Jan Kochanowski University Press

An overview of medical terminology
in Nathan Bailey's
An Universal Etymological English Dictionary (1721)[1]

M. Victoria Domínguez-Rodríguez

Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria

ABSTRACT

Our paper presents a macro- and micro-structural overview of medical terminology in Bailey's *An Universal Etymological English Dictionary* (1721), a general-purpose dictionary that served as a model for other eighteenth-century lexicographical works including Samuel Johnson's celebrated *Dictionary of the English Language* (1755). Accordingly, we first offer some key notes on Bailey's dictionary for contextualisation purposes. Then, we address his own definition of *medicine* as a reference point that could help decide what terms and expressions may be considered medical in the absence of any other information or clue in a particular dictionary entry. Finally, we examine Bailey's strategies to single out medical terminology, the overall structure of individual medical entries and the most common methods of definition deployed in the A-Z wordlist.

Keywords: eighteenth century, dictionary, Nathan Bailey, medical terminology, scope, subject label, definition.

1. Introduction

The eighteenth century has been referred to as an "age of dictionaries" (Sledd – Kolb 1955: 19). John Kersey's *A New English Dictionary* (1702) was the forerunner to a series of lexicographic works that gradually replaced the

---

hard-word dictionary tradition so popular in the course of the seventeenth century (see Starnes 1937; Osselton 1990; Starnes – Noyes 1991 [1946]; McIntosh 1998; Read 2003; Considine 2010). Later, eighteenth-century English lexicographers included common words of the language in their growing general dictionaries, with the so-called "terms of art" (specialised terminology) also having a place in their works (Segar 1931; McIntosh 1998).

Contrary to other contemporary lexicographical trends in Europe, monolingual dictionaries in England were not issued by an academy, but by individual lexicographers, resulting in steps towards more and more general English dictionaries to satisfy the market demand. The number of readers increased sharply in eighteenth-century England as a result of several factors working in combination: "the schooling system was improved. There were more authors, more books, and more documents to be bought and read for business or for pleasure. The printing presses and the publishing houses were more productive, periodicals flourished, public libraries were created, as well as academies, and learned associations" (Béjoint 2016: 14). Hence, monolingual dictionaries of the vernacular were needed by a growing reading population who "belonged to an intermediate class that […] was then called the *bourgeoisie*. They were characterised by their social aspirations" (Béjoint 2016: 14). Thus, to develop their professional lives properly and to improve their social status, the bourgeoisie demanded reference books that could guide them in the intellectual and cultural activities of the time: "they needed a grammar, an encyclopaedia, an atlas, an almanac; at the very least, they needed a dictionary that had information on words as well as on things, and that was easy to consult" (Béjoint 2016: 15).

These sociocultural circumstances prompted eighteenth-century English lexicographers to produce more user-friendly and comprehensive material, at the same time having a major role in laying down rules on correct language use and lexical choices, on the one hand, and on establishing the dictionary as a reference book *per se*, on the other. As Mitchell (1994: 551) puts it:

> While grammarians were battling over teaching methods and grammatical theory, lexicographers focused on setting standards [because they] had a stronger base from which to impose 'correctness' on the vernacular: research. Eighteenth-century lexicographers were inventorying definitions, pronunciation, and various forms of spelling. John Kersey (*A New English Dictionary*, 1702), Edward Cocker (*Cocker's English Dictionary*, 1704), and Nathan Bailey (*An Universal*

Etymological English Dictionary, 1721) helped establish the dictionary as an authority. It would be the editors of dictionaries, not the authors of grammar texts, who would become the guardians of English, formalizing it and protecting it from decay.

Our paper presents a macro- and micro-structural overview of medical terminology in Bailey's influential dictionary. After some key notes on the dictionary, we address his own definition of *medicine* as a reference point that could help decide what terms and expressions may be considered medical in the absence of any other information or clue in a particular dictionary entry. We then proceed to examine how Bailey singles out medical terminology, the overall structure of individual medical entries and the most common methods of definition identified in the A-Z wordlist.

2. Some notes on *An Universal Etymological English Dictionary* (1721)

Nathan Bailey (bap. 1691, d. 1742), a schoolmaster in Stepney (London) and a philologist, is considered one of the pioneers of English lexicography inasmuch as his contributions to the field actually influenced and, to some extent, determined the treatment of general and hard words in later monolingual dictionaries of the language.[2] He was the author of three known dictionaries during his lifetime: *An Universal Etymological English Dictionary* (1721), *The Universal English Dictionary: In Two Parts* (1727, a supplementary volume to the 1721 edition) and the *Dictionarium Britannicum* (1730).[3] The latter is presented as an improved work, that is, as "a More Compleat Universal Etymological English Dictionary Than Any Extant" (Bailey 1730: title page) and was compiled with the advice of experts in the domains of Mathematics, Botany and Etymology. However, Starnes and Noyes (1991 [1946]) state that much of the word list is based

---

[2]   For further insight into Bailey's life and lexicographic work, see e.g. Starnes – Noyes (1991 [1946]: 98-108), Murray (2003 [1900]: 45-69), Wells (1973: 20-24) and Hancher (2019).

[3]   Bailey's dictionaries went through a number of editions in the eighteenth century. A revised edition of Bailey's *An Universal Etymological English Dictionary* was published posthumously in 1755 in order to compete against Johnson's masterpiece. It was compiled by Joseph Nicol Scott, M.D., by demand of "the *Whole Body* of our Subscribers, as being the first and chief Encouragers of this New Edition of Bailey's *Dictionary*" (Scott – Bailey 1755: iii). It is generally known as the Bailey-Scott's dictionary.

on his own 1721 universal dictionary and that no markers of general or specialised usage are given.

