

Adventuring in Dictionaries

Adventuring in Dictionaries:
New Studies in the History of Lexicography

Edited by

John Considine

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS

P U B L I S H I N G

Adventuring in Dictionaries:
New Studies in the History of Lexicography,
Edited by John Considine

This book first published 2010

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2010 by John Considine and contributors

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

ISBN (10): 1-4438-2576-X, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-2576-4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	ix
The History of Lexicography John Considine	
Chapter One	1
“For the Better Understanding of the Order of This Dictionarie, Peruse the Preface to the Reader”: Topics in the Outside Matter of French and English Dictionaries (1580–1673) Heberto Fernandez and Monique C. Cormier	
Chapter Two	14
Cawdrey’s <i>Table Alphabeticall</i> (1604) Reconsidered: Its Driving Force for Early English Lexicography Kusujiro Miyoshi	
Chapter Three	23
Henry Cockeram: The Social World of a Seventeenth-Century Lexicographer John Considine	
Chapter Four	45
L’apport de Nicot et Ménage au <i>Tresor de Recherches et Antiquitez gauloises et françoises</i> de Pierre Borel Antonella AmatuZZi	
Chapter Five	58
Collocations and the Philosophical Language of John Wilkins in William Lloyd’s Lexicography of Possibilities (“An Alphabetical Dictionary”, 1668) Fredric S F Dolezal	
Chapter Six	82
Dictionaries as Behavior Guides in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century England Linda C. Mitchell	

Chapter Seven.....	94
Words by Women, Words on Women in Samuel Johnson’s <i>Dictionary of the English Language</i>	
Giovanni Iamartino	
Chapter Eight.....	126
Converting “this uncertain science into an art”: Innovation and Tradition in George Motherby’s <i>A New Medical Dictionary, or, General repository of physic, 1775</i>	
Rod McConchie	
Chapter Nine.....	149
Dessins et desseins: le rôle fondateur des ornements de l’ <i>Encyclopédie</i> dans la tradition des dictionnaires français ornés.	
Thora Van Male	
Chapter Ten	164
The Growth of the English Etymological Dictionary	
Anatoly Liberman	
Chapter Eleven	187
Can you Adam and Eve it? Dictionaries of Rhyming Slang	
Julie Coleman	
Chapter Twelve	197
The Lost and Found in Richardson’s <i>A new dictionary of the English language</i> (1836–1837/1855): An Insight into the State of the Vocabulary	
Laura Pinnavaia	
Chapter Thirteen	212
“Not altogether treated as I should treat it now”: James Murray’s Early Editorial Decisions for the <i>New English Dictionary</i>	
Peter Gilliver	
Chapter Fourteen	238
Joost Halbertsma, Latin, and the <i>Lexicon Frisicum</i>	
Anne Dykstra	

Chapter Fifteen	256
Le parti pris de “la besogne des mots”: le « Dictionnaire critique » de Georges Bataille Laura Santone	
Chapter Sixteen	269
Edmund Peck and the Making of the <i>Eskimo–English Dictionary</i> : Myths of the Missionary Lexicographer Sylvia Brown	
Chapter Seventeen	290
Legacies of the <i>Early Modern English Dictionary</i> Michael Adams	
Abbreviations	309
Bibliography	310
Contributors	361
Index	366

INTRODUCTION

THE HISTORY OF LEXICOGRAPHY

JOHN CONSIDINE

1. “This is what adventuring in dictionaries means”

The title of this book is taken from “The world of words” by Hugh MacDiarmid, a section of his long poem *In memoriam James Joyce*. In it, MacDiarmid has compared both human life and human language to “landscape,” before imagining a heroic journey through an Arctic landscape, in which rare words bristle menacingly: nunataks to the left, holes in the travellers’ kamiks, séracs ahead.¹ The extended image climaxes in an exhilarated outburst:

This is what adventuring in dictionaries means,
All the abysses and altitudes of the mind of man,
Every test and trial of the spirit,
Among the debris of all past literature
And raw material of all the literature to be. (MacDiarmid 1955/1994, 2:823)

Dictionaries meant a great deal to MacDiarmid (see e.g. Brewer 2010, 124). His son remembered how as a child “I eagerly thumbed through the hand-heavy dictionary in an attempt to catch this smoke-hazed figure out” and how this was “a game not to be won; the dictionary and he had established a rare accord of mutual esteem” (Grieve 1972, xii). MacDiarmid himself wrote in later life that “I wrote my early Scots lyrics straight out of the dictionary” (MacDiarmid 1959/1984, 223) and on another occasion that in writing them “I went to where the words were—to Jamieson’s *Dictionary*” (idem 1970/1984, 247). And in the first instalment of his

¹ A nunatak is a rocky peak projecting through the ice; kamiks are a kind of boot; a sérac is a pillar of ice on a glacier. MacDiarmid took all three words from a novel by John Buchan, *A prince of the captivity* (Buchan 1933, 85 [*nunatak* and *sérac*]; 99 [*kamik*]), but that is another story.

manifesto “A theory of Scots letters”, published in February 1923, he remarked brilliantly that “We have been enormously struck by the resemblance—the moral resemblance—between Jamieson’s Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish language and James Joyce’s *Ulysses*” (idem 1923/1984, 129). The dictionary, he continued, was charged with the comic linguistic force released in the novel: a Scots *Ulysses* would realize the potential already stored in Jamieson.

He was not, then, using the word “adventuring” in a banal or patronizing sense. His argument was much more serious: that a dictionary is an Odyssean text, and that committed engagement with dictionaries is therefore the exploration of a vast range of human experience. Adventuring in dictionaries is arduous. In the end, it entails confronting everything that has been written (MacDiarmid’s vision was evidently of a comprehensive historical dictionary) and, more alarmingly, it also entails confronting the power of words to generate future texts—and these may, like *Ulysses*, be “prodigious, uncontrollable, and utterly at variance with conventional morality” (MacDiarmid 1923/1984, 129).

