



John Wilkins' and William Lloyd's Alphabetical dictionary (1668): Towards a comprehensive, and systematically defined, lexicon

Fredric Dolezal

To cite this article: Fredric Dolezal (1986) John Wilkins' and William Lloyd's Alphabetical dictionary (1668): Towards a comprehensive, and systematically defined, lexicon, *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 19:1, 111-130, DOI: [10.1080/08351818609389254](https://doi.org/10.1080/08351818609389254)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351818609389254>



Published online: 21 May 2009.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 8



View related articles [↗](#)

**John Wilkins' and William Lloyd's
ALPHABETICAL DICTIONARY (1668):
Towards a Comprehensive, and Systematically
Defined, Lexicon**

Fredric Dolezal

ABSTRACT

The scholarship on the history of English lexicography has left the *Alphabetical Dictionary* by John Wilkins and William Lloyd outside of the standard chronology of important developments in lexicography. Since the dictionary was published along with *An Essay towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language* (1668) by John Wilkins, it has largely been neglected in dictionary histories. However, in my research I have discovered that the *Alphabetical Dictionary* contributed to the development of English lexicography. In this paper I present evidence which shows that Wilkins and Lloyd constructed a dictionary in which words used for defining (the lexicographical metalanguage) were also defined; this was an innovation in the early period of English monolingual dictionaries. I introduce this specific analysis with a broader background analysis that attempts to situate the *Alphabetical Dictionary* in the chronology of English lexicography.

**John Wilkins' and William Lloyd's ALPHABETICAL
DICTIONARY (1668): Towards a Comprehensive, and
Systematically Defined, Lexicon**

Fredric Dolezal

University of Southern Mississippi

John Wilkins' *Essay toward a Real Character and a Philosophical Language* (hereafter, *Essay*) has been acclaimed as an important intellectual achievement since its publication in 1668. The latest published essay extolling the work appeared in late 1982 (Clauss, 1982). In the article Clauss posed a question that seemingly occurs to others from time to time but quickly fades from attention: Clauss (1982: 531) asked,

By what standards can it [the *Essay*] be acknowledged as the most important work of its kind, and yet so frequently accounted forgettable (if not already forgotten)?

I cannot answer his pointed question, but will attempt to draw attention to the lexicographical component of the *Essay* (the *Alphabetical Dictionary*) which, along with its other aspects, has not been analyzed in the detail it deserves.

In my research I have discovered that John Wilkins and William Lloyd are responsible for three innovations in the development of English lexicography. They (1) introduced the broad range of the English vocabulary into the lexicon of the English monolingual dictionary (including a formidable number of multiword lexical units); they (2) were the first lexicographers to use a highly systematic and methodical construction of entries; and (3) their *Alphabetical Dictionary* (AD) was the first to have a self-defining lexicon (that is, words used for definitional purposes were also defined). In this essay I will concentrate my analysis on innovation (3); however, since the other two accomplishments are not widely recognized, indeed they are mostly overlooked or forgotten, I will briefly provide supporting evidence.

The scholarship on the history of English lexicography has left the Wilkins-Lloyd dictionary outside of the standard chronology of important developments. In previous essays I have shown that the AD has to be considered within the history of English lexicography and I have also shown its place within the lexicographic genealogy from 1604-1721 (Dolezal, 1983 a, b). *A New English Dictionary* (1702) by J.K. was heretofore considered the first monolingual English dictionary to have a

Figure 1
Selection of Entries from the *Alphabetical Dictionary*
Fable-Fane

Fable	Fairdemeanour	Falling Star
Fabric	Fairway	water falls
Fabrile Operation	Fair weather	wood falls
Fabulous	Fair wind	Falling Hair
Face	Fairing	price falls
make faces	Fairy	wind falls
Facetious	Faith	Falling Back
Facile	Faithfulness	Fallacy
Facilitate	Faithlessness	Fallible
Facinorous	Falchion	Fallow
Fact	Falcon	False
Factious	Falling	Falsify
Factitious	Falling down	Falter
Factor	Falling in	Fame
Faculty	Falling in with	Familiar
Fag	Falling off	Family
Fagot	Falling on	Famine
Failing	Falling to Leeward	Famish
Fain	Falling in hand with	Famous
Faintness	Falling to one's meat	Fan
Fainthearted	Falling in love with	Fanaticalness
Fairness	Falling out	Fancy
Fairdealing	Falling out with one	Fane

lexicon composed of the ordinary and common vocabulary; however, the following lists of entries and sub-entries taken from a section of the AD (1668) should dispel that notion. For the sake of comparison I have included a second list consisting of entries covering the same 'orthographic space' taken from all the major dictionaries published from Cawdrey (1604) to Phillips (1658) (see also Bullokar, 1616; Cockeram, 1623; Blount, 1656; Coles, 1676; Kersey, 1708; Bailey, 1721).

