Lexicographic Traditions and Prefatory Discourse of 17th Century Dictionaries: Monolingual English, Monolingual French, and Bilingual French-English Works

by
Bronwyn Burlingham

School of Translation and Interpretation
Faculty of Arts
University of Ottawa

Under the supervision of
Aline Francœur, PhD
School of Translation and Interpretation

Thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
of the University of Ottawa
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of MA (Translation)

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my deep gratitude to my supervisor, Aline Francœur, without whose guidance and support this thesis would not have been possible. I am also grateful to the School of Translation and Interpretation at the University of Ottawa for providing an inspiring and intellectually stimulating environment, as well as the University itself for providing resources, both financial and otherwise. Financial assistance was also gratefully received from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

In addition, I would like to thank my friends and family, and most especially my parents, Lorna Stewart and Garth Burlingham, as well as Cal Hartman, for their love and encouragement.

Abstract

In this study, we have explored the prefaces of monolingual English, monolingual French, and bilingual French-English dictionaries of the 17th century. The monolingual works studied constitute the first of this kind to have been published. Over the course of this research, we have demonstrated that despite different lexicographic traditions, dictionary prefaces convey basically the same type of information, and address the same general issues.

This study is divided into two main sections. In the first, we have provided historical information on the dictionaries, so as to illustrate the historical context in which they were published.

In the second section, we have examined the prefaces themselves, first giving an overview of each text studied, and then providing a thematic analysis of the prefaces within each group as a whole, observing topics that are commonly treated among them, within the broader categories of dictionary content, lexicographic context, and linguistic context.

Over the course of the research, we have established that though each text is unique, certain features are shared not only among the prefaces within one same category, but in fact across all three types of dictionary.

Résumé

Au cours de notre étude, nous avons examiné les préfaces de trois familles de dictionnaires publiés au 17e siècle: les dictionnaires monolingues anglais, les dictionnaires monolingues français et les dictionnaires bilingues français-anglais. Dans le cas des œuvres monolingues, ces dictionnaires sont les premiers du genre à être publiés. Notre étude a permis de constater que, en dépit du fait qu'elles figurent dans des dictionnaires qui relèvent d'approches lexicographiques différentes, les préfaces analysées abordent sensiblement les mêmes grands sujets.

La présente thèse est divisée en deux parties. Dans la première partie, nous avons résumé l'histoire des dictionnaires dans lesquels figurent les préfaces étudiées, et cela, dans le but de mieux cerner le contexte entourant leur publication et de situer l'émergence des traditions lexicographiques anglaise, française et bilingue (français-anglais). Dans la deuxième partie, nous nous sommes penchée sur les préfaces elles-mêmes, en donnant d'abord un aperçu du contenu de chacune. Nous avons ensuite effectué une analyse thématique des préfaces, en soulignant les thèmes communs à chaque groupe de textes. Ces thèmes ont été regroupés en trois catégories: contenu et objectif du dictionnaire, contexte lexicographique et contexte linguistique.

Notre analyse a permis de constater que, bien que chaque préface soit unique, il existe des similarités entre les préfaces étudiées, et cela, non seulement à l'intérieur d'une catégorie de dictionnaires, mais aussi entre les catégories.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Our study falls within the scope of metalexicography, as defined by Hartmann and James (1998: 93), that is, "[a] complex of activities concerned with reflection on the practice of lexicography." As such, it offers a historical perspective, aiming both at "finding out how lexicographic principles have been developed within the various intellectual or national traditions," and "finding out how different reference works are 'family-related'" (Hartmann 2001: 40). Thus, our study is in some way both a cultural-historical approach and a genealogical approach, as described by Hartmann.

While the content of dictionaries has been the object of much study (see Quemada 1967, Matoré 1968, Rey-Debove 1971, Zgusta 1971, Hayashi 1978, and Starnes and Noyes 1991), the front matter of these texts, "those component parts of a dictionary which precede the central word-list section" (Hartmann and James 1998: 60), including prefaces, has remained largely unexplored. Quemada (1997: VIII) is among the researchers[1] who have highlighted this fact, noting:

> Nous manquons d'études d'ensemble sur le *genre Préfaces de dictionnaires*, comme sur les textes qui les complètent ou en tiennent lieu: 'Avis au lecteur', 'Avant-propos', 'Eclaircissement', 'Avertissement', 'Discours préliminaire', 'Prospectus', etc. Destinés à expliquer ou à justifier le projet particulier que représente chaque dictionnaire, à préparer sa réception et son utilisation, ils abordent, à l'occasion ou en marge de la présentation du contenu, de nombreuses questions de linguistique, d'histoire de la langue, de théorie et d'histoire de la lexicographie, quand ce n'est pas la critique d'ouvrages ou d'auteurs rivaux. En dépit de leurs lacunes ou d'un ton parfois polémique—certains sont de véritables manifestes—, la plupart de ces textes éclairent de manière irremplaçable l'entreprise, ses objectifs linguistiques, didactiques, politiques, les destinataires visés, les positions théoriques et méthodologiques des rédacteurs envers la langue et sa description, les conditions d'exécution de l'ouvrage, etc.

[1] Hausmann (1989) and Francœur (2003) have made some observations.

As observed by Quemada, dictionary prefaces provide unique insight into the context of publication of each dictionary, and into the views on language held by both the author and the public at the time. Chrétien et al. (2001: 85) agree that "Les textes introductifs d'un dictionnaire informent non seulement sur les choix linguistiques des lexicographes, mais aussi sur les visions culturelles, politiques et sociales d'une époque."