An adventure is a journey into unfamiliar territory, like the Arctic landscape sketched in MacDiarmid’s poem. It is a journey which has a narrative quality, and in which, as in *Ulysses* and the *Odyssey* and all narratives, there are surprising turns. There is a famous story about the visitor to the Scriptorium in which MacDiarmid’s countryman James Murray was at work upon the *Oxford English Dictionary*.² She was displeased and incredulous to find a word which she did not know on a recent page of the dictionary, and was not mollified by Murray’s pointing out that he worked all the time on words which he had never seen before (K. Murray 1977, 299–300). Murray, who perhaps understood lexicography as deeply as any human being ever has understood it, knew that dictionaries are full of—even constituted by—surprising turns. The story of the displeased visitor has another important feature. Although it is a story about lexicography, it is not quite a story about the making of dictionaries: the conversation between Murray and his visitor was in fact an interruption to his lexicographical work, one of the many interruptions which at one level he seems to have welcomed. The point of the story, then, is that it is not so much about a dictionary as about people reacting to a dictionary, and in particular that it is one of the many good stories in which Murray is the protagonist. Every adventure has a protagonist, a person doing the

² “Countryman” in the sense that MacDiarmid and Murray came respectively from Langholm and Hawick, twenty-three miles apart by road. Both towns are in Scotland, near the English border, a fact which helped to shape both men’s thought: see MacDiarmid 1970/1984, 246, and K. Murray 1977, 12–13.

adventuring: the phrase “adventuring in dictionaries” is one in which people are necessarily present.

2. Overview

MacDiarmid’s phrase is meant to suggest the perspective of this book as a whole. The contributions to *Adventuring in dictionaries* are united by the argument, explicit or implicit, that the history of lexicography is not the history of a series of texts, reproducing each other and registering vocabulary in inhuman silence. It is, rather, a history of human activity: the activity of makers of dictionaries (including lexicographers, other contributors, and publishers), and that of users of dictionaries (including lexicographers again, and the other readers who tend greatly to outnumber them, and the considerable class of people who own dictionaries but do not read them).³ To be sure, there are times when the human element of the history of lexicography may temporarily be put to one side, as may be the case in some stages of a bibliographical or textual study, but such studies are purely ancillary to the telling of a human story. There is, for instance, an invaluable bibliography of editions of the polyglot dictionary of Ambrogio Calepino (Labarre 1975), but this work is invaluable precisely as a means to the end of understanding more about the people who had copies of Calepino in their hands. From it, one can move on, for instance, to unpack the story of the Portuguese Jesuits in sixteenth-century Japan who adapted an edition of the dictionary for the use of their pupils. Which pagan Latin authors had these young Japanese converts heard of? How far did the Latin they learned from Calepino go beyond what was needed to understand the liturgy? The recent work of Emi Kishimoto (2006, 2010) suggests answers to these human questions. It is, likewise, human questions with which the contributions to this volume engage.

In the first chapter, Heberto Fernandez and Monique Cormier discuss the “outside matter” of the first bilingual French and English dictionaries, the pages in which lexicographers and publishers addressed their readers most explicitly. Their story begins with a teacher, Claudius Holyband (alias de Sainliens), and with the pedagogically-oriented prefaces in which he commented on the relationships of his dictionaries with his other books for learners of French, and commented on elements of his work such as his defining style. Holyband not only had readers to address, but also the patron to whom his *Dictionarie French and English* of 1593 was dedicated—and although the mechanics of dictionary patronage are not the

³ On dictionaries and the history of reading, see Adams 2010.

concern of this chapter, the reference here to Holyband's dealings with his patron is a reminder that among the people who engage with dictionaries are those who subsidize their publication, whether through a love of learning, a sense of *noblesse oblige*, or a belief that a given dictionary will promote a given agenda.⁴ The chapter continues with discussion of the outside matter of Cotgrave's great dictionary, of Robert Sherwood's English–French second part of the same, and of James Howell's subsequent editions, in all of which a wider audience than Holyband's language-learners is being addressed. The discussion of Howell's adaptation of Etienne Pasquier's *Recherches de la France* (1560) in one of his prefaces opens up the important theme of the international contexts of lexicographical work, and that of the relationship between dictionaries and other philological work. The dictionary-making process comes briefly to the fore in Howell's preface to his second edition of Cotgrave–Sherwood (1660), as he claims that the printer asked “knowing persons” to write supplementary material in special interleaved copies of the 1650 edition, just as Edward Phillips had in 1658 claimed that his new dictionary was enriched by the contributions of specialist consultants. (The story of the making of another dictionary from an interleaved copy of a predecessor is told in Chapter Sixteen.) Fernandez and Cormier conclude by looking forward to the bilingual lexicography of Miège and Boyer, in which the influence of the *Dictionnaire de l'académie française* of 1694 becomes important (for the outside matter of these later bilingual dictionaries, see e.g. Cormier and Fernandez 2006).

The second chapter, by Kusujiro Miyoshi, addresses a question in the history of the monolingual English dictionaries of the seventeenth century: how much did Robert Cawdrey's successors really owe to his *Table alphabeticall* of 1604? Miyoshi concludes that Cawdrey's first successor, John Bullokar, reproduced about three fifths of the *Table* in his *English expositor* of 1616, and that his second successor, Henry Cockeram, took over a high proportion of this Cawdrey-derived material in his *English dictionarie* of 1623, so that long after Cawdrey's work had ceased to be republished under Cawdrey's name, it was circulating under Bullokar's and Cockeram's. Editions of the *English expositor* continued to appear until the eighteenth century—and indeed, dictionaries circulate long after their publication—so that a significant proportion of the entries in Cawdrey's

⁴ In fact, Holyband's dedicatee, the eleventh Lord Zouche (for whom see Knafla 2004) was an intelligent man, who had just spent six years travelling in continental Europe and might therefore have been expected to be a patron, at least on a modest scale, of language learning. For a modern perspective on dictionary patronage, see Liberman 2010, xxii–xxiii.

vade-mecum for the Jacobean reader of sermons and Scripture was still in the hands of the users of cheap dictionaries a century or more after its first publication.

My own contribution to the book takes up a *modus operandi* from Fernandez and Cormier's and a person from Miyoshi's, reconstructing the life of Henry Cockeram—about which practically nothing was known to previous historians—from the outside matter of his dictionary. This includes not only Cockeram's claim to gentle birth and his dedication of the dictionary to a relative, but also a set of liminary verses which help to locate Cockeram in a social context and perhaps in a specific pedagogical controversy in the provincial city in which he lived when the dictionary appeared. The clues provided by investigating Cockeram's dedicatee show his career in the domestic service of a nobleman in Ireland after the writing of his dictionary: we should not project the image of the Murrayesque full-time professional lexicographer back into the early modern period.

The fourth chapter, by Antonella Amatuzzi, examines another seventeenth-century text, Pierre Borel's *Tresor de recherches et antiquitez gauloises et françoises* of 1655. This learned antiquarian work might be seen as half-way between a dictionary and an encyclopedia (as might, for instance, some of the dictionaries discussed by Linda Mitchell in Chapter Six). Among the four hundred primary and secondary sources on which it draws are the general French dictionary of Jean Nicot and the etymological dictionary of Gilles Ménage. These two sources are, as Amatuzzi shows, by no means pervasively present in Borel's work: perhaps one entry in thirty (two hundred or so in a total of 6300), cites one or the other. But they are important as models; and the flexible use which Borel makes of them, abbreviating or supplementing as his material requires, exemplifies the interplay between his semi-encyclopedic work and that of earlier writers in a more purely lexicographical tradition. That interplay continued as Borel's *Trésor* was used in the revision of Ménage's dictionary which was published in 1694. Amatuzzi concludes with the point that the textual relationships she unpacks bear witness to the liveliness of lexicographical exchange in seventeenth-century France, and to the dynamism of the dictionary text.

