead Williams (1890: 9–10; for Williams, see *The Nation* 87 [1908]: 74). So the emergence of Cawdrey as a significant figure in the history of lexicography took place slowly over the 1880s and 1890s. From July 1895, the *NED* began citing the *Table* as "R. CAWDREY *Table Alph.*" (the first entry in which the full name was given appears to have been **densate**), and in 1900, Cawdrey was at last clearly identified as a lexicographical pioneer in

³ Two responses to Malone refer at second hand to the evidence he took from Cawdrey: Chalmers 1797: 111 and Ireland 1798: 33.

⁴ The third edition, Cawdrey 1613, has the initials "R. C." on the title page, by contrast with the anonymous title page of Cawdrey 1604, but lacks the signed dedication of Cawdrey 1604, so it was not readily identified as a work by Cawdrey. The Bodleian catalogued its copy as by "C., R.," separately from its copy of 1604, which was identified as by Cawdrey: Bodleian Library 1843: 387 and 486 respectively.

a widely read historical narrative, Murray's *Evolution of English Lexicography* (Murray 1900: 27, 31, 34).⁵

In the next half-century, various short, semi-popular accounts of the seventeenth-century English dictionary tradition were published (to those mentioned in Starnes and Noyes 1946: 228–231 may be added an early continental European response to Murray, Lindelöj 1904), but it is not surprising that these tended to be rather derivative. Many of the dictionaries themselves were hard to come by, especially for scholars outside England. From 1923 onwards, the Library of Congress owned a photographic reproduction of the Bodleian copy of the first edition of Cawdrey's *Table* (Aydelotte 1923: xiii), but to see the other editions of Cawdrey, it was still necessary to travel to Oxford, Cambridge and London; early editions of Bullokar were scarce and dispersed; early editions of Cockeram were not much more readily available (see Starnes and Noyes 1946: 232–3 for a census of copies in the United States). “The wide distribution of copies of a text”, it was observed by a scholar familiar with the problem, “presents many difficulties to the student who wishes to make a comparative study of different editions of the same dictionary, or a comparative study of dictionaries by different compilers” (Starnes 1954: vi). By far the best account of early modern English lexicography in the forty-five years after Murray's *Evolution* — that of Allen Walker Read, who had studied the history of lexicography as a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford before joining the staff of the *Dictionary of American English* in Chicago, and had therefore had access to early English dictionaries in England and the United States — remained in manuscript until the present century (Read 1935/2003; for Read, see Bailey 2003).

Articles published between 1937 and 1943 by two American academics, De Witt T. Starnes and Gertrude E. Noyes (see Starnes and Noyes 1946: 229–30), the former being the author of the remark about wide distribution which was quoted above, suggested that they were studying the seventeenth-century dictionaries at a higher level than had been achieved in any previous publication. The appearance in 1946 of their jointly authored book *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson* cast every preceding study into the shade. In this book, for the first time, a systematic account was given of all six free-standing monolingual dictionaries in the tradition from Cawdrey to Coles (not to mention their successors up to the eve of the publication of Johnson's *Dictionary*), with

⁵ Leo Wiener's carping account of Murray's alleged failure to make “a thorough study of the old dictionaries” (1896: 183) as he edited the *NED* says nothing about Cawdrey: Wiener lived in Massachusetts and there was no copy of the *Table* in North America.

generous provision of extracts from the front matter and the entries of each dictionary, and reproductions of a number of title pages. The book paid close, and sometimes unsympathetic, attention to the relationship between each dictionary and its predecessor. Bilingual dictionaries, specialized dictionaries, dictionaries and wordlists which formed part of other books (notably Cawdrey's main source, Coote 1596) and manuscript materials were excluded from consideration. Even so, the achievement, founded on years of work in many libraries on both sides of the Atlantic, was remarkable.