In this work, we will study the prefaces of three types of dictionaries published during the 17th century: monolingual English, monolingual French, and bilingual French-English dictionaries. The 17th century was chosen as our timeframe because it represents the dawn of monolingual French and English lexicography, and as such, a pivotal moment in lexicography in general. By exploring the works in question, both individually as well as in relation to one another, we will see that while each category of preface, and indeed each preface itself, is unique, there are overriding similarities among all of the prefaces studied in terms of the information they provide, as well as the main topics that they address.

Objective

The aim of our study is to determine whether there is a link between the lexicographic context in which a dictionary is published and the content of its prefatory material. In other words, we will explore the question of whether prefaces of the monolingual English, monolingual French, and bilingual French-English dictionaries published during the same time period differ significantly from one another.

We hypothesize that despite different lexicographic milieus (monolingual English, monolingual French, and bilingual French-English), dictionary prefaces do convey essentially the same kind of information, and address the same broad issues.

Methodology

Over the course of this thesis, we will analyze a total of fourteen prefaces: six prefaces of monolingual English works, three prefaces of monolingual French works, and five prefaces of bilingual French-English works. The total number of prefaces was not predetermined; in fact, it is a consequence of the number of dictionaries published in each group of dictionary studied. As we will see, six English dictionaries, three French dictionaries and five French-English dictionaries appeared during the 17th century.

We will begin with the study of each individual preface within the three categories of dictionaries. For each text, we will analyze the content, noting the most important as well as peripheral themes. Following this analysis, we will observe what topics, within the general categories of dictionary content and scope, lexicographic context, and linguistic context, are common to most if not all of the prefaces within one group. After identifying these subjects, we will compare and contrast the specific treatment of these topics in the prefaces. Once this thematic analysis is accomplished, we will be able to consider the similarities not only within but also across the three groups of preface.

To facilitate reflection of the prefaces in context, we will undertake a historical study of 17th century lexicography in each of the three aforementioned categories, including the specific history of the authors in question as well as the dictionaries themselves. The unique situation in French lexicography during the 17th century, due to the presence of

the Académie française, will necessitate a more in-depth historical study in this area than in the areas of monolingual English or bilingual French-English lexicography. By looking at the history of the dictionaries in question, we will be able to see that the similarities that are observable across the three groups of preface exist despite significant differences in their context of publication.

Overview of the Thesis

The thesis consists of two main sections. The first section, from Chapters 1 to 3, provides historical information on the dictionaries within each group. Specific innovations on the part of the lexicographers in question are highlighted, and additional information on the linguistic situations leading up to the publication of the dictionaries within each category is given.

The second section, from Chapters 4 to 6, deals more specifically with the prefaces themselves. In each chapter, an overview of each preface is given. This is followed by a brief discussion on how the prefaces as individual texts relate to one another. The prefaces within each group are then examined as a whole, from a thematic point of view. Within the broader categories of dictionary content and scope, lexicographic context, and linguistic context, subtopics such as target audience, predecessors, and reflections on language are identified as playing an important and recurring role within each group of preface.

Finally, a concluding chapter provides a recapitulation of our findings, and makes some observations on how the three categories of prefaces relate to one another. In addition, we suggest in this chapter some directions for future research.

Remarks

In general, our study is restricted to prefaces themselves, and in some cases title pages, as opposed to other aspects of prefatory material, such as dedications. Title pages will be considered when they present new information, or contribute to existing information relevant to our study. Because the dedications of the dictionaries studied are not generally concerned with the issue of language itself, we will not consider these in most cases. However, when a dedication suggests the author's views on language, we will make mention of this in our text.

PART I. ENGLISH, FRENCH, AND BILINGUAL FRENCH-ENGLISH LEXICOGRAPHY IN THE 17TH CENTURY

In this section, we will provide historical information on monolingual English, monolingual French, and bilingual French-English dictionaries published during the 17th century, in order to illustrate the historical context surrounding the emergence of these works. We will provide information on each of the compilers and their respective dictionaries, as well as background information on the events leading up to the publication of these works.

Because each group of dictionary represents a unique situation, the information given in this section will vary slightly from chapter to chapter. For example, Chapter 1 will contain information specifically on the emergence of the 'hard word' tradition in English lexicography. Similarly, Chapter 2 will provide details on the formation of the Académie française, since the existence of this institution would drastically influence the course of monolingual French lexicography in the 17th century. In Chapter 3, information will be given on a compiler of the 16th century, since the bilingual dictionaries in question, unlike their monolingual English and French counterparts, first appeared in the 16th and not the 17th century.

In this section, we hope to give an understanding of these unique situations, which we will apply in Part II in order to appreciate how these three groups of dictionaries, despite different contexts of publication, still relate to each other thematically.

Chapter 1. From Cawdrey to Coles: The 'Hard Word' Tradition in English Lexicography

In this chapter, we will provide background information on the first monolingual dictionaries of English, published during the 17th century. We will place special emphasis on the historical context surrounding the publication of these works, focusing especially on the development of the 'hard word' tradition.[2]

Though the first monolingual dictionaries of English did not appear until the 17th century, the origins of these works go back as far as the 7th and 8th centuries (Wells 1973: 13). Osselton (1983: 14) remarks that in terms of lexicography,

> The very beginnings, for English, lie in the treatment of certain Latin texts in Anglo-Saxon times. We find then interlinear glosses, i.e. English equivalents of Latin words (the more difficult ones of course) written in between the lines of manuscripts to help those readers whose knowledge of Latin was imperfect.