In Chapter Five, Fredric Dolezal examines the work of the English contemporaries of Borel's whose place in lively intellectual exchange is most evident: John Wilkins and William Lloyd, respectively the leading author of the *Essay towards a real character and a philosophical language* of 1668, and the provider of "continual assistance" to Wilkins, most notably the compilation (partly from bilingual English–Latin dict-

ionaries) of an “Alphabetical dictionary” to stand beside the “Philosophical tables” of the *Essay*. The philosophical language on which Wilkins and Lloyd worked had to analyse English lexical items rationally before providing them with equivalents. As Wilkins remarked, a verb such as *set*, taken together with all the phrasal verbs formed from it like *set up*, *set down*, and *set out*, may have more than a hundred senses; for his purposes, this meant that the concepts denoted by its various senses might have a great many different places in his system. Dolezal discusses Wilkins and Lloyd’s responses to this challenge, with particular attention to their lexicographical metalanguage and its implications, concluding with the argument that the “Alphabetical dictionary” is a “compendium of the many possibilities of lexicography” which from its publication invited its readers to take part in intellectual exchange. The physical bulk and excellent typography of the *Essay* sometimes tend to obscure the point of its title: that Wilkins and Lloyd really were essaying ideas, trying them out. The same kind of argument might be made for other dictionaries, as indeed is suggested by Peter Gilliver’s contribution to the present volume (Chapter Thirteen).

Whereas Wilkins and Lloyd invited their readers to debate, the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century lexicographers and encyclopedists whose work is discussed in Linda Mitchell’s contribution often had less intellectual messages for their readers. For instance, the compiler or compilers of the *Ladies dictionary* published by John Dunton in 1694 packed it with an odd mixture of lexical material out of Blount’s *Glossographia*, cosmetic receipts, improving essays, and historical exempla (see Dunton 1694/2010); the woman reader who turned to it for advice would pick up a good deal of conduct-book material from it. Other dictionaries might have better-focused agendas, like Thomas Wilson’s fiercely protestant *Christian dictionarie* of 1612, or the spelling dictionary of 1766 which concludes with what purports to be a father’s letter to his daughter pleading with her to avoid grammatical solecisms. In many of these cases, the dictionary is in a double network of relationships, both with the other texts on which it draws or to which it gives material, and with the readers who may find its advice impressive or otherwise, the latter network being much harder to reconstruct than the former.

Samuel Johnson’s rueful account of having been “desirous that every quotation should be useful to some other end than the illustration of a word” before he learned the practicalities of dictionary-making is cited by Mitchell, and leads forward to Chapter Seven, Giovanni Iamartino’s account of Johnson’s lexicographical treatment of women’s language and of words relating to women themselves. Women’s language (or at least

language labelled as such by Johnson) in fact turns out to be a marginal presence in the dictionary, although an interesting one, a matter of three or four senses of words, founded on quotations from Pope and Swift. Words referring to women's bodies, costume, station in life, relations with men, and so on, are far more numerous, and Iamartino separates these into thematic groups, each of which he analyses separately. The delicate job of eliciting the sexual politics of the *Dictionary* from the wording of definitions and the choice of quotations is as always complicated, as Iamartino points out, by the difficulty of distinguishing the lexicographer's own attitudes from those of the society whose usage he reports. When Johnson writes that *virago* is "commonly used in detestation for an impudent turbulent woman," does he endorse the detestation, and what is to be made of "impudent" and "turbulent"?

A younger contemporary of Johnson's, the medical lexicographer George Motherby—uncle of Robert Motherby, whose Scots–German *Pocket dictionary of the Scottish idiom* (1826; cf. McConchie 2009, 123–124) would repay further study—is the subject of Roderick McConchie's contribution. Motherby's dictionary is to some extent, like Dunton's *Ladies dictionary*, a compilation from printed sources, and McConchie samples its full range of sources (with particular attention to their recency) and examines their use in specific entries, concluding that Motherby "has to be seen as re-organising and prioritising medical knowledge for his own generation", and that "his dictionary must be assessed in that light rather than simply dismissed as either plagiarised or derivative." Like Miyoshi's contribution before it in this volume or, for instance, Brown's after it, McConchie's discusses a dictionary as part of a longer tradition—and one in which the redeployment of earlier material may be a contribution to the transmission of that material rather than a failure in originality (cf. Dolezal 2007, 5). Robert Motherby's dictionary, indeed, was avowedly based on an earlier book (Picken 1818; see R. Motherby 1826, vi), but is a pioneering contribution to the bilingual lexicography of Scots.

Chapter Nine, Thora van Male's study of the ornamented initial letters in the *Encyclopédie* explores what she has called the iconophor: "an image whose first distinctive feature consists of the letter which begins the name of its referent" (van Male 2001, 41; see also eadem 2004). These images are widespread in French lexicography, as her absorbing book *Art dico* (2005) demonstrates: Adam, arches, arthropods and armour may decorate an A, as may the kiwi (*aptéryx*) and the rainbow (*arc-en-ciel*); zebras, zebus, and zodiacs take their place around a Z. The *Encyclopédie*, van Male proposes here, is the first work in the French lexicographical tradition to be ornamented with iconophors (A to I in volumes 1 to 7; J to

Z in the *Supplement*), the work of the engraver Jean-Michel Baptiste Papillon. Her discussion of this witty and sometimes enigmatic feature of the *Encyclopédie* and its place in the Enlightenment project of the work as a whole ends with reproductions of four letters which defy ready decoding: private jokes of Papillon's, or riddles awaiting solution?

Anatoly Liberman's account of the development of the English etymological dictionary from Minsheu to the present day weaves two strands together: a historian's critical overview of a series of more or less successful etymological dictionaries, and a practising etymological lexicographer's reflections on the work which is yet to be done in the field. The analytic method of Liberman's dictionary-in-progress (the first volume of which is Liberman 2008), which reviews past discussions rather than merely stating its own conclusions, makes history and practice inseparable. Writing the etymology of *dwel*, for instance, does not call for an approach to the "congested perfection" of the entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* but might well call for an account of what Minsheu, Meric Casaubon, Skeat, H. C. Wyld, and many others (e.g. the sources listed at Liberman 2010, 551) had to say about it. One consequence of such an account is a nuanced sense of the place of the individual in a lexicographical tradition. For instance, in contrast with the eminent historian of lexicography whose study of Minsheu concluded that he "deserves recognition as a compiler" but "should be regarded as a scholarly poseur" (Schäfer 1973, 35), Liberman argues that "the history of English etymological lexicography cannot do without a respectful assessment of his dictionary" (see also Liberman 2009, 272).