An Universal Etymological English Dictionary is traditionally considered a milestone in English lexicography. Just as John Kersey had done in *A New English Dictionary* (1702), Bailey went beyond the seventeenth-century lexicographic tendency to focus on documenting and defining hard words adopted into the language, thus incorporating many commonly used words into his wordlist. If, from the very title page, Kersey placed a new emphasis on comprehensiveness and inclusiveness of proper, significant and genuine words, i.e. on those used by "Persons of clear Judgement and Good Style" (Kersey 1702: preface), Bailey followed in his footsteps and "built on the foundation that Kersey had laid to produce what has been termed 'the supreme popular dictionary of the eighteenth century'" (Long 1909: 31). But, like many other lexicographic works of the period, Bailey's dictionary mainly resulted from a "process of accretion rather than evolution" (Long 1909: 32). In fact, reproducing information from other sources without acknowledgement was so habitual during the age that Bailey

> was able to muster an impressive array of sources […] for example, while indebted to Kersey's 1708 *Dictionarium Anglo-Britannicum*, [he also] draws massively upon Stephen Skinner's *Etymologicon Linguae Anglicanae* (1671), the Kersey revision of Phillips, Coles' *English Dictionary*, John Ray's *Collection of English Words not Generally Used* (1674), and others. (Wells 1973: 21)[4]

The popularity of *An Universal Etymological English Dictionary* is undeniable as it went through nearly thirty editions between 1721 and 1802 and, besides, it was a primary source in Samuel Johnson's *A Dictionary of the English Language* published in 1755 (Starnes – Noyes 1991 [1946]: 98-108; Alston 1966: 13-66). As the very title suggests, Bailey compiled his 1721 dictionary having two pivotal aspects in mind: the need to be comprehensive and complete ('universal') and to provide the origin of the words included ('etymological'). And such purposes "led him away from the hard word tradition to an attempt to include all the words in the language" (Wells 1973: 19). Therefore, he produced a voluminous dictionary extending over

---

[4]   It would be of particular interest to carry out a comparative study of medical terminology to check to what extent Bailey was original in his definitions or rather borrowed a considerable amount of medical entry material quite freely from his sources.

963 pages (the A-Z entry section being printed in two columns) and having around 40,000 entries that, on occasions, incorporate encyclopaedic-like information (Starnes – Noyes 1991 [1946]; McIntosh 1998; Yeo 2001).

From the very beginning, Bailey states the aim of the dictionary and which type of user will benefit from his work; namely:

> Compil'd and Methodically digested, as well for the Entertainment of the Curious, as the Information of the Ignorant, and for the Benefit of young Students, Artificers, Tradesmen and Foreigners, who are desirous thorowly to understand what they Speak, Read, or Write. (Bailey 1721: title page).

It seems that Bailey had an educational intention and, accordingly, he compiled a dictionary for different general-user profiles that could serve to develop and improve their oral and written communicative skills. Likewise, he seems to have been concerned with the role of dictionaries in vocabulary acquisition and how they can be helpful for formal education (with "young Students"), independent learning (when he says the dictionary has information for the ignorant) and practical purposes (for instance, in case tradesmen needed to consult the dictionary for their business affairs). This is confirmed in the first page of the Introduction, in which Bailey explains the importance of using the words properly:

> Words are those Chanels by which the Knowledge of Things is convey'd to our Understandings: and therefore upon a right Apprehension of them depends the Rectitude of our Notions; and in order to form our Judgments right, they must be understood in their proper Meaning, and us'd in their true Sense, either in Writing or Speaking. For if the Words of the Speaker or Writer, tho' ever so apposite to the Matter be taken in a wrong Sense, they form erroneous Ideas in the Mind concerning the Thing spoken or written of; and if we use Words in a false and improper Sense, this causes Confusion in the Understanding of the Hearer, and renders the Discourse unintelligible. (Bailey 1721: Introduction)

Moreover, the title page is also instructive regarding the lexical content in *An Universal Etymological English Dictionary*, which combines common words and specialised terms from different scholarly disciplines, trades and professions. These are outlined as follows:

> [It comprehends] The Derivations of the Generality of Words in the *English* Tongue, either Antient or Modern [...] in their Proper Characters [...]
>
> A Brief and clear Explication of all difficult Words derived from all of the aforesaid Languages; and Terms of Art relating to Anatomy, Botany, Physick, Pharmacy, Surgery, Chymistry [...] Gardening, Husbandry, Handicrafts, Confectionary, Carving, Cookery *& c.* [...]
>
> Together with A Large Collection and Explication of Words and Phrases us'd in our Antient Statutes, Charters, Writs, Old Records, and Processes at Law; and the Etymology and Interpretation of the Proper Names of Men, Women, and Remarkable Places in *Great Britain*: Also the Dialects of our different Counties.
>
> *To which is Added* a Collection of our most Common Proverbs, with their Explication and Illustration. (Bailey 1721: title page)

Going from words of general use to proverbs, Bailey's dictionary has a place for "terms of art" that here include, among others, medical and medicine-related terminology. To him, general and specialised words alike must be learnt and used if people wish to improve their lexical competence in order to become more knowledgeable about "things", as he explains in the Introduction to the dictionary:

> It ought therefore to be the special Care and Study of every one, who would have his Mind furnished with the useful Knowledge of Things of any kind, to get a True and Distinct Idea of the proper Sense and Meaning of Words, and Terms of Art, in which they are express'd, without which no good Progress can be made. (Bailey 1721: Introduction)

3. An overview of medical terminology

In this section, we will first focus on Bailey's own definition of *medicine*, as a way of rationalising why he may have decided to present certain words and expressions as medical or medicine-related. We will then examine how he labels medical terminology in the dictionary, the overall structure of individual medical entries and the most common methods of definition identified in the A-Z wordlist. Although it is challenging to fully categorise these methods of definition and how frequently they are used throughout the dictionary, there are some recurrent patterns and strategies that will be tackled and exemplified in § 3.4 below.