Figure 2
Selection of Entries from Cawdrey to Phillips
Fable-Fane

Fabrick	Facundious	Falsify
Fabricate	Facundity	Falsity
Fabrication	Fage	Famagosta
Fabulator	Faint pleader	Fame
Fabulous	Fairy	Famucid
Fabulosity	Faitours	Famigerate
Facade	Falarick	Familiar
Facetious	Falcation	Family of Love
Facile	Falchion	Famulate
Facility	Falcidian Law	Fanatic
Facinorous	Falciferous	Fanatical
Fact	Falcon	Fane
Faction	Falding	
Factious	Falernian Wine	
Factitious	Fallaciloquens	
Factor	Fallacious	
Facture	Fallacy	
Faculent	Fallax	
Faculty	Falouque	
Facundate	Falsification	

Figure 3
A Sample of Multiword Lexical Units
in the *Alphabetical Dictionary*

at all	down stream	lay waste
as it were	draw blood	make the most
for as much	draw wine	make good
at last	draw out	make haste
at length	fall in love with	make use of
at one	fall out	over and above
bear down	good at	for the most
bear off	good for	part
bear out	hold one's breath	on all parts
by reason	hold off	to be quit with
by and by	join battle	raise money
cast about	keep away from	restore to favor
cast in one's teeth	keep back	safe and sound
come in	keep counsel	set foot
come forward	keep watch	take pains
come to light	lay hands on	take up time
		under foot
		under hand and
		seal
		well now
		well then
		as well
		yield up the
		Ghost

Innovation (2), concerning the construction of entries, deserves a complete and detailed analysis; I hope to present an essay on the topic at a later date. An example of a typical entry can be found below. From this illustration we notice an attempt to describe and disambiguate the polysemy of a single entry. This sort of exhaustive treatment of the lexicon was also a new feature in the development of English lexicography.

Clear.

Entire of itself.
 _____ ly. [wholly]
 Not mingled with other,
 [simple]
 sp, not with worse.
 [Pure]
 [Not hinder'd [being
 from] doing
 receiving] [perfective]

e.g. in any genus as of
 Quality or Relation
 Natural Power.
 _____ understanding [und. (per-
 fective)]
 _____ sight, [Sight (perf.)]
 as to Mind.
 [Ingenuous]
 [Sprightly]
 as to Body.
 [Sound]
 [Indolent]
 [Beautiful]

Habit.
 _____ repute [Rep. (perf.)]
 sp. [Sagacious]
 [Sincere]

Manner.
 [Candid]
 [Frank]

Quality.
 Visible. [Lightsom]
 _____ weather. E1.VI.1.
 [Bright]
 [Transparent]
 Unspotted. Q.I.5.
 Audible. clearsound.
 Q.III.7.

RC [not in debt] TA.IV.9.
 RJ [not in Guilt] RJ.II.7.

RM [not in War] RM.II.7.
 RE [not under Censure]
 RE.V.5.0.
 Not hinder'd from being done
 [Easie]
 Not hinder'd from being known.
 [Plain]
 [Manifest]
 {Not hindered } [come to.
 from being } [Pass'd through.]
 {Accessible]
 [Empty]
 [Passable]

We proceed to innovation (3), the self-defining lexicon. One reason why the AD is first in this area is by default of its predecessors; a dictionary of “hard” words by definition does not include ordinary words, words which are naturally used to define those hard words. For example, Phillips defines “Luminous” as “full of light” – neither “full,” “of,” nor “light” has an entry. The important reason for the self-defining nature of the Wilkins-Lloyd dictionary (there are flaws, which I will discuss) is a result of the total project; the project, of course, was the construction of a universal language and “real character.” Most of Wilkins’ *Essay* is contained in the section entitled the “Philosophical Tables”; “The design of the Philosophical Tables is to enumerate and describe all kinds of Things and Notions: and the Design of this Dictionary, is to reckon up and explain all kinds of words, or names of things” (To the Reader). It is not my purpose to offer a critique on the legitimacy of the ontological status of the Tables; rather, I analyze the Tables, and likewise the dictionary, as a linguistic corpus.