Chapter Eleven, Julie Coleman's on dictionaries of rhyming slang, begins with the first notices of rhyming slang (as in *Adam and Eve* "believe", *plates of meat* "feet") from the mid-nineteenth century to dictionaries of First World War slang, and then moving on to its first free-standing dictionary, informally published in 1931 and 1932 for the use of customers of a London pub, and to its wide coverage in subsequent printed dictionaries: the numerous online wordlists of rhyming slang would be another story. The interest of these works, many of them lightweight in every sense, often lies not so much in the authenticity of the language they purport to register, as in their cultural role as souvenirs of a touristic London (or of England in general), or as affirmations of an identity overlapping with or developing from that of the cheeky Cockney with whom rhyming slang is often associated. Here, the senses of self of dictionary maker and dictionary buyer are strongly relevant to the story of dictionary publication.

Laura Pinnavaia's contribution turns to a major figure in nineteenth-century English lexicography, Charles Richardson, whose *New dictionary* was published in book form in 1836–1837, having previously appeared in instalments as part of the serially-published *Encyclopaedia metropolitana* (1818–1845).⁵ The *Encyclopaedia* was a brainchild of Samuel Taylor Coleridge's, and it was he who had originally intended to compile the dictionary. This dictionary was not itself compiled on historical principles (Aarsleff 1967/1983, 251–252), but it anticipated the historical method of the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* and the *Oxford English Dictionary* in its dependence on chronologically ordered sequences of quotations: Coleridge's influence on the latter was transmitted through Richardson's *New dictionary* as well as through his own grandson Hartley Coleridge's editorship of the dictionary project which was to become *OED* (see McKusick 1992, 4–23). An early review remarked that “in regard to Richardson's vocabulary, we have seen it alleged that a large number of words are not to be found, which are contained in Johnson's and Webster's

⁵ Coleridge's introduction to the *Encyclopaedia metropolitana*, “General introduction, or, A preliminary treatise on method”, was completed around 24 November 1817 (Coleridge 1788–1818/1995, 627), and is therefore sometimes dated to that year, which is then given as the year when the *Encyclopaedia*, and hence Richardson's dictionary, began to be published. However, there seems to be no evidence of a separate printed publication of the “Treatise on method” in 1817 (*pace* Yeo 1991, 34), and the most authoritative modern edition of the “Treatise” (Coleridge ed. cit., 625) identifies it as having first been published in the first fascicle of the *Encyclopaedia* in 1818. This was advertised in advance as to be published on 1 January 1818 (see the advertisement reproduced in Coleridge, ed. cit., 577) but in fact appears only to have been published on 14 February 1818, when it was announced in *The Times* as “PUBLISHED THIS DAY”. So Richardson's dictionary is not a work of 1817, *pace* Reddick (2009, 175; also Cowie 2009, 425), but of 1818 onwards, as is the whole of the *Encyclopaedia*. I have not seen copies of the original fascicles, each of which included material from each of the four sections of the encyclopedia, the last of which, the “Alphabetical” section, included Richardson's dictionary. (The bound volumes of the *Encyclopaedia* redistribute this material, the “Alphabetical” section being in vols. 14–25 of the 25-volume edition). The advertisement of the second fascicle, “published a few days since”, in *The Times* of 13 May 1818 states that it includes “the usual portion of the ... Alphabetical division, in which are the interesting articles Aeronautics, Ætna, Afghaunistaun, Africa, Agricultural Implements, and Albania; and a newly-formed English Lexicon, with the authorities chronologically arranged”. This suggests strongly that Richardson's dictionary began to be published with this second fascicle, in May 1818. Instalments of the dictionary appear to have continued to be published in the fascicles of the *Encyclopaedia* until fascicle 58 in 1844 (advertised as “Just published” in *The Times* of 7 September), fascicle 59 of 1845 being a general index.

Dictionaries” (*North American review* 1837, 202), and Pinnavaia investigates this question, asking how Richardson’s wordlist differs from Johnson’s; which words current since Johnson’s time Richardson might have included in the *New dictionary*; and what his motives were for selecting his wordlist. This chapter concludes with a reflection on the way in which Richardson’s work was a forerunner of *OED*, and here, the early reviewer quoted above was perhaps prescient: after a comparison of Richardson with Webster (1828), he writes that “We do not despair of a great dictionary of the English language, far preferable to either of those on which we have so freely remarked, but we do not wish it to appear before the two living authors have reaped a generous reward for their Herculean labors” (205).

Chapter Thirteen, Peter Gilliver’s discussion of the editorial decisions which James Murray made and revised around the time of the publication of the first fascicles of what would become the *Oxford English Dictionary*, tells part of the story of that “great dictionary of the English language”. The examples of Richardson and Webster could give Murray little guidance in the very different lexicographical project which he conducted, and those of the Grimms and other Continental predecessors were likewise often insufficient. Murray had to formulate inclusion criteria for incompletely naturalized foreign words (e.g. *acalepha*); words only attested in other dictionaries (*abannition*); scientific and technical terms (*adenoma*); and words derived from proper nouns (*Aberdonian*). He also had to consider the treatment of words formed from productive combining elements like *anthra-*, of other families of derived forms (*archbishopess*, *archbishopling* ...), and of grammatically tricky words such as *abandoned*, which is sometimes evidently a past participle, sometimes an adjective, and sometimes used in contexts which suggest that it could be analysed in either way. Finally, he had to confront the points at which the historical evidence appeared to be at odds with the logical sense-development of a given word, and the points at which the philological vocabulary of the 1870s and 1880s did not seem to include a name for a process which he wanted to identify. These challenges are discussed by Gilliver from the perspective of a current editor of *OED* and that of a historian of the dictionary; nearly all the examples mentioned above are illustrated with reproductions of Murray’s original slips in the *OED* archives. It was at the beginning of the dictionary that Murray was most often developing policy on the fly. But as Gilliver concludes, examination of later ranges of the dictionary may well turn up similar “inhomogeneities”: similar signs of the flexibility and responsiveness of Murray’s lexicographical thought.