3.1 Scope

Bailey's entry Medicine[5] includes two definitions, namely: "[*Medecine*, F. of *medicina*, L.] the Art of Physick, also a Physical Remedy." The first is the core sense of the word and contains an indirect cross-reference to Physick, which in turn includes two other similar definitions: "[*physique*, F. of *Ars physica*, L. of *φυσικη* (sic.), *Gr.*] the Art of curing Diseases, or Medicines prepared for that Purpose." In both entries, *medicine* and *physick* are defined as an art, that is, an occupation requiring skill, knowledge or experience to be performed; and this occupation is expressly linked to disease and therapy in *physick*. However, the second definition in both entries corresponds to a semi-specialised subsense referring to a substance, preparation or technique that relieves or cures a disease.

In the etymological information immediately following the headword, Bailey reveals that *medicine* and *physick* are synonymic loanwords in English, one having French<Latin origin and the other a French<Latin<Greek one. According to *The Oxford English Dictionary* (s.v. Medicine 4.a and Physic 3.b respectively), the two terms had been integrated into the language since the Middle Ages in both senses: *medicine*, as "the science or practice of the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of disease (in technical use, often taken to exclude surgery)", dates back to *Sir Tristrem*: "Þe fair leuedi, þe quene, Louesom vnder line And sleiȝest had y bene, And mest couþe of medicine" (*ca.* 1330, *?a* 1300; line 1204); *physick*, instead, is first found *a.* 1387 in John Trevisa's translation of Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* (III. 263 "Appollo fond first art of fisik [*?a* 1475 anon. tr. medicynes; *L. medicinæ*] among þe Grees."). On the other hand, *medicine*, as "1.a. A substance or preparation used in the treatment of illness; a drug; *esp.* one taken by mouth. Also: such substances generally", is first attested in the *Ancrene Riwle*: "Þu seist þet nis nan neod medicine" (*?ca.* 1225 (*?a* 1200); Cleo. C.vi: 136), while *physick* with the same meaning is located in *The Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester*: "He nom wiþ him spicerie þat to fysike drou" (*ca.* 1300; *Calig.* 3162 *MED*).

All in all, *medicine* and *physick* were still in use in Bailey's time,[6] carrying their original scientific connotations and having a range of precise meanings

---

[5]   Bailey's entries may include one, two or three headwords; in all cases, just the first is printed in capital letters, the second being in italics, with initial capital letter, rather inconsistently. We do not reproduce this practice here to avoid confusion; all terms and expressions under scrutiny are in small caps if the dictionary entry is meant, otherwise in italics.

[6]   While *medicine* is still current today in both senses, *physick* is mainly restricted to historical, obsolete or archaic usage (*OED*, s.v. Physic, passim).

and authority in certain contexts (French 2003: 204-205). A couple of actual examples from eighteenth-century works appear in Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* of 1726 ("While the whole Operation was performing, I lay in a profound sleep, by the force of that soporiferous Medicine infused into my Liquor") or in Charles Lucas's *Pharmacomastix* of 1741 ("Neither thinking the knowledge of simple or compound medicines material, or necessary, nor their preparation or composition his proper occupation, they lay themselves out for practising physic and surgery") (*OED* s.v. Medicine 1.a and Physic 3.b respectively).

In view of the above, we expect the medical terminology included in Bailey's 1721 dictionary to revolve around the medical profession, human diseases and therapeutic actions, with room for exceptions. However, not all terms and expressions are explicitly labelled as medical or associated with medicine in the A-Z entry list, making it difficult to decide whether, in Bailey's opinion, they fell under the three keyword hypernyms – *art*, *disease* and *therapy* – or not.[7] Yet the dictionary contains clearly identifiable medical terms due to their etymological origin (classical), explicit subject labelling or the tacit semantic relationship with the domain (see § 3.2).

Generally speaking, Bailey's medical terminology covers at least five different semantic fields. What follows is a categorisation based on the key concepts included in the definitions of *medicine* and *physick* discussed above, so that the entries under (A) and (B) are related to the art itself; those under (C) and (D) to disease; and those under (E) to therapy:

A. Medical branches and (sub-)specialities having an active role in the medical theory and practice of the age, such as Anatomy ("a neat dissection or cutting up the Body of Man or Beast, whereby the Parts are severally discovered and explained, for the use of Physick and natural Philosophy.")[8] or Pharmacy ("that Part of Physick which teaches the Choice and Preparation of Medicines, the Apothecaries art."). However, when Bailey inserts an entry that is specifically used in these and other medicine-related disciplines – such as botany, chemistry

---

7   This shortcoming makes it very difficult to draw a neat line to select unlabelled or non-explicitly-medical entries belonging to the scope of medicine in Bailey's dictionary (all the more so from a somewhat biased 21st-century point of view).

8   In this section we omit Bailey's etymological notes, labels and abbreviations to concentrate on the meanings of the terms, and also for clarity's sake on the exemplification process. But note that Bailey does not systematically include etymological information in the dictionary entries, with no identifiable lexicographic criteria for the addition of this kind of information, or otherwise.

or optometry – he often singles them out by inserting unequivocal labels, as described in § 3.2, for medical terms. But this practice is not consistent throughout the dictionary and, on occasions, it is not possible to distinguish medical from pharmaceutical terminology, for instance, especially when the entry is not informative enough or is too broad for the term to fit into either discipline.

B. Professions, jobs and specialisations related to medicine and other allied disciplines, such as GALENICK PHYSICK ("is that which is grounded upon the Principles of *Galen*."), EMPERICK ("a Physician by bare Practice, a Mountebank or Quack.") or ENTEROLOGY ("a Discourse or Treatise of the Entrails.").

C. Physiology, that is, normal organic processes and bodily functions, such as EUPEPSY ("a good and easy Concoction or Digestion.") and RESPIRATION ("Breathing, an alternate Dilation and Contraction of the Chest, whereby the Air is taken in by the Wind-Pipe, and by and by is driven out again.").

D. Physiopathology, referring to altered organic processes and functions evident or measurable whenever the human body is affected by impairment, injury, disease or disorder; e.g. SCOTOMY ("a Dizziness or Swimming of the Head causing a Dimness of Sight."), FRACTURE ("is the Breaking of a Bone"), or VENEREAL DISEASE ("a virulent Distemper commonly called the *French Pox*."). This is probably the most frequent type of medical terminology in Bailey's dictionary, and it is usually explained to the eighteenth-century lay reader by non-classical counterparts or analogies (cf. § 3.4).