Support for my analysis of the *Essay* as a linguistic text, in general, and as a lexicological and lexicographical text, in par-

ticular, comes partly from Ogden's (1934; 1942) and Richards' (1943) call for a universal language founded upon what they call "Basic English." Richards mentions Wilkins when discussing the feasibility of defining the words of a language by means of a finite corpus of terms.

In comparing definitions ... we were struck by the fact that whatever you are defining, certain words keep coming back into your definitions. Define them, and with them you could define anything. That suggests that there might be some limited set of words in terms of which the meanings of all other words might be stated. If so, then a very limited language, — limited in its vocabulary but comprehensive in its scope — would be possible. This was by no means a new idea; it has haunted many analytic philosophers through the centuries, among whom Leibniz and Bishop Wilkins are the best known; but it set Ogden on the track which later led to Basic English (Richards, 1943:26).

Wilkins did accomplish a fairly comprehensive description of English by means of a limited lexicon. The "Philosophical Tables" contained a determined and finite corpus which becomes the basis for definition within the AD. Bishop Wilkins stated his intentions very clearly in the title of the dictionary: *An Alphabetical Dictionary Wherein all English Words According to their Various Significations, Are either referred to their Places in the Philosophical Tables, or explained by such Words as are in those Tables*. The dissimilarities between Ogden's and Wilkins' works are striking, however; Ogden's "limited vocabulary" consists of 850 words listed alphabetically under the headings "Operation," "Things," and "Qualities." Wilkins' Tables are organized by concept into "Genus's," [sic] "Differences," and "Species" (which deserves special attention that there is no room for in this essay). As the names suggest, they stand for a hierarchical order. Species "Mouth" is a member of Difference "Of the Head," which is a member of Genus "General Parts of Animals." However, the hierarchical arrangement is far more

complex than the Aristotelian nomenclature suggests. I include the table for Difference "Of the Head" as illustration (see Figure 4). A short perusal of the table reveals an array of interlocking subclassifications. Most significant for this analysis is the liberal use of substantive or discursive definition within the formal system. The Species "Mouth," or "Radical," as Wilkins names all lexical items which are on the level of Genus, Difference, or Species, is only partly defined by its locus in the "Philosophical Tables"; preceding the Radical "Mouth" we find the substantive definition, "that Scissure of the Face through which we breathe and receive our nourishment." His method of classification in this table is somewhat comical (q.v. "Tongue" and "Palate"), but founded upon a recognizable formula.

As I have mentioned previously, the dictionary is largely dependent upon the Tables for complete definition of its lexicon. The Tables are not always necessary, however; the dictionary does provide adequate descriptions of meaning for many entries. The method of definition in the AD is typical of the period; that is, we find a preponderance of synonyms and one-word paraphrases (see Hayashi, 1978). The distinguishing feature found in the AD is the general, though not exclusive, use of a limited corpus of terms (the Radical words) for the purpose of definition. For example, the lemma "Oral" is followed by "adj. Mouth"; "Mouth" as we have seen is a Radical word. Before we proceed with the discussion, I emphasize this: the Radical words are not to be taken as lexical units of English, but rather as names standing for certain "things and notions" which are "enumerated and described"; the purpose of the dictionary "is to reckon up and explain all kinds of words."¹ In Figure 5, I document the nature of the relationship between the "Philosophical Tables" and the *Alphabetical Dictionary*.

Figure 4

Chap. VII.

Parts general.

177

III. Amongst *External containing Heterogeneous parts*, that which is the **III. OF the chief**; being the Seat and Residence of the Soul, is the **HEAD**: To which **HEAD** may be opposed the other part styled **BODY, Carcass**.

The parts of the Head are either

More general; || either the fore-part less hairy: or the hinder-part more hairy.

I. } FACE; *Visage, Aspect, Countenance, Favour, Look, Minc; Physiognomy, Feature, Vizard, Mask.*

II. } PATE, *Scalp, Noddle, Sconce, Skull, Brain-pan.*

More particular parts of the Head and Face are either

More properly Organical; for

Sense; whether such parts as are

External; used for

Seeing, or Hearing.