Anne Dykstra considers a very different nineteenth-century dictionary, the *Lexicon Frisicum* compiled up to the lemma *FEER* by Joost Hiddes Halbertsma, and published posthumously in 1872. Its metalanguage is Latin, by no means an obvious choice for a dictionary of a vernacular in the third quarter of the nineteenth century, even in the Low Countries, where a tradition of excellence in Latin was very strong, and continues to this day (IJsewijn 1990, 148–156; cf. also Waquet 1998/2001, 124–129). Dykstra discusses contemporary and more recent responses to Halbertsma’s use of Latin, with particular attention to the limited use of the language by the Grimms in the definitions of the first volumes of the *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, and the use of the vernacular by Matthias de Vries in that of the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal*. He ends with the challenging question, what else could Halbertsma have done? Frisian words were of great interest to scholars in England and elsewhere who would have found editorial matter in Frisian or Dutch rather challenging; Halbertsma read English fluently, but was unhappy with his command of the written language; a defining language such as French or German (in both of which Halbertsma had written: see De Jong 2005, 53 and passim) would have created problems of its own. In the present day, as Jozef IJsewijn has justly remarked (1990, vii),

The loss of Latin as the international academic means of communication was and is a heavy blow to all scholars and scientists who speak a minor language. As a native speaker of Dutch myself, I know the problem at firsthand. Latin put us all at the same level, since everybody had to learn it and, writing in Latin, one could never hurt the linguistic sensitivity of native speakers. Now, to be born in an English-speaking country is an immense privilege.

Halbertsma’s dilemma continues to be relevant.

In Chapter Fifteen, Laura Santone discusses the “Dictionnaire critique” of Georges Bataille and others, a dictionary whose entries appeared, in alphabetic order, in 1929 and 1930 as a series of contributions to the short-lived review *Documents: Doctrines, archéologie, beaux-arts, ethnographie* (see Bataille et al. 1929–1930 in the bibliography of the present volume for a list of the entries). *Documents* was, despite its sober title, a Dionysian project which set out to present “a series of challenges to those disciplines that were implied by its rubric” (Ades et al. 2006, 14), and the “Dictionnaire critique” was no exception; it interrogated the “tasks of words” rather their banal meanings, through a wordlist which included *cheminée d’usine* “factory chimney” and *Keaton (Buster)*. As Santone argues, an entry like that for *œil* “eye”, illustrated on a single opening by

Dali's *Le sang est plus doux que le miel*, a photograph of a disturbingly exophthalmic Joan Crawford, and the cover of a penny shocker in the series "L'œil de la police", is much closer to Bataille's own violent erotic novella *L'histoire de l'œil* (written the year before the entry) than to a respectable dictionary. The "Dictionnaire critique", like Wilkins and Lloyd's "Alphabetical dictionary", came out of a sparkling intellectual milieu, self-consciously clever and innovative, investigating, to recall Fredric Dolezal's words, "the possibilities of lexicography".

Sylvia Brown's study of Edmund Peck—the founder of the first permanent mission on Baffin Island in the Canadian Arctic—and the "myth of the missionary lexicographer" investigates the *Eskimo-English dictionary* of 1925 which is conventionally attributed to Peck. Working from Peck's personal papers and from the original manuscript of the dictionary, which is written on the interleaves and in the margins of a copy of an Inuktitut-German dictionary compiled by earlier missionaries, Brown disentangles the story of its making, and that of Peck's own language learning. Missionary lexicography is bound to depend regularly on the help of informants, but the range of contributors to what became known as Peck's dictionary is particularly wide, and their contributions can be assessed with more precision than usual. The stereotype of the heroic solitary lexicographer dates back in English-language writing to Johnson and beyond; lonely and heroic as Peck's evangelizing work may have been, his lexicographical work, such as it was (and Brown demonstrates that it was very limited), was by no means conducted in heroic solitude.

The final chapter, by Michael Adams, discusses some of the legacies of what one might call a failed dictionary project, the *Early Modern English dictionary* imagined by William Craigie in 1919 and undertaken in two periods of activity at the University of Michigan in the twentieth century. The slips for the *EMED* were shipped in 1997 to Oxford (Brewer 2007, 76), where they are used in the editing of *OED3*, while the attractively decorated filing-cabinets which came with them add a note of gaiety to the open-plan office in which they are housed. But quite apart from the slips, Adams argues, the ideas developed by *EMED* editors had a significant impact on the *Middle English Dictionary*, and continue to contribute to the making of the *Dictionary of American Regional English* and the *Dictionary of Old English*. Moreover, parerga like the *Michigan Early Modern English materials* of 1975 and related projects like Tilley's great dictionary of proverbs of 1950 are legacies of the *EMED* project as well: when it is seen as part of a network of dictionaries and associated publications, its achievement looks very much more robust than when it is seen in artificial isolation. The history of completed dictionaries, one

might say, is only one part, and not always the most interesting, of the history of lexicographical activity and lexicographical thought.

3. Origins of the collection

Scholarly work is by definition carried out in the awareness of its place in a tradition, and so every scholar has some sort of mental sketch of the historical background of her own work, scholarly lexicographers being no exception. But although a sense that dictionaries have a history must go back to antiquity, the formal written history of lexicography is comparatively recent. By the late seventeenth century, Daniel Georg Morhof's *Polyhistor*, which set out to be a comprehensive guide to human learning, had chapters on ancient and recent dictionaries of ancient Greek (Morhof 1691/1708, 791–815). Accounts of the younger traditions of vernacular lexicography came later (e.g. Molbech 1827 and the more comprehensive Grimm 1854, cols. xix–xxvi). In the case of English, it was remarked as early as 1837 that “The history of English lexicography, ... if it should fall into the right hands, might be wrought into a very curious and amusing book” (*North American review* 1837, 186), but the invitation appears not to have been taken up at once, and Henry Wheatley's “Chronological notices of the dictionaries of the English language”, which appeared in the *Transactions of the Philological Society* in 1865, was a pioneering work. Wheatley was writing shortly after the inception of the Philological Society's project for a new dictionary of English; thirty-five years later, James Murray, the chief editor of that dictionary, surveyed the “origins and development of English lexicography” in a public lecture at Oxford, the text of which was published (J. Murray 1900) and has become a classic. The milestone publications in the subsequent historiography of English-language lexicography have been Starnes and Noyes's *The English dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson* (1946), reissued with new prefatory material by Gabriele Stein (Stein 1991) and complemented by her *The English dictionary before Cawdrey* (1985); Hausmann, Reichmann, Wiegand, and Zgusta's *Wörterbücher / Dictionnaires / Dictionaries* (1991), which for the first time offered a synchronic and diachronic survey of lexicography across the world; and the multi-authored *Oxford history of English lexicography* (Cowie 2009).