As the books in which these lists were found, and thus the lists themselves, began to circulate, there became a need to organize the terms found in these glosses.

As Starnes and Noyes (1991: 2) note, the works produced from these glosses during the Renaissance, "the numerous bilingual and multilingual dictionaries in which the English vocabulary is prominent," contributed to the development of English lexicography, "and of special importance among these [were] the English-Latin and Latin-English dictionaries." The dictionaries of Sir Thomas Elyot, further developed by Reverend Thomas Cooper, are examples of such important works: "The significance of these texts is [...] emphasized by the fact that the English lexicographers of the

[2] Hard word dictionaries offer limited coverage of the lexicon, and are largely restricted to language used by scholars, including words that may be unfamiliar to unscholarly readers.

seventeenth century frequently looked to the Cooper and the Thomas in framing definitions for 'hard' English words" (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 4).

Starnes and Noyes (1991: 7) observe that Elyot "was only one of many writers who took great license in introducing new words and reviving old ones. The result was that by the middle of the [16th] century such scholars as Sir John Cheke and Thomas Wilson had become alarmed for the fate of the English language and protested against the linguistic innovations." Thus, the conflict between the conservatives and the innovators, "a key theme of seventeenth-century debate on the language" (Benson 2001: 66), was born. Arising from this conflict were the first monolingual compilations: "this has been the controversy of innovator and importer against purist and defender—a quarrel out of which emerged, among other things, the unilingual dictionary" (McArthur 1986: 84). During the 16th century, dictionaries involving English and modern languages such as French and Italian appeared, which, according to Wells (1973: 16), "complemented the influence of the English-Latin and Latin-English wordbooks in establishing a lexicographical tradition in England."

In addition to "a greatly increased reading public," Wells (1973: 16) identifies the "rapid expansion of the English vocabulary" as chiefly contributing to the necessity of a monolingual dictionary of English:

> Increased commerce, exploration, travel, and numerous translations of foreign writings led to many new borrowings; more important, the freedom of coinage, and the conscious literary efforts to enrich the lexicon that gave birth to 'inkhorn terms', sharply pointed up the necessity of a work explaining the new accessions to the vocabulary. Thus the first English dictionaries were dictionaries of 'hard words'; their purpose was to explicate the meanings of the many new terms in the language (Wells 1973: 16-17).

During this time, these borrowed words were not "readily comprehensible to 'uneducated' readers" (Jackson 2002: 33). Thus, these terms are among the 'hard words' treated in the first monolingual dictionaries of English.

In addition to borrowed words, many of these 'hard word' dictionaries address specialized terms in various fields. According to Osselton (1983: 16), "no systematic attempt was made to include the ordinary words of the language (words such as *book*, *cart*, or *stone*) before 1700." Thus, despite Cawdrey's insistence on "plaine" English, his work, along with the works of his 17th century contemporaries, would be considered as at least somewhat specialized.[3]

During the 17th century, marked by "the fastest vocabulary growth in the history of English in proportion to the vocabulary size of the time," according to Nevalainen (1999: 336), seven monolingual dictionaries of English were published. These include the six works explored in this study: Robert Cawdrey's *A Table Alphabeticall* (1604), John Bullokar's *An English Expositor* (1616), Henry Cockeram's *The English Dictionarie* (1637), Thomas Blount's *Glossographia* (1656), Edward Phillips's *The New World of English Words* (1658), and Elisha Coles's *An English Dictionary* (1676).[4] In 1689, the *Gazophylacium Anglicanum* was published anonymously. This work was not included in our study because of its highly etymological focus. Though it is true that, due to their specialized nature, the other works published in this category may not be termed general dictionaries as such, the *Gazophylacium* did not fit in to the 'hard word' tradition, and

[3] Benson, Benson, and Ilson (1986: 3) further specify a "Latin/Greek 'hard word' tradition," describing the dictionaries that explained words arising from these classical languages. They note that the publication of Coles's dictionary marked a "break" in this tradition by its inclusion of "slang and cant terms," though for our purposes, we consider this work to be included within the broader category of hard word dictionaries, since Coles's dictionary does focus on "difficult terms," as noted on his title page.

[4] Please refer to the bibliography and appendices at the end of the thesis for the complete titles and title pages of the dictionaries studied.

therefore, we deemed that the prefatory material to this work would not contribute to our understanding of this specific genre of preface.

1.1 Cawdrey: A Table Alphabeticall (1604)

Robert Cawdrey's dictionary, *A Table Alphabeticall*, was published in 1604, and may rightly be termed as the first monolingual English dictionary. As such, remarks Peters (1966: v), it "constitutes a lexicographic milestone." Though there is little biographical information available for Cawdrey, we do know from his prefatory material that he was a schoolteacher, and that his son Thomas, also a schoolteacher, collaborated with him on the project. As we will see, this may account for a certain "pedagogic" tone at a given moment in the preface to the work.

Starnes and Noyes (1991: 13) observe that Edmund Coote's The English Schoole-Master, published in 1596, was the "immediate inspiration" for *A Table Alphabeticall*, and that Cawdrey also drew from the work of another bilingual lexicographer, Thomas Thomas.