E. Therapeutics, including terms for simple and compound remedial agents, methods and techniques with medicinal or curative properties; e.g. ALEXIPYRETICUM ("a Remedy that drives away Fevers."), SACCULI MEDICINALES ("several Simples ty'd up in little Bags, to be apply'd to Parts aggrieved"), SYNULOTICKS ("Medicines which bring Wounds or Sores to a Scar.") or TO TREPAN ("to apply a Trepan in Fractures of the Scull.").

3.2 Identification

Bailey's medical terminology is not visually distinctive or printed in a different letter type or format; i.e. the terms are normally incorporated into the A-Z entry list. Therefore, to find medical terms in Bailey's dictionary the pages have to be scanned in order to locate the headwords that can be categorised as medical, either directly or indirectly.

    Direct identification is possible in four different ways, as follows:
(a) when the headword's denotative meaning is unequivocally medical
because it is a self-explanatory expression; (b) when subject labels appear
in between square brackets just after the headword or in the definition
itself with no brackets; (c) when the definition contains keywords related
to medicine; and (d) when a specific abbreviation – an initialism – in italics
appears at end of the definition.

    As to the first type, a number of medical headwords in Bailey's
dictionary are noun phrases having a clear denotative meaning (cf. § 3.3).
Indeed, dictionary users will know that medical terminology is dealt with in
the following entries even before reading the full definitions:[9]

(1)   (a)   ATTENUATING MEDICINES, are such as opening the Pores with their
              sharp Particles, cut the thick and viscous Humours, in the Body,
              so that they may easily be circulated through the Vessels.

       (b)   MALIGNANT DISEASE, is that which rages more vehemently and
              continues longer than its Nature usually permits it do.

But Bailey shows a preference for the second procedure, that is, the insertion
of subject labels into different places in the definition, even if he does not do
that systematically. At times, he encloses short, slightly varying prepositional
phrases between square brackets just after the headword, such as "in a physical
sense", "in physick", "with physicians" or "among physicians" (as in (2)); less
frequently, this information appears at some point in the definition, integrated
into the sentence(s) with no bracketing (3). In any case, the prepositional
phrase deployed introduces a specialised subsense, being a mechanism to
"mark individual items in the vocabulary" as well as to make dictionary users
"appreciate the connotations that a word has in context, and to be able to use
the word effectively themselves" (Brewer 2016: 480):

(2)   (a)   EXPIRATION, [in a *Physical Sense*] is an alternate Contraction of the
              Chest, whereby the Air, together with the Fuliginous Vapours,
              are exprest or driven out by the Wind-pipe.

       (b)   OROBOIDES, [among *Physicians*] a Settlement in Urine like Vetches.

       (c)   PECCANT HUMOURS, [with *Physicians*] are such Humours of the
              Body that contain some Malignity, or else abound too much.

---

[9]   Bailey's etymological notes are not included here.

(3)   CENOSIS, [*Κενοσις, Gr.*] an empting, or voiding: In a Physical Sense, a discharging the Body of Humours.

As indicated above, the third means of direct identification occurs when the very definition contains keywords related to medicine so that the meaning can be more or less clearly delineated and associated with medical and health issues. Note the following examples:

(4)   (a)   CONVALESCENCE, CONVALESCENCY }, a Recovery of Health.[10]

      (b)   SPHIGMICA, that Part of Physick, which treats of Pulses.

      (c)   A PURGE, a cleansing Medicine.

Finally, the fourth lexicographic procedure consists in placing the shortened form *P. T.* (for "Physical Term") at the end of the definition (5a-c). This form is included in the abbreviation list which comes after Bailey's introduction to the dictionary, but it is much less used in the entries than the subject labels; exceptionally, the extended version of this abbreviation is found just after the headword (5d):

(5)   (a)   APOCRISIS, APOCRISIA, } Ejection, or voiding Superfluities out of the Body. *P. T.*

      (b)   ARYTHMUS, a Pulse, which is so far lost, that it cannot be any longer felt. *P. T.*

      (c)   DILUENTS, Medicines serving to thin the Blood. *P. T.*

      (d)   RES NATURALES, [*Physical Term*] natural Things, which are reckoned 3 in Number, *viz.* Health, the causes of Health, and its Effects.

As opposed to direct identification of medical terminology by means of the abovementioned procedures, medical entries in Bailey's dictionary may lack indications of the specialised meaning of words. Hence, indirect identification is sometimes necessary, on the basis of sense or concept association with the domains as in (6a), where the epidermal symptoms point to skin disorder, or in (6b), where the abnormal curvature may affect the lumbar and cervical regions:

(6)   (a)   PAPULOSITY, Fulness of Blisters and Pimples.

      (b)   LORDOSIS, the bending of the Back-bone forward in Children.

---

[10]   For the function of a closing curly brace < } > after the headwords, see § 3.3.

Overall, one of the main problems arising here is that Bailey defines some words and expressions so broadly or vaguely that they could be understood in either a general or a specialised sense. In those cases, a tacit categorisation is not possible:

(7)   (a)   Emphraxis, an Obstruction in any Part.

        (b)   Ingestion, putting in.

        (c)   To exudate, to sweat out.

3.3 Entry structure

Bailey's dictionary follows the same entry typology throughout the A-Z entry list; i.e. there is no special treatment for the so-called "terms of art" announced in the title page. The typical medical entry consists of a simple or complex headword followed by +--+ etymological, classifying and content data that jointly give shape to the definition of the term. While simple headwords are nouns, adjectives, verbs and abbreviations, in this order of importance, complex ones include two- or three-word English noun phrases or else idiomatic expressions and loans from classical languages. Greek and Latin terms and expressions can present Latin spellings, as in Res Præter Naturam ("[*Physical Term*] Things beside Nature, *viz.* Diseases, with their Symptoms, Causes and Effects.") or an Anglicised one, as in Bronchocele ("[of *βρογχός* and *κύλυ*, *Gr.*] a Tumour in the top or middle of the fistulous-part of the Wind-pipe."), a transliteration from the Greek alphabet.