The period between Starnes and Noyes's *English dictionary* and Cowie's *Oxford history* is one in which the history of lexicography has developed from its pioneering beginnings to a flourishing subdiscipline both of the study of dictionaries and their making (so, for instance, Sidney Landau's widely used textbook *Dictionaries: The art and craft of*

lexicography has a historical chapter) and of the history of the language sciences. A sign of the maturation of the subdiscipline was the organization by Julie Coleman in 2002 of the first International Conference on Historical Lexicography and Lexicology (ICHLL), which took place at the University of Leicester. It was intended as a successor to two round-table meetings of the 1970s, which brought the editors of historical dictionaries together (papers from these meetings were published as *Accademia della Crusca 1973* and *Pijnenburg and Tollenaere 1980*). The scope of ICHLL1 was, however, much wider than theirs, and a number of the papers which were presented at Leicester dealt with the history of dictionaries rather than with the current making of historical dictionaries—hence the title, *Historical dictionaries and historical dictionary research*, of a collection of articles based on some of those papers (Coleman and McDermott 2004). ICHLL2, which took place two years later in Gargnano, organized by Giovanni Iamartino, and ICHLL3, which took place in Leiden in 2006, organized by Marijke Mooijaart and Marijke van der Wal, both likewise welcomed presentations on the history of dictionaries, and books originating in those conferences included articles on the subject (Considine and Iamartino 2007, Mooijaart and van der Wal 2008).

The seventeen chapters of this volume originate in presentations given at ICHLL4, which took place in Edmonton, Canada, in June 2008, supported by the University of Alberta and by a generous grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Two companion volumes present articles developed from presentations which discussed current projects in historical lexicography and from presentations which discussed questions of historical lexicology (Considine 2010a, 2010b). The decision to offer three volumes all of which originate in the Edmonton conference has been taken with two ends in view: firstly, to make each volume as coherent as possible, and secondly, to ensure that contributors had the opportunity to develop their ideas as satisfying articles rather than simply writing up their presentations briefly for publication, as would have been necessary to keep a single-volume collection within bounds. Like other volumes with an ICHLL background, this is meant to be more than a proceedings volume (cf. Considine 2007, viii, and Wild 2008, 450).

CHAPTER ONE

“FOR THE BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE ORDER OF THIS DICTIONARIE, PERUSE THE PREFACE TO THE READER”: TOPICS IN THE OUTSIDE MATTER OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH DICTIONARIES (1580–1673)

HEBERTO FERNANDEZ
AND MONIQUE C. CORMIER

1. Introduction

For almost one hundred years, the works of Claudius Holyband and Randle Cotgrave (the latter expanded by Robert Sherwood and James Howell) dominated French and English bilingual lexicography. In this chapter, the subjects discussed by these lexicographers in the outside matter of their dictionaries are studied and compared to see what light they shed on the scope and compilation principles of each dictionary. The shift from Holyband’s pedagogical approach to Howell’s normative intention is also noted. The corpus—consulted via *Early English Books Online*—comprises Holyband’s *Treasurie of the French tong* (1580) and *Dictionarie French and English* (1593); the second edition of Cotgrave’s *Dictionarie of the French and English tongues* (1632), with Robert Sherwood’s added English–French part; and its three further editions revised by James Howell (1650, 1660, and 1673–1672).

2. Claudius Holyband’s *Treasurie* (1580)

Claudius Holyband was a pioneer in the teaching of the French language in England during the second half of the sixteenth century. The monodirectional French–English dictionary entitled *The treasurie of the*

French tong (1580) and the enlarged edition, *A dictionary French and English* (1593), are among his reference publications for teaching French, together with such manuals as *The French Littleton* (1566), *De pronuntiatione linguae gallicae* (1580), and *A treatise for declining of verbes* (1580).¹

The front matter of *The treasure of the French tong* comprises a title page, a dedication, and a preface. The title-page of the dictionary reads

The Treasure of the French tong: Teaching the waye to varie all sortes of Verbes: Enriched so plentifully with Wordes and Phrases (for the benefit of the studious in that language) as the like hath not before bin published ... For the better understanding of the order of this Dictionarie, peruse the Preface to the Reader.

It highlights the main features of the book, namely, a fuller treatment of verb conjugations and the inclusion of new words and phrases for students of French.² Holyband also directs the reader to the preface “for the better understanding of the order of this Dictionarie”, in other words, for an explanation of the arrangement or structure of the work.

By 1580, Holyband had produced a number of manuals for teaching French. He was a consummate teacher and had a clear didactic outlook when compiling the *Treasure* in an attempt “to resolue thee [the reader] of euey ambiguitie that may rise in our [French] language”. Concerning the macro- and microstructures, Holyband claimed, first, to have “expounded all the harde wordes by diuers and sundrie examples” (on his use of examples, see Kibbee 1985) and, second, to have given the “theame and principall Tenses of all our most difficulte Verbes”. Verbs are listed in the infinitive, followed by the present indicative, the first perfect tense (“j’aimay, I loued”), the second perfect (“j’ay aimé, I have loued”), and the future tense (“j’aimeray, I shall or will loue”). In this way, according to Holyband, students would be able to conjugate any verb throughout all the moods and tenses because they derived from those presented in the dictionary. Holyband noted that he dealt more fully with verb conjugation in his *Treatise for declining of verbes* and that the dictionary, together with the *Treatise* and his *French Littleton*, formed a trilogy of references to help students become fluent in French. Before ending the preface with

¹ On Holyband’s life and work, see Farrer 1908/1971; Lambley 1920, 134 ff.; Byrne 1953; Alston 1970a and 1970b; Anderson 1978, 26 ff.; Stein 1985, 245 ff.; Eccles 1986; and Cormier and Francoeur 2004.

² According to Kibbee (1989, 68; 71), the *Dictionarie French and English* (Harrison 1571) contains some 10,500 entries and Holyband’s *Treasure* some 17,500.

some remarks on pronunciation and verb morphology, Holyband described his method of glossing, explaining that in some cases he used a periphrasis to gloss a headword, for lack of a suitable equivalent, but that such a way of glossing was preferable to giving a wrong equivalent:

But some perchaunce, wil saye, that hee hathe not the proper exposition of many wordes, but only by circumlocution: whiche in deede I doe confesse: but whether it be not better to finde th'Interpretation of the Frenche by circumlocution, than by a false Englishing, as dydde those whiche brake the Ice before, as they doe terme it, let the indifferent, iudge thereof. (sig. ¶|3r-v)³

Metalexical topics prevail in the front matter of the *Treasure*, where Holyband highlighted the fuller treatment of verbs and the additions to the macrostructure. As for the microstructure, he mentioned the use of examples to explain hard words and periphrases where he could provide no equivalent. Metalinguistic topics were limited to some remarks on pronunciation and verb morphology.