1. } EYE, *Ocular, optic, see, view, look, kenn, behold, gaze, pore.*

2. } EAR, *Lug, bear, bearken, auricular.*

Tasting, or Smelling: || either that Sciffure of the Face through which we breath and receive our nourishment: or that hollow prominence, through which we breath and smell.

3. } MOUTH, *Chaps, muzzle, oral, devour.*

3. } NOSE, *snout, Nostril, smell.*

Internal; used for

Tasting, Speaking, or Eating;

Convex: || either that of a soft fleshy substance, whereof there is but one: or that of a most hard and dry consistence, whereof there are many.

4. } TONGUE, *lick.*

4. } TOOTH, *Fang, Tusk, bite, gnaw, nibble, Holders, Grinders.*

Concave; either the upper inward part of the Mouth: or the open passage through the Neck into the middle region of the Body.

5. } PALATE, *Roof.*

5. } THROAT, *gustural, jugular.*

Less properly Organical; but contributing to the making up the Fabric of the Face; distinguishable by their various Positions into

Upper and fore-right; || *Extremity of the Face*: or *Protuberance over the Eye.*

6. } FOREHEAD, *Brow, Front.*

6. } EY-BROW.

Lateral; || *towards the middle*: or *towards the upper parts.*

7. } CHEEK, *Jole.*

7. } TEMPLES.

Lower;

Fore-right; || either the upper and lower *Extremity* of that Sciffure which makes the Mouth: or the *Extremity* of the Face:

8. } LIP.

8. } CHIN.

Lateral;

9. } JAW, *Chap, Mandible, Jole.*

9. } PLACE OF TONSILLÆ.

Interpretive Key for figure 5

LOC = Table locus cited in dictionary.

M. Sense = Multiple senses given.

Def. = Definition given.

2nd L. = Table locus cited under definitional word of initial entry
(e.g., Frizzle, [curl (aug.), Curl, O.V.5.A.]

3rd L. = Table locus cited under definitional word of second
entry definitional word.

x = Occurrence of appropriate category.

(R) = Radical word.

All of the following lexical units are given as found in the
Tables; any differences between Table and dictionary entries
which are not morphological will be noted parenthetically.

Figure 5
Relationship between the Philosophical Tables
and the *Alphabetical Dictionary*

Table Entry	LOC	M.Sense	Def.	2nd L.	3rd L.
austerity	X	X	X		(R)
Male-administration	X				(R)
Arrogant	X	X	X		
Affability	X	X	X		(R)
bear with	X	X	X		
benign	X	X	X		
crabbed		X	X	X	
Clemency	X				(R)
chary		X	X		X
cocker	X		X		
courtesie	X	X	X		
Condescension	X				(R)
dote (-on)			X		
discipline	X	X	X		
defence		X	X	X	
domineer			X	X	
deign			X	X	

FIGURE 5 continued.....

Table Entry	LOC	M.Sense	Def.	2nd L.	3rd L.
favourableness		X	X		
Fondness	X	X	X		(R)
fair demeanour		X	X	X	
facil		X	X	X	
good governance	X				(R)
guard		X	X	X	
gentle		X	X	X	
Graciousness	X		X		(R)
harshness	X	X	X	X	(R)
inflexible		X	X		4th L
indulgence		X	X	X	
insolence	X	X	X		(R)
ill governance	X				
insult			X	X	
imperiousness		X	X	X	
kind		X			X
lenity		X	X	X	
mildness		X	X	X	
make much of		X	X		X
misgoverning			X	C	
magesterialness	X				
patronage			X		
protection	X	X	X		(R)
propitious			X		
rigid			X	X	
rigor	X	X	X		
reasonableness	X				(R)
regiment		X	X	X	
refuge		X	X	X	
ruffian		X	X		X
roister		X	X	X	
roughness		X	X	X	
ruggedness		X	X	X	
sharp		X	X	X	
stiff		X	X		X
stern		X	X		
strict		X	X	X	
Severity	X	X			(R)

FIGURE 5 continued.....