        Alongside the headword and its variant spellings, if any, we find etymological information, though not consistently, the subject label, though not always, and the definition proper, according to four main identifiable patterns explained below. Note that the information given in brackets is not always present in the entry so that different combinations arise.

A.   Headword + (etymon and language of origin)[11] + (subject label) + definition + (initialism). This pattern contains one headword and one definition, plus additional information, and is seen in the entries listed in (8) that include a Latin formulaic expression common in medical or pharmaceutical texts (8b) and an example of the simplest version of the pattern: headword + definition + initialism (8d).

---

[11]   In Bailey's dictionary, etymology is not only used to trace back the origin of the word, but also as a method of definition as explained in § 3.4.4.

(8)   (a)   HUMORES, [in *Physick*] the several Humours of the Body, L.

        (b)   AD PONDUS OMNIUM, [among *Physicians*] signifies that the last
                prescribed Medicine ought to weigh as much as all the Medicines
                mentioned before. L.

        (c)   AFFECTED, [in a *Physical Sense*] troubled or sized with a distemper.

        (d)   ANEURISM, a Dilation or Bursting of the Arteries, so that they
                continually beat and swell. *Gr.*

B.   Headword + (etymon and language of origin) + (subject label)
           + definitions [= sense$_1$, sense$_2$…] + (initialism). This second pattern
           contains one headword and a definition in which two or more senses
           are explained; that is, polysemy is introduced in the same entry.
           The different senses are separated from each other by a colon or
           semicolon, depending on how conceptually close the two meanings
           are. If they are more or less related, Bailey uses a colon to separate
           them, as in (9) where both senses have to do with remedies and their
           therapeutic effects; however, if each sense refers to more distant or
           even independent ideas in the medical field, he inserts a semicolon as
           in (10):

(9)   ANACOLLEMATA, Medicines apply'd to the Forehead or Nostrils to stop
        bleeding: Also Medicines that will breed Flesh, and conglutinate the
        Parts. *L.*

(10)   (a)   ANADOSIS, [in *Physick*] is the Distribution of Chyle, through its
                proper Vessels; also whatsoever tends upwards, as a Vomit. *Gr.*

        (b)   ANTIADES, [*Αντίαδες, Gr.*] the Glandules and Kernels, commonly
                called the Almonds of the Ears; also an Inflammation in those
                Parts.

C.   Headword [= entry$_1$, entry$_2$…] + (etymon and language of origin) +
           (subject label) + definition + (initialism). Unlike the second type of
           entry structure above, this third one consists of the same headword
           repeated two or three times, in separate entries. This type has two
           variants. The first is found when Bailey provides the general definition
           of the word followed by a specialised one in the same entry, the two
           being separated by a colon, and then he adds a second entry defining
           a further meaning. In examples (11), (12) and (13), the etymological
           note appears only in the first entry:

(11)   [entry₁] Anadiplosis, [ἀναδίπλωσις, *Gr.*] a redoubling: A Figure in Rhetorick, when the last Word in the End of a Verse or sentence, begins the next.

[entry₂] Anadiplosis, [in *Physick*] a frequent Reduplication of Fevers, *& c.*

In the second variant structure, Bailey provides the general definition of the word and then adds more specialised meanings ("terms of art") in the following entries, as exemplified by Area and Exhalation:

(12)   [entry₁] Area, [*Area, L.*] a Barn-Flower; also, the Ground-Plot of a Building.

[entry₂] Area, [among *Physicians*] an Ulcer or Sore of the Head that causes Baldness.

[entry₃] Area, [in *Geometry*] is the Superficial Content of any Figure, measured in Inches, Feet, Yards, *& c.*

(13)   [entry₁] Exhalation, [*Exhalaison, F.*] a Fume, Steam or Vapour. *L.*

[entry₂] Exhalation, [among *Philosophers*] is whatsoever is raised up from the Surface of the Earth or Water, by the Heat of the Sun, subterraneous Fire, *& c.*

[entry₃] Exhalation, [in *Physick*] is a subtile spirituous Air, which breathes forth out of the Bodies of Living Creatures.

D.   Headword [= spelling₁, spelling₂…] + (etymon and language of origin) + (subject label) + definition + (initialism). When a headword has two or more spelling variants in English, Bailey puts one under the other separated by commas, as if in a list of separate entries, and joins them together by using a closing curly brace (}). The definition is, therefore, applicable to all the words or expressions embraced.

(14)   (a)   Archiater, Archiatrus, } [Ἀρχίατρος, *Gr.*] the Chief or Principal Physician; a Physician to a Prince, *L.*
       (b)   Scrofula, Scrophula,} Hard Glandules or Swellings of the Glandules of the Neck and Ears, the King's Evil. *L.*

3.4 Methods of definition

In Bailey's dictionary, the methods employed to define medical terminology are not special for the purpose, but rather similar to those he uses

throughout the wordlist. That is, the words of general use and the "terms of art" are explained by the same definitional procedures. However, a preliminary analysis of Bailey's dictionary reveals that the five commonest methods to define medical terms are, in order of frequency: (a) synonymy; (b) hyponymy; (c) relation; (d) cross-reference; and (e) etymology. While the first three and the fifth were already common definitional practices in early modern English medical texts (McConchie – Curzan 2011: 84-87) – which may have influenced, or even modelled, seventeenth- and eighteenth-century dictionary definitions of medical terminology – the deployment of cross-references is more associated with early English lexicography than medical literature (Starnes – Noyes 1991 [1946]; Franzen 2012). Note that, sometimes, two of these methods of definition coexist in a given entry, as commented on and exemplified in the following subsections.