1.2 Bullokar: An English Expositor (1616)

Also in the 'hard word' tradition was *An English Expositor*, compiled by John Bullokar, "a doctor of physic" (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 20), and published in 1616. Interestingly, it was Bullokar's father, William Bullokar (Warren 1997), who had called attention to the "'unruled' condition of the vernacular, which, in his eyes, rendered it barbarous and inferior to the classical languages" (Jones 1953: 284).

With "almost twice as many entries as Cawdrey's *A Table Alphabeticall*" (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 21), Bullokar's work marked a step toward a more comprehensive dictionary,[5] though it is to be remarked that *An English Expositor* remains firmly in the 'hard word' tradition. In fact, according to Starnes and Noyes (1991: 21), due to his emphasis on "hard words of foreign origin," as well as old words, "*The Expositor* even more than *A Table* is a dictionary of 'hard' words."

1.3 Cockeram: The English Dictionarie (1637)[6]

As Hulbert (1968: 18-19) remarks, the publication of Henry Cockeram's *The English Dictionarie* in 1623 marked a turning point in English lexicography, whereby dictionaries began to be used as a tool for beautifying the language. The work is divided into three parts—dealing with hard words, vulgar words and their more refined equivalents, and mythology (Hulbert 1968: 18-19)—which, according to Starnes and Noyes (1991: 35), "extends the range of interest and appeal far beyond that of Cawdrey and Bullokar." Another point of interest in regards to Cockeram's work is that it is the first "to have the title of *The English Dictionary*" (Mathews 1966: 19).

Cockeram's contribution to the field of monolingual English lexicography was largely "encyclopedic" by its inclusion of certain "miscellaneous" information that had previously been seen in some Latin-English compilations (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 33). Starnes and Noyes (1991: 34) note of this characteristic of *The English Dictionarie*,

[5] Starnes and Noyes (1991: 23) do note, however, that not all words contained in *A Table Alphabeticall* are included in Bullokar's work.
[6] Though this work was first published in 1623, the first edition available to us for study was that published in 1637.

"Cockeram's innovation definitely anticipates certain features, such as the brief biographies, common to most English dictionaries of the present day."

1.4 Blount: Glossographia (1656)

The *Glossographia* appeared some years later, in 1656. Compiled by Thomas Blount, "a barrister of the Inner Temple," this dictionary "is more ambitious than preceding works of the kind" (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 37-38).

According to Mathews (1966: 20-21), this "little volume possessed some notable features. In it are found crude efforts at etymology. Most of the words are referred to the languages from which they come, and frequently the source word in the foreign language is given." Blount's dictionary was unique in another way as well, in that Osselton (1983: 16) terms it "one of the most notoriously Latinate dictionaries of the mid-seventeenth century." This is likely due to Blount's heavy reliance on bilingual Latin-English dictionaries. Though not all of this copying was acknowledged, it is to be observed that Blount is credited with being the first of the monolingual lexicographers "to cite the authorities he had consulted" (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 47).

1.5 Phillips: The New World of English Words (1658)

Basing himself largely on the *Glossographia*, Edward Phillips, the nephew of John Milton, published *The New World of English Words* in 1658. One feature that distinguishes this work, along with the *Glossographia*, is the fact that "In order to make their works more authoritative, both lexicographers secured the services of specialists in the various fields from which their words were taken" (Jones 1953: 276). Though Starnes

and Noyes (1991: 54) note that in the case of *The New World*, "There is no evidence in the text to indicate that specialists did actually make contributions."

With "approximately 11,000 entries" (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 48), Phillips's *The New World* is more substantial than any of the works of his predecessors. This is largely due to the introduction of "a greater number of proper names, including place names, and probably more old words" (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 56). Unfortunately, Phillips' dictionary is more strongly remembered in connection to its largely unacknowledged dependence on the work of other compilers (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 56).

1.6 Coles: An English Dictionary (1676)

Elisha Coles's *An English Dictionary* appeared in 1676. The following year, Coles, "teacher of Latin and student of shorthand," published a bilingual Latin-English dictionary (Mathews 1966: 25). Coles's motivation for publishing his *English Dictionary* may have arisen from his view that "a good foundation in English is essential to instruction in Latin" (Jones 1953: 281). This is in keeping with the observation that Coles is "one of a long list of schoolmasters of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries who published dictionaries" (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 58).

Perhaps the most notable innovation of Coles is the inclusion in *An English Dictionary* of "Canting Terms": "Though the custom of collecting dialect words was not new, no one before Coles had deliberately chosen to introduce them into a general dictionary" (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 63).

1.7 Conclusion

As we have seen, the 16th and 17th centuries were important periods in the development of the English language. In fact, it was during this time that the first grammatical and lexicographic descriptions of the language were produced. As observed by Helmut Gneuss (1996: 21), "the grammatical description of English began in the late sixteenth century, and from this time onwards, English was studied in its own right, and no longer exclusively as an aid in the contrastive teaching of Latin." Thus appeared the first monolingual dictionaries of English, with Cawdrey's *A Table Alphabetical*, the first of its kind, being published at the turn of the 17th century. This compilation, and the five works that followed, are of the 'hard word' tradition. As such, they offer limited coverage of the lexicon, and are largely restricted to scholarly language, including words that were likely unfamiliar to unscholarly readers.