Table Entry	LOC	M.Sense	Def.	2nd L.	3rd L.
shelter		X	X	X	
surly		X	X	X	
scornful		X	X		
Superciliousness	X				
swagger		X	X	X	
stately		X	X	X	
suffer		X	X	X	
sourness		X			
soft		X	X	X	
serene	X	X	X		
tart	X	X	X		
tender		X	X	X	
Tyranny	X				(R)
Unreasonableness	X	X	X		(R)
vouchsafe			X	X	

COMMENTARY: The preceding chart consists of entries in a Table of the Genus "Manners," "Homiletical Vertues towards Inferious." There is a high degree of cross-referencing; out of 70 lexical units in the Table, 65 are cross-referenced in the dictionary.

- 1) 39 units are cross-referenced secondarily; i.e., the locus marking in the dictionary occurs not at the corresponding entry word, but under the word(s) used to define the entry word. Of these,
 - a) 33 are found under the definitional word;
 - b) 5 are found under the definitional word of the first definitional word (3rd L.);
 - c) 1 is found one step further removed than (b).
- 2) 28 units are immediately cross-referenced under the Table entry; of these, 15 are Radical words;
- 3) 5 units are not cross-referenced;
- 4) 3 non-Radical words are defined only by a locus marking.

-
- 5) Radical words are defined using locus marking and another method (paraphrase, etc.) if the entry in the dictionary has multiple senses.
 - 6) The units cross-referenced by means of (1a) almost always are defined by a Radical word.
-

We have just seen the general relationship between the AD and Tables; now I will present specific examples of definitions from the AD to further support my interpretation of the data. Before we get to the next group of data, it is necessary to describe one more feature of the AD which is derived from the philosophical language developed in the *Essay*. In order to eradicate redundancy and imprecision, Wilkins' philosophical language was based entirely on the "Lexicon" of the Tables; because of this limitation of expression he created "transcendental particles" which extended the meanings of the Radicals in a systematic and predictable manner. For example, the Tables have a Radical for "Bee" but not for "Hive"; however, "hive" could be expressed in the philosophical language by addition of the Transcendental Particle "House" — i.e., bee + house = hive; ammunition + house = arsenal; fornication + house = brothel. Wilkins devised 48 Transcendental Particles, including "Cause" (die + cause = kill); "Instrument" (shaving + instr. = razor); "Room" (dunging + room = "Jakes," "Privy"); "Frequentative" (talk + freq. = babble); "Diminutive" (Price + dim. = cheap); "Excessive" (heedfulness + exc. = carking). The Transcendental Particles describe regular semantic relations; this concept deserves attention beyond the scope of this essay. Igor Mel'cuk introduces a congruent semantic operation in work on the *Explanatory-Combinatory Dictionary*; in the ECD these operations are called Lexical Functions (see Apresyan, Melcuk, Zolkovsky, 1969).

The combination of the 48 Particles with the Radicals allowed Wilkins to develop a limited corpus for definition; this corpus of terms approaches the status of a meta-language. The Particles also enhanced the self-defining feature of the dictionary.

In general, the method of definition can be formally presented as follows:

1. Entry word – explained by – $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Paraphrase} \\ \text{Synonym} \\ \text{Reference to Tables} \end{array} \right.$
2. Paraphrase – } = { Radical Word
Synonym – } = { Radical = particle
3. Radical } – explained in – { Philosophical Tables
Particle } = { “Natural Grammar”

Most, but not all, definitions follow this formula I have constructed.

Let us look at one entry word in the AD which typifies the method.

Lamb. [Sheep] Be.II.2. (young
to ____ [v. Parturition])

From this entry we know that a lamb is a young sheep (“young” is a Transc. Part.) and is classified in the Genus of “Beast.” There is a verb form, “to Lamb,” which is defined as the act of parturition. If we turn to the appropriate table (Genus Beast, Difference Two, Species Two), we are told that a Difference Two Beast is “viviparous, producing living young,” and “cloven-footed”; under Different Two, “Cloven-footed beasts,” we learn that this beast is also “horned and ruminant” and is “useful ... in respect of the Fleece and Flesh.” “Sheep” is a Radical word conjoined by affinity to “Goat,” the other Species Two Radical (“useful in respect of Hair and Flesh”). The sub-species membership of “Sheep” is: “Ram, Ewe, Lamb, Weather, Mutton, Bleat, Fold, Flock, Shepherd.” These words are all included as entries in the AD. Some of the entries have multiple senses described in the AD; I have only given the pertinent data.

Ram. [Sheep.Be.II.2. (male)] ***"male" is a Transc. Part.**

Ewe. [Sheep (female)] ***"female" is a Transc. Part.**

Weather. [Guelt Sheep] Be.II.2.