3.4.1 Synonymy

The most frequent form of definition is to provide dictionary users with one or more synonyms of Germanic origin or in any case words more familiar to them. Thus, the headword is the specialised term and the synonymic definition lists words that Bailey considered acceptable to clarify the meaning,[12] or make it conceptually "accessible" to the end user. These kinds of concise definitions were useful to explain the meanings of unfamiliar words to an expanding reading public and were probably influenced by the early seventeenth-century hard-word lexicographical tradition (Wells 1973; McConchie – Curzan 2011):

(15)   (a)   Ablepsy, [*Ablepsia, L.* of *Ἀβλεψία, Gr.*] Blindness, Unadvisedness.

     (b)   Salubrity, [*salubrite,* F., *salubrites,* L.] Wholsomness, Healthfulness, Clearness.

     (c)   Venemous, [*Venimeux, F.*] Poisonous.

A variant is found when a headword like Arthritis is defined by both a synonym and a brief explanation of the term that describes the resulting medical condition (cf. § 3.4.3), the two definitional elements being separated

---

[12] The need for objectivity is one of the well-established principles of dictionary defining (Heuberger 2016: 31), yet early modern lexicographers were still at the initial stages and they suffered from various shortcomings that determined the quality and comprehensibility of the definition. One of these, according to Béjoint, was that, at times, "they, the lexicographers, knew what was good for the public, and the users simply had to adapt to the dictionary as it was" (Béjoint 2010: 223).

from each other by a semicolon to indicate that the two meanings are related: the first refers to the disease itself, the second to the symptoms it produces (cf. § 3.3). The entry in (16a) includes a synonym ("the Gout"); although Bailey does not expressly cross-refer the user to the headword Gout (16b), this is actually listed in the dictionary and contains an extended etymological note based on analogy with a natural phenomenon as well as a definition that is not very different from the one s.v. Arthritis:

(16)   (a)   Arthritis, [αρθριτις, *Gr.*] the Gout; a Pain in the Joints of the Limbs.

       (b)   Gout, [*Goutte*, *F.* of *Gutta*, *L.* a Drop, because it is an Humour that falleth down, as it were by Drops into the Joints, the *Greeks* call it *γόσορα*] a painful Disease in the Legs, Feet, *& c.*

In addition, some entries include glossing in their definitions. For instance, as shown in (17a) such a phrase as "commonly called" introduces vernacular equivalent terms that can also be found elsewhere in the dictionary as headwords (17b-c) and is combined with expressions that suggest the same or nearly the same meaning (cf. § 3.4.4 on cross-references).

(17)   (a)   Apostema, Aposteme, } [Ἀποςτημα, *Gr.*] a preternatural Swelling, caused by corrupt Humours gathered from any Part of the Body, commonly called an Imposthume or Abcess.

       (b)   Abscess, Abscesse, } [*Absces*, *F.* of *Abscessus, L.*] an Ulceration arising in any part of the Body after a *Crisis*: The same with an Imposthume.

       (c)   Impsotume, [*Apostume, F. Apostema, Ital.*] a swelling of Humours or gathering of corrupt Matter in any Part of the Body.

3.4.2 Hyponymy

Medical terminology is also defined in terms of inclusion or class-membership (Palmer 1981: 85) by means of a hypernym-hyponym pair that establishes a hierarchical sense relationship. In some entries, the definitional procedure consists of relating a generic term (hypernym or superordinate) to a specific instance of it (hyponym or subordinate), the hypernym being included in the definition and the hyponym being the headword itself.

As with synonymy, definitions involving hyponymy may take different forms. The most recurrent one is directly associating the headword to a semantic field. In this way, the hypernym is the first word appearing in

the definition and the reader can quickly associate the medical term with a given subject matter. In (18), the headwords are recognised as a type of symptom (18b) and as a medicinal product (18a and 18c):

(18) (a) EMULSION, a physical Drink, made of the Kernels of some Seeds, infused in a convenient Liquor. *L.*

(b) MARASMUS, [*μαρασμός, Gr.*], a Fever in which the Body wastes away by Degrees.

(c) MATRICALIA, Medicines for Diseases in the Matrix.

Alternatively, the hypernym may not be immediately mentioned since it is sometimes preceded by such formulaic phrases as "that part of", "a sort of" or "a kind of", which make the hierarchical relationship clearer. In (19a-c) these serve in turn to describe the medical term as a specific medical-related discipline, a symptom manifested in the skin, and a disorder that causes hair loss. Each refers to a distinct concept in their respective semantic fields:

(19) (a) THERAPEUTICKS, [*Therapeutique, F. Terapeutice, L.* of *Θεραπευτική, Gr.*], that Part of Physick which shews the Method of curing Diseases.

(b) ATHEROMA, [*αθήρομα, Gr.*], a sort of Swelling, consisting of a thick and tough Humour, like Pap of sodden Barley.

(c) ARNALDIA, ARNOLDIA, } a kind of Disease that makes the Hair fall off. *O. L.*

3.4.3 Relation

According to McConchie and Curzan, there is a type of definition in early modern English medical texts that describes medical conditions "in relation to their symptoms and body parts in relation to the body as a whole and to other body parts. We might call this symptomatological defining 'symptomatography'" (McConchie – Curzan 2011: 85).

In Bailey's dictionary, a series of definitions based on this descriptive approach can be identified, some of them requiring advanced specialised knowledge on the users' part or further dictionary consultation in order to fully understand them. Bearing in mind that this is a general reference work aimed at the eighteenth-century average dictionary user, a definition like the one reproduced in (20) may be difficult to grasp without knowing what "a continual Fever" is (which anyway has its own entry in the dictionary), or what "whole Mass of Blood" means. On occasions, it seems that the term is

not only used by physicians but it is defined for them or, at least, for people having a basic knowledge of the keywords that construct the definition.

(20)   Augmentum Febricum, [among *Physicians*] is a Computation from what time the Heat of a continual Fever has seized upon the whole Mass of Blood, 'till it hath arrived at the Height.