We have also observed that, despite the fact that all of these works are of the 'hard word' tradition, each dictionary is in some way innovative. Bullokar's compilation is nearly twice the size of Cawdrey's, while Cockeram's contains encyclopedic information, and Blount's is rich in etymological information and latinisms. For his part, Phillips produced a compilation more substantial than that of Blount, despite his dependence on the latter work. Finally, Coles's inclusion in his dictionary of dialect words was certainly an innovative practise in the 17th century. Thus each lexicographer in his own way has contributed to the field of English lexicography.

Chapter 2. Richelet, Furetière, and the Académie française: the Clash of the Dictionaries

We now turn our attention to the history of the first monolingual French dictionaries, published during the 17th century. These three works are as follows: *Dictionnaire françois*, by Pierre Richelet (1680), *Dictionaire Universel*, by Antoine Furetière (1690), and *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1694).[7] Because of the unique situation caused by the formation of the Académie française during this period, we have included historical background on the beginnings of the Acdémie itself, in addition to the information given specifically on the production of the *Dictionnarie de l'Académie*.

2.1 Dictionnaire de l'Académie—Beginnings

The Académie française was formed in 1634, under the protection of the Cardinal de Richelieu, and officially recognized in 1635, though its origins were in informal meetings held among those interested in discussing language and literature. From the time of its official formation, the goals of the Académie included the compilation of several works of reference, "un Dictionnaire, une Grammaire, une Réthorique & une Poëtique sur les observations de l'Académie" (Benhamou et al. 1997: 9).

From its very beginnings, the notion of "purity" in language was fundamental to the group. In fact, Chapelain,[8] "très actif depuis 1625 dans la compagnie informelle" (Benhamou et al. 1997: 9), brought up this notion as one of the guiding principles of the Académie in its very early stages: "dès la seconde assemblée, sur la question qui fut

[7] Please refer to the bibliography and appendices at the end of the thesis for the complete titles and title pages of the dictionaries studied.

[8] Jean Chapelain, a poet and literary critic, as well as a pupil of the poet Malherbe (Encyclopædia Britannica, 1979 ed., Micropædia II, p. 744-745), was considered one of the "pionniers" of the Académie (Benhamou et al. 1997: 9).

proposée de [la fonction de l'Académie], M. Chapelain représenta qu'à son avis elle devoit être de travailler à la pureté de notre langue et de la rendre capable de la plus haute éloquence" (Beaulieux 1967: 13).

This preoccupation with the purity of language, which Seguin (1999: 235) goes so far as to call an "obsession," may help to explain the relative prescriptivism of the project. Chapelain, who was initially put in charge of the dictionary and grammar (Benhamou et al. 1997: 9), was an admirer of the work of the Accademia della Crusca (Benhamou et al. 1997: 11),[9] and his original goal was to follow its example for the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. However, Quemada (1997: IV) notes one marked difference between the philosophies of the two projects: "dès les premières ébauches, l'Académie a donné à son projet des visées plus linguistiques et plus prescriptives que ne l'avaient fait les autres promoteurs de la lexicographie monolingue moderne, en particulier les philologues de La Crusca, son inspiratrice toscane." The first edition of the dictionary of the Académie also differs from the project of the Accademia della Crusca by its lack of quotations, though it is to be observed that in Chapelain's original plan, it was intended that quotations from famous authors would be included in the dictionary (Beaulieux 1967: 15).

Other features of Chapelain's plan serve to illustrate the prescriptive intentions of the Académie: in addition to grammatical considerations such as parts of speech and gender of nouns, the dictionary would indicate which words were "du genre sublime, du médiocre et du plus bas" (Beaulieux 1967: 15). Furthermore, the Académie "travailleroit [...] à ôter toutes les superfluités qui pourroient être retranchées sans conséquence" (Beaulieux 1967: 15). While certain old words would be included in the dictionary for the

[9] Bray (1990: 1798) notes that he was also a member of the Accademia della Crusca.

purpose of reading older texts, these would be accompanied by the recommendation "qu'il ne faut plus les employer" (Beaulieux 1967: 16).

According to Chapelain's plan, specialized terms would not be included in the dictionary, leaving to other compilers "la liberté de faire des Dictionnaires particuliers pour l'utilité de ceux qui s'adonnent à ces connoissances spéciales" (Beaulieux 1967: 16).

Such was Chapelain's design for the dictionary, presented in March of 1634 (Benhamou et al. 1997: 11). In 1635, Vaugelas, another member of the Académie, proposed an alternate project, which, though initially rejected, would be adopted a few years later, when he took over the responsibility for the dictionary at the beginning of 1639 (Beaulieux 1967: 17).

As early as this time, there was a marked lack of interest in the project, as cited in a letter from Chapelain dated January 6th, 1639. He remarks, "les membres ne s'y portoient que lâchement, pour ce qu'ils n'en attendoient ni honneur ni récompense particulière, et les trois quarts regardoient ce travail comme une courvée" (Beaulieux 1967: 16).[10]

Vaugelas advocated "l'usage de la Cour qui se confondait, selon lui, avec celui des bons auteurs" (Benhamou et al. 1997: 13). Fairly prescriptive in his original plan, he warned against "le mauvais usage" (Benhamou et al. 1997: 13), as well as old words and neologisms. Benhamou et al. note that this prescriptive attitude was somewhat moderated over time (Benhamou et al. 1997: 14).

