Bullokar's and Cockeram's Interest in Word Formation: Treatment of Derivatives in the Earliest English Dictionaries

Kusujiro Miyoshi
Soka Women's College

1. Introduction

It has generally been acknowledged among authorities that the history of English dictionaries in the seventeenth century is characterized by the "hard word tradition", which De Witt Starnes and Gertrude Noyes (1946:8) explained as "an increase in the number of 'hard' words — those of foreign origin which offered difficulty to the reader".

I do not oppose this perspective on the whole. However, it is also true that, during this century, lexicographical technique in the treatment of word formation developed considerably, with derivative suffixes receiving special attention. Starnes and Noyes (1946:63) pointed out the fact that Elisha Coles included "groups of related words" in his *English Dictionary* (1676), which Noel Osselton (2009:146) later cited an example of:

> *Tristifical, l.* which doth / *Tristitiate*, or make / *Tristful*, sad, sorrowful.

However, as far as I can judge, a thorough examination has not been conducted on the way in which the treatment of derivatives developed in English dictionaries. Coles is occasionally thought to have been the first lexicographer in the seventeenth century to pay special attention to word formation, which is far from true. Osselton is one of only a few authorities who, in his book *Chosen Words* (1995), has analyzed the treatment of derivatives in individual dictionaries before Coles's. However, it is regrettable that Osselton did not do this from a historical perspective.

In fact, the two lexicographers succeeding Robert Cawdrey's *Table Alphabeticall* (1604), the first English monolingual dictionary, can be regarded as having laid the foundation for the treatment of derivatives through a keen interest in English word formation, John Bullokar compiling the *English Expositor* (1616) and Henry Cockeram the first part of the *English Dictionary* (1623). This was more than fifty years before Coles's *Dictionary*.

In this presentation, I will clarify how Bullokar and Cockeram developed the treatment of derivatives, Bullokar referring to Cawdrey's *Table*, and Cockram to both the *Table* and Bullokar's *Expositor*. I will use a sampling method to analyze the entries beginning with the letter *L* in these three dictionaries (59 entries in Cawdrey's *Table*, 121 in Bullokar's *Expositor* and 428 in Cockeram's *Dictionarie*). This is a sampling method which Joseph Reed (1962:95) adopted in his analysis of Noah Webster's *American Dictionary of the English Language* (1828), concerning which Reed 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, and thus provides a convenient starting-point for analysis.

Regarding the order of my analysis, I will first determine how closely Bullokar and Cockeram referred to Cawdrey's *Table* on the whole, then analyze how the two lexicographers developed the technique for the treatment of derivatives with reference to the preceding works, and finally examine their original contributions to derivative entries. Additionally, between the second and third stages of the analysis, I will also point out a few incidental findings enabled by the collation of these three dictionaries.

2. Bullokar's and Cockeram's reference to Cawdrey's *Table*
2.1. Bullokar's reference to Cawdrey's Table

As the focus of my presentation is Bullokar's and Cockeram's development of the treatment of derivatives, it is first necessary to inquire into how closely they each referred to Cawdrey's *Table*. In performing this task, I will also need to revise a prevailing, but possibly false, understanding about the influence of the *Table* on later dictionaries.

Since Starnes and Noyes discussed Cawdrey's *Table* in 1946, the prevailing assumption seems to have been that it exerted little influence on later dictionaries. This is because their claim that "The *Table Alphabeticall* was ... a beginning and no more" (Starnes and Noyes, 1946:192) has been widely accepted, along with their assertion that "many words defined by Cawdrey are omitted from the *Expositor*" (1946:23). In fact, however, both Bullokar's *Expositor* and Cockeram's *Dictionarie* show traces of their close reference to Cawdrey's *Table*.

With this premise, I will, in this section examine Bullokar's use of the *Table*. In the next section I will do the same with Cockeram.

In the entries for the letter *L* of his *Expositor*, Bullokar provides the counterparts of 30 entries out of the 59 in Cawdrey's *Table*, representing 50.8% of the total, a fact that contradicts Starnes and Noyes's assertion.

Five out of the 30 counterparts are verbatim transcriptions of Cawdrey's entries, as the following two sets of entries indicate:

> Cawdrey: laborious, painfull, full of labour
> Bullokar: *Laborious*. Painfull, full of labour.

> Cawdrey: laudable, worthie of praise
> Bullokar: *Laudable*. Worthy of praise.

The other three entries are **largesse**, **legate** and **lassitude**.