Gueld. [Un-testicle] ***"testicle" is a Radical**

Testicle. PG.VI.8.A.

"Testicle" is defined in the Tables: "being for generating; denoting ... the glandules for preparing the sperm."
(All the words cited appear in the AD.)

Mutton. [Flesh of Sheep]

Bleat. {Sheep} (voice) ***"voice" is a Transc. Part.**
 {Goat }

Fold. [Sepiment for Sheep] — "may serve to express and describe those several kinds of things and names which are used for Enclosure." (p. 334)

Flock. Aggregate. ***"aggregate" is a Transc. Part.**

Aggregate — "doth denote a multitude in Society."
(p. 330)

Shepherd. [Herdsman of Sheep]

Herdsman. RC.II.6 ***"herdsman" is a Radical**

"Herdsman" is defined in the Tables: "Civil Relations":
"Professions ... illiberal ... belonging ... to the country ... relating to the most ancient Professions of ... feeding of Cattel."

In all entries except "Flock" we find the Radical "Sheep"; in most of these a Transc. Part. is also used. Under "Weather" there is the use of a non-Radical ("Guelt"); however, under "Gueld," a Radical word ("Testicle") is given with the prefix denoting "lack of." "Testicle" in turn is explained only by its locus in the Tables ("General Parts of Animals") and is adequately defined therein.

The second part of the entry for "Lamb" is the verb form.

to Lamb. [v. Parturition]

Parturition. AC.I.3.

"Parturition" is defined in the Tables: "Corporeal Action"

“relating unto the ... Bringing forth what hath been thus conceived; ... in due time.” The sub-species membership is: “Bearing, Birth, Nativity, bringing forth, travail, groning, in labour, lying in, Child-birth, eaning, farrowing, kindling, foling, whelping, deliver, Midwife, brought to bed, cry out, lay egg.”

The preceding examples document (1) the use of a limited corpus for definition and (2) the self-defining nature of the lexicon.

The following data show lapses in the general method.

Latter, [Succeeding]

Succeed, Be After, Mag.I.2.D.

Be Successor, [a.T.VI.6]

Come by Succession. RC.IV.2.A.

In the entry for “Latter” we find a paraphrase which has multiple senses; there is no indication of which sense is appropriate. Furthermore, in the entry for “Succeed” the relevant sense is improperly marked for locus in the Tables. Instead of the Genus of Magnitude, the “Be After” sense is found the Genus of Space, SP.I.2.D.

Ominous, [Before-Signing]

Here again the paraphrase is ambiguous, though in the entry for “sign” all senses are handled in one Table locus. In the Tables we are told a sign is “by which anything is known”; the sub-species membership is “Badge, Token, Mark, Note, Symptom, Symbol, Index, Indication, Cue, Print, Scarr, Track, Signature, signifie, Beacon, beckon, Boad, foretaken, presage, Prodigie, portentous, ominous, auspicious.” This is an impressive array of words, but we are given no indication, sign, or note that would help us delineate “ominous” from, say, “auspicious.” In addition, “ominous” has other senses which were not included in the AD.

There are shortcomings inherent in the method of definition. The main problem is the self-imposed attempt to classify "all things and notions" according to their proper place in the order of things. As a result the Radical words are not part of a description of the English language; therefore, the definitions in the AD which are dependent to varying degrees on the Tables are many times either too powerful or too restrictive for describing the meanings of English lexical items. This condition is sometimes ameliorated by deft use of sub-entries, headings, and synonyms; the sub-species lists in the Tables are also helpful in orienting the explanations towards a description of English. Unfortunately, Wilkins' sub-species lists and some of the structural information in the AD (sub-entries, headings, etc.) only suggest semantic proximity and line derivation, leaving the interpretation of the data to the reader.

The classification method itself causes problems. The dictionary entry "Curl" is only given a Table locus, O.V.5.A. ("Sartorian Operations ... preparations of Stuffs by Placing the parts in lesser Plicatures"). There is no indication that curling is commonly associated with hair also. Furthermore, "Plicatures" is not defined. These imperfections are a direct result of the demands of the universal language project and the consequence of constructing a classification scheme. There is a somewhat erratic attempt at a description of English in the AD; the unevenness is caused in large part by a fuzzy methodological boundary between logical and lexicographical definitions.