Upon Vaugelas' death in 1650, Mézeray, "historiographe du roi" (Benhamou et al. 1997: 14), took charge of the dictionary.

[10] As it turns out, this attitude of the Académiciens would be an obstacle that would plague the dictionary until its publication, long overdue in 1694.

> Comme VAUGELAS, [Mézeray] s'appliqua à la normalisation de la langue et à la défense de l'orthographe traditionelle. Il s'attacha à la description du bon et du bel usage qu'il fit évoluer vers celui des 'honnêtes gens'. Il plaida pour l'insertion de phrases populaires, se heurtant aux défenseurs de l'usage aristocratique et, devant le refus de l'Académie, dénonça cette carence (Benhamou et al. 1997: 14).

By all accounts, Mézeray was indispensable to the advancement of the dictionary; Beaulieux (1967: 38) goes so far as to credit him as being "le principal auteur du Dictionnaire."

> C'est ce qu'écrit avec exagération Furetière: «Ce grand ouvrage qu'on prône si haut et qu'on fait croire être le travail d'un grand nombre de personnes illustres, n'est véritablement et en effet que celui d'un seul homme qui en donne quelque communication à ses amis pour en apprendre leur sentiment, et qui souffre qu'ils le barbouillent par leurs corrections et additions. Ainsi on doit les cinq ou six premiéres lettres de ce Dictionnaire à M. de Vaugelas qui y a travaillé douze ou quinze ans et toutes les autres à M. Mezeray qui s'y est appliqué trente trois années» (Beaulieux 1967: 38).

It is to be noted that the latter may indeed involve some exaggeration, since Mézeray has elsewhere been credited with only 23 years of service to the dictionary (Benhamou et al. 1997: 14).

After the death of Séguier in 1672, who had replaced Richelieu as chancellor of the Académie upon his death in 1642, Louis XIV decided to take more direct power over the group, "se déclar[ant] Protecteur de l'assemblée" (Benhamou et al. 1997: 15). As *Sous-Protecteur*, Colbert, a member of the Académie since 1660 (Beaulieux 1967: 22), identified the completion of the dictionary as being an important priority of the Académie (Benhamou et al. 1997: 15). Under the influence of Louis XIV, Perrault was elected as chancellor of the Académie, replacing Séguier. Beaulieux (1967: 22) remarks that he was "reconnu comme le porte-parole de Colbert," and that as a result, he immediately possessed "une grande autorité."

It was in January of 1673 that the policy of *jetons* was introduced to the Académie by Colbert.[11] In order to encourage participation in the dictionary, forty *jetons* per meeting were provided, to be divided among the members present; in theory, one for each member if they were all in attendance, which, according to Perrault, never once happened (Beaulieux 1967: 23).

Despite Perrault's support for the *jetons* policy, there were some decided disadvantages. Apparently, this strategy attracted those motivated by money toward the dictionary, according to Beaulieux (1967: 88), "Les flatteurs de Chapelain ratés faméliques de la littérature." These members would come to be known as the *jetonniers*.

The *jetonniers* became possessive of the project, wanting to limit the number of participants of the dictionary so as to increase their personal share of the pool of *jetons*. In so doing, they alienated those who may have had a positive influence on the dictionary. According to Beaulieux (1967: 25), the *jetonniers* would deliberately vote in members of the Académie who would be unlikely to attend meetings on the dictionary, and therefore would not threaten their monopoly over the *jetons*.

As it turned out, simply encouraging the Académiciens to attend meetings on the dictionary was not enough to ensure increased productivity.

In June of 1674, the Académie gained a sort of monopoly over the French language: "CHARPENTIER, sur l'intervention de COLBERT, obtint un *Privilège du Roy* (qu'il avait préparé), qui interdisait la publication de tout autre dictionnaire de la langue française avant celle du dictionnaire de l'Académie et accordait à celle-ci un monopole de vingt ans pour tout remaniement ultérieur" (Benhamou et al. 1997: 15).

[11] A *jeton* is a token, in this case, exchangeable for money.

It is to be remarked that, though Mézeray's "canevas" was to be the model for the dictionary even after the institution of the *jetons* policy, his role in the dictionary was eventually largely overtaken by Charpentier, under the influence of Perrault. Mézeray took on the role of *secrétaire-perpétuel* in 1675 (Benhamou et al. 1997: 14), and Charpentier, in his unofficial role as "chef des 'jetonniers'" (Benhamou et al. 1997: 16), came to have a large influence over the dictionary.

According to Furetière, it was the decision of Perrault, under Colbert, to begin the printing of the dictionary in 1678 (Beaulieux 1967: 74-75). This edition of the dictionary, which was still in such a premature state that Mézeray had advised discarding it altogether, would in fact never be made public. 500 copies of this publication, which would come to be known as the "avant-première édition" (Beaulieux 1967:74), were printed. It should be noted that the dictionary was being printed "en première revision" (Beaulieux 1967: 75): "En même temps que l'impression se poursuivait, on continuait la revision, ou plus exactement la rédaction" (Beaulieux 1967: 77). In July of 1678, Perrault, clearly aware of the shortcomings of the dictionary (Beaulieux 1967: 79), called to a vote the question of whether to continue with the printing, or whether to start over completely. It was decided that the impression would continue, but that the Académie would seek to improve it through lists of errata and omissions that would be included with the dictionary (Beaulieux 1967: 79).