In addition to this fact, in the remaining 25 entries out of the 30, we can find at least ten where Bullokar seems to have intentionally modified Cawdrey's definitions, as in the following two entries:

> Cawdrey: lenitie, gentleness, mildnes
> Bullokar: *Lenitie*. Gentlenes, mildness, mercie.

> Cawdrey: leuitie, lightnes, inconstancie
> Bullokar: *Leuitie*. Lightnesse.

Other similar entries are **lasciuious**, **laude**, **limitation**, **limit**, **linguist**, **liquid**, **literature** and **luxurious**.

Thus, it may safely be said that Bullokar refers closely to Cawdrey's *Table* in a minimum of 15 entries out of the 59, representing 25.4% of the *L*'s in Cawdrey's *Table*.

2.2. Cockeram's reference to Cawdrey's Table

In Cockeram's case, we find 37 entries in the *L*'s of his *Dictionarie* with counterparts in Cawdrey's *Table*. Of these, 29 also correspond to entries in Bullokar's *Expositor*, sometimes making it difficult to determine whether Cockeram based the entries on the *Table* or the *Expositor*. In some cases the distinction is quite clear. For instance, in the following set of entries, we can say that Cockeram based himself on Bullokar's definition, rather than on Cawdrey's:

> Cawdrey: leete, court
> Bullokar: *Leete*. A court or law-day holden commonly euerie halfe yeare.
> Cockeram: *Leete*. A court or Law-day, held commonly euery halfe yeare.

In contrast to this, in the following examples it is hard to say whether Cockeram abbreviated Bullokar's definition or copied Cawdrey's directly:

> Cawdrey: literature, learning
> Bullokar: *Literature*. Learning: knowledge in bookes.
> Cockeram: *Literature*. Learning.

Nonetheless, Cockeram, in the *L*'s of his *Dictionarie*, provides eight entries with counterparts in Cawdrey but not in Bullokar. When we analyze these entries, though they are small in number, we are able to see the traces of Cockeram's direct reference to Cawdrey's *Table*. That is, in two entries out of the eight, Cockeram's definitions are almost exactly the same as Cawdrey's:

> Cawdrey: lingell, shoemakers thread
> Cockeram: *Lingele*. A shoemakers thread.

> Cawdrey: lumbar, old stuffe
> Cockeram: *Lamber*, Old staffe.

The eight entries also include two which are clearly abbreviations of Cawdrey's definitions:

> Cawdrey: lauacre, a bath or font
> Cockeram: *Lauacre*. A bath.

> Cawdrey: lethall, mortall, deadly
> Cockeram: *Lethall*. Deadly.

We can now say that, for Cockeram, Cawdrey's *Table* was a direct source during his compilation process of the *Dictionarie*, as was Bullokar's *Expositor*. Additionally, since Cockeram's *Dictionarie* includes 37 counterparts of Cawdrey's entries within the range of the *L*'s, or seven more than in the case of Bullokar's *Expositor*, it will not be an exaggeration to say that Cockeram referred to the *Table* more often than Bullokar did. And, here, we may say once again that Starnes and Noyes's claim to the effect that the *Table* was a beginning and no more, which I cited at the beginning of this section, has little credibility.

3. Bullokar's and Cockeram's interest in derivatives
3.1. Bullokar's interest in derivatives and Cawdrey's Table

How then did Bullokar develop Cawdrey's treatment of derivatives, and Cockeram develop Cawdrey's and Bullokar's? I have now arrived at the stage where this topic can be dealt with.

Cawdrey provides the following four entries, which can be partitioned into two sets within the range of the *L*'s in his *Table*, probably reflecting his interest in derivatives:

> laud, praise, or commendation
> laudable, worthie of praise

> limitation, appointment, how farre any thing shall goe, restraining
> limit, bounds, border, or land marke, also to such bound

I will analyze Bullokar's development of the treatment of derivatives in this section and Cockeram's in the following section.

Bullokar has 11 new entries in the *L*'s of his *Expositor* that refer to seven in Cawdrey's *Table*. He also seems to have consciously avoided including the counterparts of two entries out of these seven. This

situation is presented in the table below, where I have underlined Bullokar's new entries, and marked with asterisk those of Cawdrey's that Bullokar did not include.

Table 1. Bullokar's interest in derivatives and Cawdrey's *Table*

	Cawdrey's Entries	Bullokar's Entries
1	***languishing**	**Languishment**, **languor**
2	**lascivious**	**Lascivious**, **lasciviousness**
3	**legitimate**	**legisters**, **legitimate**, **legitimation**
4	**licentious**	**licentious**, **licentiousness**
5	**liquide**	**liquid**, **liquefaction**, **liquefie**
6	***logical**	**logician**, **logicke**
7	**lunatick**	**lunacie**, **lunaticke**

I cite here the contents of a few entries mentioned in the table to show Bullokar's relevant additions to and exclusions of entries, in terms of his interest in derivatives.