However, in the definitions here below (21-22) one may notice that the symptomatological description is less technical and more visual, in the sense that it helps users to form a mental image of the concept being defined, and it may even combine clinical signs with a description of patients typically showing this symptom to offer a more detailed or illustrative definition:

(21)   Metastasis, [among *Physicians*] is when a Disease departs from one Part to another, as in Apoplectick People, when the Matter which affects the Brain is translated to the Nerves.

(22)   Pestilential Tumours, [among *Physicians*] a Swelling accompanied with a Fever, Swooning, *& c.* which usually arises in the time of a Pestilence or Plague.

3.4.4 Cross-references

Another method of definition consists in introducing cross-references to the immediate context or elsewhere back or forward in the dictionary, thus forming a network of sense relations within the book. As with the identification of medical terminology, the cross-references may be direct or indirect.

On the one hand, direct cross-references are similar to modern practices and help dictionary users move backwards or forwards through the pages; expressions like "which see", or just the imperative "see" plus a synonym or variant spelling,[13] can serve as a definition (23), or be appended to it after a short explanation that unequivocally establishes a relation of similarity or correspondence between headwords (24). In any case, the user is guided to look elsewhere in the dictionary for further details.

---

[13]   This contrasts with the practice in (14), where two variant spellings are joined together by a closing brace instead of being separate and cross-referenced. This also illustrates the difficulty in establishing a clear-cut typology of Bailey's lexicographical procedure because, even though the dictionary seems to be fairly consistent throughout, there are also several exceptions to the rule.

(23)　(a)　Antastmaticks, see *Antiasthmaticks.*

　　　(b)　Matrix, see matrice.

(24)　(a)　Abluent medicines, the same with *Abstergent*; which see.

　　　(b)　Ecpyesma, [ἐχπύεσμα, *Gr.*] the same with *Empyema*.

On the other hand, indirect cross-references can occur when the user finds a word in the definition that is immediately before or after the headword, so that there is no need to page through the dictionary to locate its meaning. This is observed whenever there are two or more words listed in a row because they belong to a group of derivatives, but the adjective or verb is only defined in relation to the noun:

(25)　Asthma, [*Asthme, F., Asthma, L.* of ᾶσθμα, *Gr.*] a difficulty in Breathing, proceeding from an ill affection of the Lungs.

　　　Asthmatick [*Asthmatique F. Asthmatic, L.* of Ἀθματικός, *Gr.*] belonging to, or troubled with an Asthma.

This also applied in the cases of Bailey's symptomatological definitions that contain some examples of diseases that produce a given medical condition. Although these entries do not include a cross-reference directing the user to look for further information, it can be argued that the corresponding entries should have to be consulted. In the case of Acinesia, for instance, the meaning of the term might be more completely and precisely understood by looking up the entries for *palsey*, *apoplexy* and *swoon* in the dictionary:

(26)　Acinesia, [Ἀκινησία, *Gr.*] the Immobility of the whole Body, or of any part thereof, as in a Palsey, Apoplexy, Swooning, *& c. L.*

3.4.5 Etymology

Apart from using etymology simply to trace the origin of the headword back to such languages as Arabic, Danish, (Old) French, Greek, Hebrew, (Old) Latin, Syrian or Teutonic, Bailey sometimes draws on etymology as a further method to define medical terminology concisely (though perhaps not very efficiently). He does so by offering a literal or approximate translation, or even a paraphrasis, of the original meaning of the loanword into English, as these examples show:

(27)　(a)　Pellicle, [*pellicula, L.*] a Little Skin.

　　　(b)　Recidivous, [*recidivus, L.*] falling Back.

4. Conclusion

Bailey's "universal" and "etymological" dictionary is an example of the general monolingual dictionaries published in the eighteenth century,

> to which, as to Store-Houses, […] Persons may have recourse, as often as any thing occurs in Conversation or Reading, with which they are unacquainted, or when they themselves would speak or write Properly and Intelligibly. (Bailey 1721: Introduction)

The analogy with a building in which there is abundant supply of goods, or with a repository in which non-material elements can be found, reveals one of the central purposes of Bailey's work: providing the general dictionary user with words enough to understand, codify and communicate ideas meaningfully.

Apart from "the generality of words in the *English* Tongue" announced on the title page, Bailey's dictionary covers a wide range of "Terms of Art", among which medical and medical-related terminology is a relevant subset. The modern distinction between a general and a scientific or technical dictionary (Becker 2016) is somehow blurred in this case. In fact, Bailey's entry for *medicine* indicates it is an "art" itself, i.e. a profession or occupation requiring knowledge (= theory) and skill (= practice) to be exercised, but it can also be a generic name to encompass remedies or medicinal products for disease treatment.

As to the entry structure, there are several combinations of headword/ definition in which extra information is provided to further characterise the term being explained. The etymon and language of origin, for instance, trace the specialised word back to its earliest form and source, probably in an attempt at "negotiating the relative prestige of the language from which terminology comes and supplying English with the vocabulary to discuss medicine" (McConchie – Curzan 2011: 83), but the etymological information does not go beyond the identification of the word(s) from which the English term is derived. Variant spellings of the same headword, subject labels and initialisms are variously inserted in Bailey's medical entries, thus creating a number of possible combinations. Different definitions can be either included in the same entry, properly separated from each other by punctuation marks, or found in distinct entries; in this case, the headword is repeated two or three times, the first being attached to the general meaning of the word, and the next ones detailing the specialist or professional domains.

Finally, different methods to define medical terminology have been identified. The most salient one is the use of synonymic equivalents (either by listing words on an almost one-to-one correspondence or by glossing). In order of importance, this is followed by the establishing of a unidirectional relationship between hyponyms and their hypernyms in several semantic fields (i.e. a taxonomy); defining by listing the signs and symptoms that characterise a given disease or disorder, sometimes also using analogy to better illustrate the meaning; cross-referencing back and forwards in the dictionary; and "Englishing" the original meaning of a borrowed learned word by providing a literal translation or paraphrasis. The definitions vary in structural complexity, going from one word to full complex sentences, yet the effort to explain the terms in plain language is evident in all the examples provided in § 3.