Starnes and Noyes had at once defined a field of inquiry and given what appeared to be the definitive account of it. Robert L. Ramsey, who had been a mentor of Allen Walker Read, concluded his review of their book by saying that it would "serve as incentive and guide for many future expeditions and conquests" (Ramsay 1947: 60), and many studies have indeed been written on aspects of the tradition since 1946 (some of them are gathered in Considine 2012b). "The book," remarked another reviewer, the American philologist Kemp Malone (1949: 566), "is by far the best thing we have in its field and it is not likely to be superseded soon". Nor has it been: seventy years later, the standard history of the seventeenth-century monolingual dictionary tradition is still *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson*, in the original or in a reprint with supplementary material by Gabriele Stein (Starnes and Noyes 1991). There have certainly been criticisms. The German Anglist Jürgen Schäfer remarked that the book "creates the image of a self-perpetuating cycle when assigning dependencies: one dictionary maker copied from his predecessor and was in turn exploited by his successor", adding mildly that "It is at least a question whether such a presentation does justice to the intricacy of the historical development" (Schäfer 1970: 32). Reviewers of the reprint of 1991 regretted that there was no supplement "warning the reader about statements and evaluations superseded by post-1946 research" (Görlach 1993: 134), and commented — rightly, as we shall see — on the way that Starnes and Noyes's "method for showing textual genealogy" was at once "thoroughly researched" and "somewhat impressionistic" (Dolezal 1996: 206).⁶ But no new monograph has replaced their pioneering work, even though the conditions of lexicographical research have changed drastically

⁶ Starnes and Noyes deserve to be defended against a third criticism, that they gave the false impression of having seen certain dictionaries, such as the third and fourth editions of Cawdrey (Bailey 1991: 124). This is based on a misunderstanding of the words "not located" in their census of American copies: they had not located either in the United States, but Starnes had worked in the British Library, where there were copies of both.

with the availability of the vast majority of early English printed dictionaries on microfilm and online, and of first editions of all six of the seventeenth-century monolingual dictionaries in printed facsimiles.

3. Kusujiro Miyoshi and *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson*

The ten studies which follow are the fruits of work undertaken in the course of the last twenty-five years by the Japanese historian of lexicography Kusujiro Miyoshi. Like Allen Walker Read, Miyoshi began his studies of English philology on another continent (with Haruo Kozu at Kansai University of Foreign Studies) and developed them as a graduate student in England (with Reinhard Hartmann at the University of Exeter). They bear witness to his long and meticulous engagement with the first century of monolingual English dictionaries as described by Starnes and Noyes, from Cawdrey's *Table* to J. K.'s *New English Dictionary* of 1702 — not that his work on English lexicography has been confined to this field (cf. Miyoshi 2007). They might all be described as “expeditions and conquests” of the sort which Robert Ramsey hoped to see setting out from the base of *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson*.

In Chapter One, Miyoshi engages with the question of the *Table Alphabeticall*'s relationship to its successor, Bullokar's *English Expositor*. Cawdrey's work has a rather ambiguous place in Starnes and Noyes's narrative: their title “from Cawdrey to Johnson” suggests that their subject is a tradition which arises from Cawdrey, but in their account of Bullokar, they say (1946: 22) that he “borrowed freely from Thomas”, i.e. from the Latin–English *Dictionarium Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae* of 1587, and “also contracted a debt to Cawdrey's *A Table Alphabeticall*”, illustrating both points with tables of selected entries. “Naturally”, they conclude (23), “the greater debt” is to Thomas, “as this is by far the larger work”: Fredric Dolezal's description of their procedure as not only “thoroughly researched” but also “somewhat impressionistic” comes to mind. So, does Bullokar's dictionary — and, if so, the whole subsequent tradition — really owe more to Thomas than to Cawdrey? And is it right to contrast Cawdrey's attention, stated on the title-page of the *Table*, to treat “hard vsuall English wordes” with Bullokar's “special attention to hard words of foreign origin” (Starnes and Noyes 1946: 21)? Miyoshi's account in this chapter of the actual extent to which Bullokar borrowed from Cawdrey and of their relative interest in loanwords, together with his supplementary account of the material in Cockeram's *English Dictionarie* which came via Bullokar from Cawdrey, sets our understanding of the relationship between

the first two dictionaries in the seventeenth-century tradition on a firmer footing than ever before.