The following examples show Bullokar's addition of entries to Cawdrey:

Cawdrey: lasciuious, wanton, lecherous
Bullokar: *Lasciuious*. Wanton, dishonest. / *Lasciuiousness*. Wantonnesse.

In this example, Bullokar adds the entry on **lasciuiousness** to Cawdrey's on **lasciuious**, nominalizing the word "wanton", which is included in Cawdrey's definition. Then, in the example below, Bullokar adds the entries for **legisters** and **legitimation** to Cawdrey's for **legitimate**, inflecting the word "legitimate", Cawdrey's head-word:

Cawdrey: legitimate, lawfull, according to lawe, and good order
Bullokar: *Legisters*. Lawyers. / *Legitimate*. Lawfull, lawfully begotten. / *Legitimation*. A making of one legitimate.

Table 1 shows that Bullokar's apparent exclusion of Cawdrey's entries is in fact a replacement of entries. That is, Bullokar excludes the entries on **languishing** and **logical**, providing instead the entries on **languishment** and **languor** for the former and **logician** and **logick** for the latter, as shown below:

Cawdrey: languishing, pining, consuming, wearing away with griefe or sicknes
Bullokar: *Languishment*. A feeblenesse, a fainting. / *Languor*. Feebleness, sicknesse, infirmitie.

Cawdrey: logicall, (g) belonging to reason
Bullokar: *Logician*. One skilfull in Logicke. / *Logicke*. The art of Reason.

Why Bullokar replaced entries like this is currently not clear, but, taking into account that he referred to Cawdrey's *Table*, as we saw in Section 2, we may at least claim that such replacements were relevant to his interest in derivative suffixes.

3.2. Cockeram's interest in derivatives and Cawdrey's and Bullokar's dictionaries

Cockeram has 18 new entries associated with six entries in Cawdrey's *Table* and 12 in Bullokar's *Dictionarie*, excluding two in the former and one in the latter. The overview of this situation can be seen in the following table, where I have underlined the entries which are new to Cockeram and marked with an asterisk those of Cawdrey and Bullokar which Cockeram excludes.

Table 2. Cockeram's interest in derivatives and Cawdrey's and Bullokar's dictionaries

	Cawdrey's Entries	Bullokar's Entries	Cockeram's Entries
1	***lapidarie**	***lapidarie**	**lapidate, lapidation**
2	***laxatiue**	----------	**laxament, laxate, laxitie**
3	**legate**	**legate**	**legate, legation**
4	----------	**legend**	**legendarie, legends**
5	**liquid**	**liquid, liquefaction, liquefie**	**liquable, liquation, liquator, liquefation, liquefie, liquid**
6	**literature**	**literature**	**literate, literature**
7	**litigious**	**litigious**	**litigate, litigious**
8	----------	**loquacitie**	**loquacitie, loquentie**
9	----------	**lubricitie**	**lubricitie, lubricate, lubricke**
10	----------	**lucre**	**lucre, lucrificable, lucrate**
11	----------	**lutum**	**lutum, lutament**

As to the new entries in Cockeram, quite notable is the fact that seven words out of these 18 appear for the first time in his *Dictionarie* according to the *OED*, signifying the possibility that Cockeram coined them with reference to Cawdrey's and Bullokar's dictionaries. The seven words are *lapidate, laxament, laxate, liquator, lubricate, lucrificable* and *lucrate*. This only applies to Cockeram's case, and cannot be seen in Bullokar's entries, in the *L*'s of his *Expositor* that refer to Cawdrey's *Table*. In light of this, I will examine how Cockeram added new entries and excluded Cawdrey's and Bullokar's, by citing some entries related to the seven words. For convenience, I have underlined the words that Cockeram may have coined.

The following example shows well how Cockeram added entries:

> Bullokar: Lubricitie. Slipperness.
> Cockeram: *Lubricitie*. Slippernesse. / *Lubricate*. To make slippery. / *Lubricke*. Slippery.
> [Cawdrey did not include the relevant derivatives.]

In this example, it is clear that Cockeram added the entries to the verb *lubricate* and the adjective *lubricke*, possibly coining the verb, based on Bullokar's entry on *lubricitie*.