Mézeray died on July 10, 1683, and three members of the Académie, including Furetière, were sent to his home to retrieve what had already been printed of the

dictionary.[12] Beaulieux reports that according to Furetière, Mézeray, in a note left after his death, had this to say about the Académie's project:

> Ce qui est imprimé du Dictionnaire est extrêmement défectueux, tout rempli de transpositions, d'obmissions, de repetitions, de fausses phrases, de mots douteux, définitions et descriptions impropres et qui n'expliquent point la nature des choses; il s'y est même glissé en plusieurs endroits des ignorances grossiéres comme tous ceux des Messieurs qui ont de fois à autre jetté les yeux dessus l'ont reconnu; si bien qu'il ne se peut corriger par des cartons ni par des *errata*. Ainsi il me semble qu'il faut le supprimer entiérement et obliger Mr Petit[13] a en rapporter les feuilles qui seront comptées et serrées dans l'armoire (Beaulieux 1967: 78).

The role of *secrétaire-perpétuel* was assumed by Rénier-Desmarais on July 31, 1683 (Beaulieux 1967: 77).

The impression was finally completed in June of 1692 (Beaulieux 1967: 81), however at this point, the Académie decided to take a different course of action.

> Convaincus enfin par les académiciens dignes de ce nom et encore plus sans doute par les interminables listes d'errata et d'addenda qui soulignaient cruellement les erreurs et les insuffisances de ce malheureux dictionnaire, les jetonniers se résignèrent à suivre, bien tardivement, le conseil que feu Mézeray, Racine et Perrault avaient donné dix ans plus tôt: supprimer cette impression et, après une multitude de corrections, la recommencer (Beaulieux 1967: 81).

Initially, the Académie claimed they would allow the current printer of the dictionary, Coignard, to sell the 500 printed copies, but only once a supplement to accompany these copies had been compiled. In fact, the Académie soon decided to completely forbid any sales of this "avant-première édition."

[12] According to Rey (1978: 54), this visit would raise suspicions among certain Académiciens that Furetière had stolen parts of the impression, and plagiarized them in his own dictionary.
[13] "Imprimeur du roi," responsible for the printing of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* until his death in September of 1686 (Beaulieux 1967: 76).

2.2 Emergence of the Dictionnaire françois and the Dictionaire Universel

Over the course of its compilation, there was tension within the Académie surrounding the dictionary. Citing A. Adam, Collinot remarks that this was the result of a clashing between groups with different visions for the project:

> [...] cette fraction d'Académiciens, attelés à la tâche du dictionnaire [de l'Académie], était elle-même divisée en deux partis antagonistes. D'un côté, les Modernes—Charpentier, Perrault, Bensserade, Huet et Quinault—, de l'autre, les Grammairiens—Patru, Mézeray, Furetière [...] Comme le rapporte A. Adam: «Le parti de Charpentier l'emporta. Patru, découragé et furieux, cessa de fréquenter l'Académie, Furetière décida d'écrire un dictionnaire pour son propre compte» (Collinot 1985: 12-13).

Both Furetière and Patru, along with Richelet, among other collaborators, would compile their own dictionaries. The dictionary of the Patru group, known as Richelet's dictionary —as well as Furetière's work, initially—got around the Académie's monopoly on dictionaries by classifying their works as specialized. "En 1674, l'Académie française obtenait le monopole des dictionnaires par privilège royal. Ce ne fut donc qu'au prix de la ruse que [le dictionaire de Richelet] et [le dictionnaire de Furetière] firent leur entrée dans le public, avant [le dictionnaire de l'Académie]" (Collinot 1985: 13). The "ruse" in question involved the purpose of Richelet's and Furetière's compilations according to their title pages, which indicated the areas of specialization that their respective dictionaries would address.

2.2.1 Richelet: Dictionnaire françois (1680)

Patru had been an active participant in the dictionary until 1675, when, frustrated at the inertia of the Académie with regards to the project (Seguin 1999: 248), he decided to participate only informally (Benhamou et al. 1997: 16). In 1677, "Patru avait conçu le

projet d'un dictionnaire et pris comme collaborateurs Cassandre et Richelet, Rapin et Bouhours, quelques autres encore" (Collinot 1985: 12). In fact, this dictionary would come to be known by Richelet's name only, despite the cooperation of several collaborators. The *Dictionnaire françois* was eventually published in Switzerland in 1680:

> Le dictionnaire de RICHELET, auquel PATRU avait beaucoup collaboré, parut à Genève en 1680; saisi et interdit en France dans des circonstances dramatiques,[14] il circula clandestinement à la Cour, dans le public et à l'Académie. Le succès de ses options lexicographiques différentes, particulièrement le classement par ordre alphabétique, l'usage des citations et l'application de la réforme orthographique, inquiétèrent l'Académie sur ses propres choix. Elle accusera sa différence en bannissant encore davantage les modifications et la modernisation de l'orthographe traditionelle (Benhamou et al. 1997: 17).

Interestingly, these "options lexicographiques" mirror to a certain extent the original intentions of the Académie for its dictionary, as outlined by Chapelain, for example, the use in the *Dictionnaire françois* of citations (Rey 1978: 52). Ultimately, this dictionary would be very successful, based on its numerous re-editions (Bray 1990: 1798).