3. Claudius Holyband's "faisceau de plusieurs mots, peu de sentences, et moins de proverbes" (1593)

In 1593, Holyband published *A dictionarie French and English*, an enlarged edition of the *Treasure*—some 20,500 entries, according to Kibbee (1989, 73)—with an identical front matter (title page, dedication, and preface). The wording of the 1593 title page is similar to that of the *Treasure*, but there is no mention of verb conjugation nor of additions to the macrostructure, even though it is an enlarged edition. Nevertheless, this compilation is also “for the benefite of the studious in that language [French]” (title-page), and the reader is likewise directed to the preface “[f]or the better understanding of the order of this dictionarie” (ibid.).

The dedication to Edward la Zouche, eleventh Baron Zouche of Haryngworth (1556–1625; for him, see Knafla 2004), contains some biographical data. As a token of gratitude, Holyband offered his patron Lord Zouche “ce present faisceau de plusieurs mots, peu de sentences, et moins de proverbes icy semez et espars, en ce mien Dictionaire” (sig. A3r), a phrase that summarizes the contents of the dictionary. Further on, Holyband explained that his purpose was to contribute to “l'esclaircisse-

³ Here Holyband refers to the preface of the *Dictionarie French and English* (Harrison 1571), “qu'on a l'habitude d'attribuer à Lucas Harrison et que Holyband a ou bien produit lui-même ou bien copié sans scrupule” (Hausmann 1991, 2956).

ment et facilité de nostre langue Françoisé” (ibid.), which shows the didactic intention underlying the book.

The preface is almost identical to that of the *Treasurie*. There are some changes in spelling and wording, and some examples were changed, but Holyband again conceived the dictionary as part of a set of reference works for teaching French: “that is, the French *Littleton*, or my sayd booke *De Pronuntiatione*, this *Dictionarie*, & my *Treatise of Verbes*” (sig. A4v). The remark about the use of periphrases in the microstructure was deleted in this preface. An important new feature in the 1593 dictionary is the indication of gender: “Finally, our learner shall knowe our three genders, thus: the Masculine gender is knowne by this letter, *m*: the Feminine by *f*: the Common of two, *com*” (ibid.).

To sum up, the 1580 and 1593 dictionaries are structurally identical: a title page, followed by a dedication and a preface. The contents of the front matter texts are very similar too, except for the different dedications. As for the title page, the mention of what Holyband thought his innovation in 1580, namely, a fuller treatment of irregular verbs, was deleted in the 1593 edition; the mention of the “wordes and phrases” added in 1580 was also deleted. However, in the 1593 dedication, Holyband mentioned the inclusion of proverbs and maxims and, in the preface, gender marking. Both dictionaries were compiled from a didactic point of view, and the target public was students of French.

4. Robert Sherwood’s “ce mien petit labour” (1632)

The importance of Cotgrave’s dictionary of 1611 has been recognized by a number of scholars.⁴ Cotgrave’s “bundle of words”, as he calls it in the dedication, went through five editions, three of them during the author’s lifetime. The front matter comprises a title page, a dedication to William Cecil, second Earl of Exeter (1566–1640), a preface “Au favorable Lecteur François” by Jean de L’Oiseau de Tourval, and a paragraph “To the Reader” introducing the “Errata”. The back matter comprises a short French grammar, with a table of verb conjugations

The preface by Tourval deals with the content of the dictionary and was discussed from a perspective similar to ours by Naïs (1968) and

⁴ The most comprehensive study of the sources of Cotgrave’s dictionary is that of Smalley (1948); other scholars who discuss the dictionary are Farrer (1908/1971, 85–95), Starnes (1937, 1015–1017), Naïs (1968), Anderson (1978, 30–39), P. M. Smith (1980), and Rickard (1983 and 1985). On Cotgrave’s life, see Eccles (1982, 26) and Leigh 2004a.

Rickard (1983).⁵ Cotgrave did not take a prescriptive approach, but was open to collecting words from any author; he included French regionalisms, and archaic and obscure words culled from a wide variety of books, probably because his purpose was to help the English *read* any kind of book written in French. The target public was therefore broader than that of Holyband's dictionaries because the dictionary was destined for both English *and* French users, as shown in Tourval's preface. The back matter contains a short French grammar, divided into twenty-two sections dealing with pronunciation and the parts of speech, entitled "Briefe Directions for such as desire to learne the French Tongue", with "A Table of the Conjugations of perfect Verbes" inserted between pages four and five.

In our discussion of the Holyband dictionaries, we saw that he included some rudiments of grammar, such as pronunciation, gender, and conjugation of irregular verbs. Cotgrave went further than Holyband and succinctly elaborated on those and other aspects of French. Moreover, Holyband designed his dictionary to be part of a set of equally important works for teaching French, while Cotgrave placed his grammatical synopsis *at the end* of the dictionary, which could mean that for him the lexicon was paramount, as Naïs (1968, 345) explains: "Tout se passe comme si l'auteur considérait qu'un dictionnaire (bien complet) suffit pour comprendre la langue; et, pour savoir la parler, il suffit d'y ajouter quelques rudiments de phonétique et de morphologie." The grammar and table of verbs at the end of Cotgrave's dictionary provide a fuller treatment of two features introduced by Holyband in the microstructure of his dictionary. The objective is still didactic, but while Holyband was a consummate teacher, Cotgrave was first and foremost a lexicographer.

In 1632, the grammarian and language teacher Robert Sherwood (for him, see Leigh 2004b) turned Cotgrave's work of 1611 into a bidirectional dictionary by adding an English–French part; the sources of this English–French compilation are discussed by Starnes (1937, 1018) and O'Connor (1990, 57–58). Sherwood built the English–French part upon the same structural pattern as Cotgrave 1611, with a front matter and a back matter. The 1632 French–English part is a reprint of 1611, with only minor changes; the title page states that to Cotgrave's French–English dictionary "is also annexed a most copious Dictionarie, of the English set before the French by R.[obert] S.[herwood] L.[ondoner]". Some changes in spelling appear in the dedication, the preface by Tourval, and the paragraph

⁵ Tourval was a friend of Cotgrave's who, according to Lee (1904–1906, 101), was an able linguist and translator of King James' books into French.

introducing the errata. The French grammar in the back matter is identical to that of the 1611 edition.