Cockeram also replaced Cawdrey's entries with new ones, as in the following example:

> Cawdrey: laxative, loose, purging
> Cockeram: *Laxament*. A releasd. / *Laxate*. To release, to loose, to pardon. / *Laxitie*. Pardon, chiefly cheapnesse.
> [Bullokar did not include the relevant derivatives.]

Why Cockeram omitted the entry for **laxative**, which appears in Cawdrey, is still to be investigated.

4. A new light on the history of lexicographical technique

It may be worth mentioning here that my collation of the three dictionaries thus far reveals aspects about the development of lexicographical technique that have not been noticed previously, to my knowledge. In this section, I will point out some of these aspects by citing two examples.

The first example is:

> Cawdrey: litigious, quarrellous, full of strife.
> Bullokar: *Litigious*. Contentious, full of strife.
> Cockeram: *Litigious*. Contentious in Law. / *Litigate*. To contend in Law with one.

In this example, we can see that Bullokar dealt with *litigous* by copying Cawdrey's phrase "full of strife", adding the word "Contentious". Cockeram also included this entry, with the definition "Contentious in Law". Cockeram then added the entry for **litigate**, where the head-word is another derivative, with the definition "To contend in Law with one", verbifying the word "Contentious".

The second example concerns the derivatives of the word "liquid", as provided by the three lexicographers.

> Cawdrey: liquid, moist, melted
> Bullokar: *Liquid*. Thin and moist. / *Liquefaction*. a melting. / *Liquefie*. To melt.
> Cockeram: *Liquable*. Which may be melted. / *Liquation*. A melting. / *Liquator*. He which melteth. / *Liquefaction*. That Liquation is. / *Liquefie*. To melt. / *Liquid*. Thin and moist.

In this example, we can clearly see that Bullokar adds the entries for **liquefaction** and **liquefie** to Cawdrey's entry for **liquid**, with Cockeram further adding the entries for **liquable**, **liquation** and **liquator**. We also note that in Cockeram's entry for **liquation**, the definition "A melting" is also the definition in Bullokar's entry on **liquefaction**. Cockeram's own entry for **liquefaction** refers to Bullokar's definition via his own entry for **liquefaction**, which is defined as "that Liquation is". This type of co-referencing may reflect Cockeram's attempt to present these entries in a systematic way. In Cockeram's set of entries, we can also see the strong possibility that he coined words in conformity with the usual ways of forming nouns and adjectives, as the *OED* indicates that the head-words "liquable", "liquation" and "liquator" appear for the first time in his *Dictionarie*.

5. Bullokar's and Cockeram's innovative entries for derivatives

Bullokar and Cockeram not only increased the number of entries for derivatives. Their interest in word formation also led them to add new entries for derivatives in word groups not included by their predecessors. As before, I will first discuss Bullokar, then Cockeram.

5.1. Bullokar's innovative entries for derivatives

In Bullokar's *Expositor* we can see the beginnings of including innovative entries for derivatives by the English lexicographer, independent of previous dictionaries. Thus, in the *L*'s of his *Expositor*, we find the following two entries that can be regarded as comprising one set:

> *Laureate*. Crowned with Laurell. / *Laurell*. The Bay tree, or a garland of Bayers.

Cawdrey's *Table* does not include **laureate**, **laurell** or other relevant entries for derivatives, and the situation seen in this example signifies the fact that Bullokar was the first lexicographer to pay attention to the relevance of *laurel* to *laureate* in terms of the derivative suffix. Actually, this set of entries is the only case within the range of my scope that indicates Bullokar was conscious of derivatives independent of Cawdrey's *Table*. Nonetheless, this example shows that Bullokar did create original entries for derivatives.

5.2. Cockeram's innovative entries for derivatives

We can see that Cockeram also developed the treatment of derivatives. In the *L*'s of his *Dictionarie*, he has 14 sets of entries for derivatives with 32 words in total that do not occur in the previous dictionaries. In addition, according to the *OED* at least 16 of these 32 appear in Cockeram's *Dictionarie* for the first time. This situation is presented in the table below. The 16 possible coinages are underlined.

126

Table 3. Cockeram's innovative entries for derivatives

1	**lacerate, laceration**	8	**lignation**, **lignator**
2	**lachrymable**, **lachrymate**, lachrymation	9	**limpid**, **limpitude**
3	**latrate**, **latration**, **latrator**	10	**lucubrate**, lucubration
4	**lauatrine**, **lauatrix**	11	**ludificate**, **ludification**, ludifie
5	**laconomancie**, laconomanticke	12	**luminaries**, **luminate**
6	**liberation**, liberate	13	**lustration**, **lustrate**
7	**licitation**, **licitator**	14	**lymphat**, **lymphation**, lymphaticall

The *OED* also indicates that Cockeram's *Dictionarie* is the first English work in which the words *liberate* and *luminate* are used as verbs (sets 6 and 12 respectively in the table above).