The boundary between the taxonomy of a particular language and a classification of human knowledge must be carefully drawn when constructing an adequate scheme for a universal language; the distinguishing of logical from lexicographical definitions is especially important before work on the semantic component can be begun. Wilkins attempted to set forth definitions of both types, a facet of his work which seems to be overlooked by Ogden (even though, as I have mentioned above, there is a line of influence from Wilkins to Ogden).

Ogden's and Richards' work on "Basic English" avoids the ontological problem Wilkins felt obligated to solve; Wilkins gives it primary consideration:

The first thing to be considered and enquired into is Concerning a just Enumeration and description of such things or notions as are to have Marks or Names assigned to them [i.e. the Radicals] (AD: 20).

Ogden's limited corpus for definition of 850 words is not classified by concept nor is it given a special semantic structure. Wilkins, of course, would say their language failed just because they did not have a "common notion" of the "nature of things," a necessary first step in constructing a universal language.

The consequence of Wilkins' work on a classification of "all things and notions" was a detailed semantic analysis of a fairly large group of important concepts. His decision to use the classification scheme as a meta-language for the purpose of definition is an important development in the history of lexicography. In my essay, the flaws and successes of the AD were presented in relation to the pertinent accepted practices and desiderata of modern lexicography (q.v. Zgusta, 1971). In relation to English lexicography of the 17th century, the AD holds a unique position; not until the middle of the 18th century are there dictionaries with lexicons that (1) cover the broad range of English or that (2) are self-defining. The notion of a limited corpus of definitional terms was not put into practice until the 20th century. There can be no doubt that Wilkins' and Lloyd's work must be reevaluated and given proper recognition in the theory and practice of lexicography.

FOOTNOTE

- 1 We must be careful when analyzing the definitional adequacy of the AD and "Philosophical Tables," because they are documents of the 17th century; the range of application and the various senses of a word must be considered in a

historical context. An example of this is the Radical word "Pudding." Wilkins describes it as a "Grain or some Vegetable ... mixed with some other eatable substance ... Haggis, Sausage, Dumpling, Link." Though the standard definition of pudding no longer includes sausages, the OED does support Wilkins' definition: "mixture of minced meat, suet, oatmeal ... a kind of sausage"; and "A preparation of food of a soft or a moderately firm consistency ... either mingled in a farinaceous basis, or are enclosed in a farinaceous "crust" (cf. Dumpling). ..." More research needs to be done on the *Essay* as a description of 17th century English.

REFERENCES

- Apresyan, Y, I.A. Mel'čuk, and A.K. Žolkovsky. "Semantics and Lexicography: Towards a New Type of Unilingual Dictionary." in *Studies in Syntax and Semantics*, F. Kiefer, ed., Dordrecht: Reidel, 1969, 1-33.
- Bailey, Nathan. *A Universal Etymological English Dictionary*, etc. London: 1721.
- Blount, Thomas. *Glossographia*. London: 1656.
- Bullokar, John. *An English Expositor*. London: 1616.
- Cawdrey, Robert. *A Table Alphabetical*. London: 1604.
- Clauss, Sidonie. "John Wilkins' *Essay toward a Real Character*: Its Place in the Seventeenth Century Episteme." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 43 (1982), 531-53.
- Cockeram, Henry. *The English Dictionarie*. London: 1623.
- Coles, Elisha. *An English Dictionary*. London: 1676.
- Dolezal, Fredric. *The Lexicographical and Lexicological Procedures and Methods of John Wilkins*. Ph.D. Dissertation, U. of Illinois, 1983a.
- Dolezal, Fredric. "John Wilkins and the History of English Lexicography, 1604-1721," ms., 1983b.
- Hayashi, Tetsuro. *The Theory of English Lexicography*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1978.
- J.K. *A New English Dictionary*. London: 1702.
- Kersey, John. *Dictionarium Anglo-Britanicum*. London: 1708.
- Ogden, Charles K. *The System of Basic English*. N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace, 1934.
- Ogden, Charles K. *The General Basic English Dictionary*, etc. N.Y. W.W. Norton, 1942.
- Phillips, Edward. *The New World of English Words*. London: 1658.
- Richards, I.A. *Basic English and its Uses*. N.Y.: W.W. Norton, 1943.
- Zgusta, Ladislav. *Manual of Lexicography*. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.