The front matter of Sherwood's publication comprises a separate title page for the English–French part, a dedication, and a preface; the back matter comprises a section of remarks on English pronunciation, followed by verb conjugations and, finally, the errata. The purpose of the Holyband (1580, 1593) and Cotgrave (1611) dictionaries was to teach French, while Sherwood (1632) targeted a wider public, and the separate title page states that this dictionary was “[c]ompiled for the commoditie of all such as are desirous of both the Languages”. Sherwood's dedication “[a]ux favorables Lecteurs François, Alemans, & autres” shows that the dictionary was not compiled only for English and French users. In other words, this part was compiled with a broader public in mind, a step further than Holyband (students of French) and Cotgrave (English *and* French publics). Sherwood called his compilation “ce mien petit labour” (sig.)(2r), but stressed the comprehensiveness of the macrostructure: “je pense avoir comprins [sic] tous le [sic] mots, ou la plus grande partie, de la langue Angloise” (ibid.). Like Holyband's, Sherwood's main concerns were pronunciation and verb conjugation: “j'y ay mis à la fin, quelque courtes reigles, pour vous aider à prononcer icelle langue; & aussi tous les Verbes anomaes, que j'ay peu amasser”, a reference to the “Adresses bien briesves pour aider aux Estrangers à prononcer la langue Angloise”, and the “Conjugaisons des verbes tant reguliers qu'irreguliers” in the back matter. The dedication is followed by the preface “To the English Reader”, where Sherwood explained the organization of the microstructure: “In giuing the French interpretation to the English words, I haue, for the most part, obserued to set downe first the Proper; then, the Translated and Metaphorical” (sig.)(2v).⁶ For the first time, a lexicographer in the French and English tradition clearly explained the structure of his glosses.

Sherwood (1632) closely followed the structure laid down by Cotgrave in the 1611 first edition: macro- and microstructural choices are explained in the front matter while grammatical information is in the back. Sherwood stressed that, with the inclusion of the English–French part, the dictionary would be useful to a wider public to learn both languages. Moreover, he explained something his predecessors had not: the order he followed in the microstructure, first giving the literal meaning, then the figurative and metaphorical.

⁶ *Proper* and *translated* mean “literal” and “figurative” respectively.

5. James Howell's "Newly Refin'd and Amplifi'd" Dictionary (1650, 1660, 1673-1672)

5.1. The Edition of 1650

The third edition of Cotgrave's dictionary was published in 1650, with the "Animadversions and Supplements" of the Welsh man of letters James Howell (c. 1594–1666; for him, see Woolf 2004). Howell's edition of Cotgrave–Sherwood (1632) contains several additions to the outside matter. The French–English part includes front matter comprising the title page, a new epistle dedicatory, a "French Grammar" preceded by a "Proeme", remarks on French pronouns and adverbs, a dialogue, a section illustrating the advantages of the modernized French orthography, Cotgrave's dedication, and Tourval's preface. The English–French part, on the other hand, is almost identical to the previous edition of 1632, containing in the front matter a separate title page, a dedication, and Sherwood's preface to the English reader, to which Howell added "A Caution to the Reader". The back matter contains remarks on English pronunciation, verb conjugations, and a short English–French topical vocabulary. Howell deleted Cotgrave's "To the Reader" paragraph and the "Errata", moved the French grammar from the back matter to the front, and added four texts in this part: an epistle dedicatory, a dialogue, remarks on French pronouns and adverbs, and remarks on the French Academy's modifications to French orthography. Howell attached a small topical vocabulary to the back matter of the English–French part and removed the Errata page. The deletion of the errata in both parts of the dictionary makes sense because this was a revised edition.

Howell's new epistle dedicatory was a six-page essay on the history of French which, according to Lambley (1920, 192), was "taken, without acknowledgement, from Pasquier's *Recherches*". Lambley refers to the work of a French lawyer and man of letters, Etienne Pasquier (1529–1615), who in 1560 published the first book of his *Recherches de la France*, a work on French history and literature. We scanned this book trying to find specific proof of Howell's borrowings from Pasquier. The epistle seems to consist of excerpts from Pasquier's book; in fact, Howell's quotation from Guillaume de Lorris' *Roman de la Rose* (sig. a3r) can be found *verbatim* in chapter forty-six, book eight of Pasquier (1560/1996, 1653). Likewise, Howell notes that he borrowed two passages from "two of the most approved ancientest Authors in French ... *Geoffroy de Villardovin*, Marshall of *Champagne*, and *Hugues de Bersy*, a Monke of *Clugny*" (sig. a3v), but actually the first passage comes from chapter three,

book eight, and the second from chapter three, book seven, of Pasquier (1560–1621/1996, 1517 and 1387 respectively). Howell may not have borrowed his entire epistle from Pasquier, but he certainly consulted the *Recherches*.

The epistle is dedicated to “the Nobility and Gentry of Great Britain That are desirous to speak French for their pleasure, and ornament” and to “all Marchant Adventurers as well English, as the worthy Company of *Dutch* here resident, or others to whom the said Language is necessary for commerce and Forren correspondence”. At the time of the first edition of Cotgrave’s dictionary in 1611, there was already an exchange of courtiers, diplomats, merchants, students, and travelers between England and France; Howell’s dedication is a step further in the process of targeting a wider audience. Howell understood that, for a dictionary to serve the pragmatic needs of merchants and travellers, he had to adopt the reforms introduced by the French Academy. As Naïs (1968, 346) points out, “Voilà un public auquel Cotgrave ne pensait sûrement pas, mais son existence même obligeait à distinguer les formes vieilles et littéraires, dont il n’avait que faire pour écrire ses lettres de commerce.”

Language change and evolution, language as a living organism, the change in words and meanings, and the idea of a standard: these are the linguistic topics discussed in the epistle. Howell began by mentioning the changing character of all things: “Ther is no quality so incident to all earthly things as corruption and change.”⁷ And if everything changes, then so does language. Howell thought language change was the result of outside causes and new words entering a particular language and old ones dying:

For Languages are like *Lawes* or *Coines*, which commonly receive some change at every fist [*sc.* shift?] of Princes: Or as slow Rivers by insensible alluvions take in and let out the waters that feed them, yet are they said to have still the same beds; So Languages by a regardles kind of adoption of some new words, and manumission of old, doe often vary, yet the whole bulke of the same speech keeps entire. (sig. a2v)

On the same page of the epistle, Howell continued to elaborate on the origin of French, and invoked the idea of language as a living organism that grows and decays: “Now, as all other things have their degrees of

⁷ Guy Miège used this phrase in a modified form in the preface to his *New Dictionary French and English* (1677, sig. A3r): “Change, the common Fate of Sublunary things, is of all others That of living Languages, which sometimes are in a flourishing, and sometimes in a declining condition.”