The following examples illustrate these entries:

Latrate. To barke like a dog. / *Latration*. A barking. / *Latrator*. Which barketh, or rayleth, or scoffeth.
Luminaries. Lights. / *Luminate*. To giue light.
Lymphat. To make mad. / *Lymphation*. A making mad. / *Lymphaticall*. One distracted by a vision.

It is also worth pointing out that three sets of the 14 include the linking words "therein" and "it" as shown below, with the linking words underlined:

Lauatrine. A square stone in a kitchen, with a hole to auoid water, a sinker. / *Lauratrix*. Shee that washeth therein.
Laconomancie. Diuination by water in a bason. / *Laconomanticke*. Hee that practiseth it.
Lignation. A hewing or purueying of wood. / *Lignator*. He which doth it.

In the introduction of this paper, I mentioned Coles's "groups of related words". It would not be too far from the truth to suggest that these sets of entries with linking words are prototypical of such groups.

6. Conclusion

In this presentation, I have discussed Bullokar's and Cockeram's treatment of derivatives, and investigated their interest in word formation in terms of derivatives. Compiled in the first stage of English monolingual lexicography, their dictionaries never exclusively listed hard words of foreign origin.

Within the range of the *L*'s in his *Expositor*, Bullokar, conscious of derivatives, provides 11 new entries with reference to seven in Cawdrey's *Table*, adding two original entries. Cockeram, also provides 18 new entries in the *L*'s of his *Dictionarie*, associated with six entries in Cawdrey's *Table* and 12 entries in Bullokar's *Expositor*. He also added 32 original entries, being inspired by his interest in derivatives.

Thus, it may now safely be said that the earliest history of English lexicography is characterized by the development of information on English word formation in terms of derivatives, as well as by the increase in the number of hard words.

If Bullokar and Cockeram had treated only hard words, their dictionaries would be regarded as only offering "encyclopaedic information", which Reinhard Hartmann and Gregory James (1998:49) defined as being "based on factual knowledge ... with the description of objective realities". This, however, is not the case. Bullokar's and Cockeram's dictionaries are also sources of linguistic information, the "information categories presented by the compiler ... based on language" as defined by Hartmann and James (1998:88).

In this respect, we should also take the fact into account that derivatives and word formation have linguistically close relevance to word classes, whose treatment the lexicographer was to become interested in in the eighteenth century, approximately one hundred years after Cockeram's *Dictionarie*.

Although obscured by an increase in the number of hard words, the lexicographical technique in offering linguistic information had developed significantly during the earliest stage of English monolingual dictionaries.

References

Cited Dictionaries

Bullokar, John (1616/1971), *An English Expositor*, Anglistica & Americana, no. 71, Hildesheim and New York: Georg Olms.

Cawdrey, Robert (1604/1970), *A Table Alphabeticall*, English Experience (Its Record in early printed Books published in Facsimile), no. 226, New York: Da Capo Press.

Cockeram, Henry (1623/1968), *The English Dictionarie*, English Linguistics 1500–1800 (A collection of facsimile reprints), no. 124, Menston: Scolar Press.

Coles, Elisha (1676/1971), *An English Dictionary,* English Linguistics 1500–1800 (A Collection of Facsimile Reprints), no. 268, Menston: Scolar Press.

Secondary Sources

Hartmann, Reinhard Rudolf Karl and James, Gregory (2001), *Dictionary of Lexicography*, London and New York: Routledge.

Osselton, Noel E. (1995), *Chosen Words: Past and Present Problems for Dictionary Makers* (Exeter Linguistic Studies), Exeter: University of Exeter.

Osselton, Noel E. (2009), "The early developement of the English monolingual dictionary (seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries)" in Cowie, A. P. (ed.) *The Oxford History of English Lexicography*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Reed, Joseph W., Jr. (1962), "Noah Webster's debt to Samuel Johnson", *American Speech,* XXXVII, 95–105.

Starnes, De Witt T. and Noyes, Gertrude E. (1946), *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson, 1604–1755*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.

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

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:

Miyoshi, Kusujiro. 2013. Bullokar's and Cockeram's Interest in Word Formation: Treatment of Derivatives in the Earliest English Dictionaries. In *Selected Proceedings of the 2012 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 3)*, ed. R. W. McConchie et al., 120-127. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2841.