One of Miyoshi's arguments has important implications: he points out that if an entry in Bullokar corresponds verbally with one in Thomas 1587 and with one in Cawdrey 1604, it is likelier to be from the latter. This is surely true: it is very hard to imagine how Bullokar could have gone to work without using a copy of Cawdrey's *Table* as a basis for addition or subtraction. It would, indeed, be interesting to test the hypothesis that the printer's copy for Bullokar's *Expositor* was either an interleaved and marked-up copy of one of the first three editions of the *Table* or a transcript of such a copy; as we know, Thomas's *Dictionarium* was itself produced by just such a process of marking-up of an earlier printed dictionary (see Stevenson 1958, an exceptionally important study). A supplementary point which might be made here is that Cawdrey's *Table Alphabeticall* represents a great innovation in English publishing: the form of the *English Expositor* is fundamentally indebted to Cawdrey. Dictionaries are, as Sidney Landau observes in the last paragraph of the revised version of his fine monograph on "the art and craft of lexicography" (2001: 424), "articles for sale". What Cawdrey, or his publisher Edmund Weaver, realized, as nobody had before, was that a monolingual general wordlist of English could be an article for sale in its own right. It was that realization, and the "conscious attempt at niche marketing in the book trade" (McConchie 1992: 57) which followed from it, which founded the monolingual English dictionary tradition.

Chapter Two turns from an emphasis on the first and second members of the tradition to an emphasis on the second and third: Bullokar's *English Expositor* and Cockeram's *English Dictionarie*. Miyoshi offers a study of the treatment of derivatives in these two dictionaries, with reference to their treatment by Cawdrey. This is a topic which tells us something about the way in which the early monolingual lexicographers understood their work. Cawdrey had included occasional pairs such as **strict** and **strictnes** in his *Table*, although these often seem either to have shown some non-predictable difference in sense (for example, his definitions of *strict* and *strictnes* are respectively "straight, seuere, or sharpe" and "narrownes, or smalenes") or to have shown Latin derivational processes rather than the simple application of English affixes, as in cases like **sublime** and **sublimity**, or **succede** and **successor**. As Miyoshi shows, Bullokar was up to something different, offering pairs such as "**Lasciuious**. Wanton, dishonest" and "**Lasciuiousnesse**. Wantonnesse", which show an English derivational process operating in quite a predictable way. Here — and, as Miyoshi goes on to show, in Cockeram — there is a real interest in how

English word-formation works, and a sense that it is appropriate subject-matter for the English dictionary.

In this chapter, Miyoshi points out something curious in both Bullokar's and Cockeram's treatment of inherited entries: the apparently unmotivated loss of material. Where Cawdrey had an entry **logicall**, Bullokar had entries **logician** and **logicke** but not **logicall**; where Cawdrey had an entry **laxatiue**, Bullokar deleted it, and Cockeram had entries **laxament**, **laxate**, **laxitie**, but not **laxatiue**. These particular losses can hardly be explained by simple scepticism as to the existence of a form (though to be sure, this might sometimes operate, as in Bullokar's rejection of Cawdrey's "**exorde**, beginne", for which no other attestation has been found): as Miyoshi shows here and in Chapter Six, Cockeram's interest in the derivational possibilities of English may have led him into a number of coinages of his own. Bullokar and Cockeram both seem to have been reluctant to absorb Cawdrey's book in its totality into their own: can this be connected with the very recent emergence of the English word *plagiary*, first attested in *OED* in a text of 1598, and already used with reference to a book "wholy stolne out" from another in the year of publication of the *Table* ([Sutcliffe] 1604: 375)? The variant title-pages of the first edition of Cockeram's *Dictionarie* likewise suggest an uneasy relationship with its predecessors; as Starnes and Noyes point out (1946: 26), the title-page which names Edmund Weaver as publisher calls the dictionary "a Collection of the choisest words contained in the Table Alphabeticall and English Expositor, and of some thousand of words never published by any heretofore". but the cancel title-page which names Nathaniel Butter as publisher calls it simply "a Collection of some thousands of words neuer published by any heretofore". Perhaps Weaver hoped that those who had bought the *Table* from him in the past would now replace it with the *English Dictionarie*, while Butter supposed that a claim to novelty would be a better marketing strategy. Chapter Nine returns to the point that the compilers of the early monolingual dictionaries did not simply accumulate as many head-words as possible.

Miyoshi's next three chapters turn to Cockeram's *English Dictionarie*, examining three different aspects of "The Second Part", or in full "The Second Part of the English Translator", in which Cockeram lists "the vulgar words" with hard-word equivalents, so that "whensoeuer any desirous of a more curious explanation by a more refined and elegant speech" consults it, "he shall there receiue the exact and ample word to expresse the same" (Cockeram 1623: sig. A4v). This was the first sustained attempt at the monolingual lexicography of common English words.