Needless to say, Bailey is not pioneering a lexicographic approach to medical terminology in general monolingual English dictionaries. Seventeenth-century authors such as Thomas Blount (*Glossographia*, 1656) and Edward Phillips (*The New World of English of Words*, 1658) are representative of the hard-word tradition and actively sought ways of incorporating and defining medical terms into their dictionaries, which could be rooted in earlier vernacular medical texts and glossaries (McConchie – Curzan 2011; Domínguez-Rodríguez 2016). Overall, the examples selected and commented on in this paper show Bailey's most commonly used strategies to present and explain medical terms in the dictionary. The form(at) and content of the entries examined suggest an authorial intentionality to reach general dictionary users, especially whenever Bailey employs simple, familiar language to describe scholarly knowledge and specialised vocabulary otherwise obscure to lay people.

REFERENCES

Sources

Bailey, N.
    1721   *An Universal Etymological English Dictionary*. London: Printed for
             E. Bell and J. Darby.
    1727   *The Universal Etymological English Dictionary: in Two Parts*. London:
             Printed for T. Cox.
    1730   *Dictionarium Britannicum*. London: Printed for T. Cox.

Blount, T.

    1656   *Glossographia: Or a Dictionary, Interpreting All Such Hard Words…*
              London: Printed by Tho. Newcomb.

Johnson, S.

    1755   *A Dictionary of the English Language*. London: Printed for J. and
              P. Knapton et al.

Kersey, J.

    1702   *A New English Dictionary*. London: Printed for Henry Bonwicke
              and Robert Knaplock.

Oxford English Dictionary Online (OED),
              http://www.oed.com, accessed March 2019.

Phillips, E.

    1658   *The New World of English of Words*. London: Printed by E. Tyler
              for Nath.

Brooke.

Scott, J.N. – Bailey, N.

    1755   *A New Universal Etymological English Dictionary*. London: Printed for
              T. Osborne and J. Shipton.

Special studies

Alston, R.C.

    1966   *A Bibliography of the English Language from the Invention of Printing
              to the year 1800. Vol. 5: The English Dictionary*. Leeds: Arnold & Son.

Becker, H.

    2016   "Scientific and technical dictionaries; Coverage of scientific and
              technical terms in general dictionaries". In: P. Durkin. (ed.) *The Oxford
              Handbook of Lexicography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 393-407.

Béjoint, H.

    2010   *The Lexicography of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

    2016   "Dictionaries for general users: History and development; Current
              issues". In: P. Durkin (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Lexicography*.
              Oxford: Oxford University Press, 7-24.

Brewer, C.

    2016   "Labelling and metalanguage". In: P. Durkin (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook
              of Lexicography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 488-500.

Considine, J.

    2010   "The history of lexicography". In: J. Considine (ed.) *Adventuring in
              Dictionaries: New Studies in the History of Lexicography*. Newcastle upon
              Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, ix-xxii.

Domínguez-Rodríguez, M.V.

    2016   "Thomas Blount's *Glossographia* (1656): An approach to citation styles
              in the medical entries". In: M.V. Domínguez-Rodríguez et al. (eds.)
              Words across History: Advances in Historical Lexicography and Lexicology.

Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Servicio de Publicaciones y Difusión Científica de la ULPGC, 149-166.

Franzen, C. (ed.)
2012   *Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers. Volume 2: Middle English.* Oxford/New York: Routledge.

French, R.
2003   *Medicine Before Science. The Business of Medicine from the Middle Ages to the Enlightenment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hancher, M.
2019   "Bailey, Nathan (Bap. 1691-d.1742)". In: *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online (ODNB).* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heuberger, R.
2016   "Learners' dictionaries: History and development; Current issues". In: P. Durkin (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Lexicography.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 25-43.

Long, P.W.
1909   "English dictionaries before Webster", *Bibliographical Society of America* 4, 25-43.

McConchie, R.W. – Curzan, A.
2011   "Defining in early modern English medical texts". In: I. Taavitsainen – P. Pahta (eds.) *Medical Writing in Early Modern English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 74-93.

McIntosh, C.
1998   "Eighteenth-century dictionaries and the Enlightenment", *Yearbook of English Studies* 28, 3-18.

Mitchell, L.C.
1994   "Inversion of grammar books and dictionaries in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries". In: W. Martin et al. (eds.) *Euralex 1994 Proceedings.* Amsterdam: Euralex, 548-554.

Murray, J.A.H.
2003 [1900] "The evolution of English lexicography". In: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.) *Lexicography: Critical Concepts. Volume I: Dictionaries, Compilers, Critics and Users.* London/New York: Routledge, 45-69.

Osselton, N.E.
1990   "English lexicography from the beginning up to and including Johnson". In: F.J. Hausmann et al. (eds.) *Wörterbücher. Dictionaries. Dictionnaires.* Vol. 2. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1943-1953.

Palmer, F.R.
1981   *Semantics* (2nd edn.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Read, A.W.
2003   "The beginnings of English lexicography", *Dictionaries* 24, 187-226.

Segar, M.
1931   "Dictionary making in the early eighteenth century", *The Review of English Studies* 7 (26), 210-213.

Sledd, J.H. – G.J. Kolb
    1955   *Dr. Johnson's Dictionary: Essays in the Biography of a Book*. Chicago:
              University of Chicago Press.
Starnes, D.W.T.
    1937   "English dictionaries of the 17th century", *Studies in English* 17, 15-51.
Starnes, D.W.T. – G.E. Noyes
1991 [1946] *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson 1604-1755*
              (ed. by G. Stein). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Wells, R.A.
    1973   *Dictionaries and the Authoritarian Tradition*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Yeo, R.
    2001   *Encyclopaedic Visions: Scientific Dictionaries and Enlightenment Culture*.
              Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Address: M. Victoria Domínguez-Rodríguez, Instituto Universitario de Análisis
y Aplicaciones Textuales, Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, c/ Pérez del
Toro 1, 35003 Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain.
ORCID code: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6098-369X.