2.2.2 Furetière: Dictionaire Universel (1690)

Like Richelet, Furetière had been keenly involved in the dictionary of the Académie. But as noted by Rey (1978: 42), "Il est [...] vraisemblable que la fréquentation des compilateurs du dictionnaire académique, la constatation de leur relative imcompétence et celle des lacunes de leur ouvrage, aient donné à Furetière l'idée d'un dictionnaire de nature complémentaire, puis tout simplement de valeur supérieure." As it turned out, the compilation of Furetière's dictionary would cause a crisis within the Académie.

[14] Collinot (1985: 13) notes of the *Dictionnaire françois*, "il n'y eut guère de difficultés majeures pour sa publication," but does point out that "1500 exemplaires de la première édition furent saisis et brûlés."

When his intention of creating his own dictionary became known, Furetière sought a *privilège royal* that would allow him to publish his work despite the monopoly of the Académie, maintaining that his dictionary would contain only specialized terms. Charpentier was charged with the task of examining Furetière's work in progress so as to determine whether this was indeed the case. Whether misled by Furetière, or simply not as scrupulous as he might have been, Charpentier determined that the project did not overstep its boundaries, thus allowing for Furetière's *privilège* to go through. The *privilège* was granted in August of 1684 (Benhamou et al. 1997: 18).

As it became more clear to the Académie that Furetière's dictionary was not in fact restricted to specialized terms, they sought to have his *privilège* revoked, which was finally achieved in February of 1685 (Rey 1978: 58). It was at this time that Furetière was also expelled from the Académie.

Furetière tried unsuccessfully to regain the right to publish his dictionary, arguing that though he made use of non-specialized terms in his work, words that were thus the property of the Académie, these terms included "«seulement les mots communs et triviaux que personne n'ignore», ces mots ne figurant chez lui que «pour servir de base, d'introduction et de liaison aux autres»" (Rey 1978: 85).

Finally convinced that he would not succeed in regaining his *privilège*, Furetière responded to the encouragement of another writer, Pierre Bayle,[15] exiled in Holland, who had openly been calling for the publication of the *Dictionaire Universel*. Despite the Académie's attempts to stop its publication, Furetière's dictionary was published in Holland in 1690 with the help of Bayle, who also authored the preface to this work (Rey

[15] A philosopher and professor, Bayle is well known for his controversial *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, published in 1697, which was widely condemned due to its "numerous annotations deliberately designed to destroy orthodox Christian beliefs" (Encyclopædia Britannica, 1979 ed., Micropædia I, p. 892).

1978: 70). Sadly, Furetière did not live to see his dictionary published, as he died two years beforehand, on May 14, 1688 (Rey 1978: 69).

2.3 Publication of the Dictionnaire de l'Académie (1694)

The possibility of a second edition of the *Dictionaire Universel*, the first edition of which had been very well received, added pressure to the Académie to complete their dictionary once and for all. This was finally achieved in the summer of 1694, and the work was presented to Louis XVI on August 24th of that year (Beaulieux 1967: 83).

Overall, the first edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* was not considered a success. Bray (1990: 1799) remarks that it is generally regarded as "un ouvrage difficilement consultable qui est inaccessible au public qu'il vise." Nevertheless, it is valuable today in that it provides insight into the context in which it was published: "le *Dictionnaire* donnait par le menu une représentation unifiante de la société réelle, vue par le groupe qui l'élaborait" (Seguin 1999: 246).

2.4 Conclusion

As we have observed in this chapter, the formation of the Académie française during the 17th century gave rise to a unique situation that would dramatically affect the evolution of French lexicography. More than in the other types of dictionaries studied, the works in this section are dependent on each other, with all three compilations emerging directly or indirectly from the Académie.

The Académie's "monopoly" over the French language threatened the publication of any competing work. Thus, the publication of the *Dictionnaire françois*, and especially

the *Dictionaire Universel*, would be fraught with difficulties, necessitating that both works be published abroad. Despite this fact, both of these dictionaries would appear before that of the Académie. Ironically, the Furetière affair is said to have hindered the Académie (Beaulieux 1967: 77-78), contributing to the list of factors that slowed the progress of its work. Also among these factors were the deaths of Vaugelas and Mézeray, and perhaps most importantly, the attitude of the Académiciens themselves with respect to the dictionary, for example, the jealousy of the *jetonniers*, and the seemingly irreconcilable divergence of opinions within the group. Due to these complications, it would take sixty years from the time of its conception for the dictionary to be published.

Over the course of our study, we will observe how the interdependence among the three prefaces in this category relates to thematic similarities among the works, and how the three groups of prefaces themselves relate to one another.

As with the other types of dictionary studied, we will observe that the historical context in which these works appeared provides insight into some of the choices made within the dictionary, as expressed in the preface, as well as the attitudes about language held by the compilers.

Chapter 3. Cotgrave, Miège and Boyer: the Early Years of French-English Dictionaries

In this section, we will explore the history of the third group of dictionaries considered in our study, that is, bilingual French-English dictionaries published during the 17th century. These works include *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues*, by Randle Cotgrave (1611); three dictionaries by Guy Miège, *A New Dictionary* (1677), *A Dictionary of Barabarous French* (1679), and *The Great French Dictionary* (1688); and *The Royal Dictionary*, by Abel Boyer (1699).[16] We will also provide some background information on what had been achieved in the field of bilingual English-French lexicography prior to the 17th century.

Dictionaries as we know them today evolved from bilingual compilations designed to help speakers of modern languages such as French to understand writing in Latin. Perhaps because of their relative closeness to these first compilations, bilingual French-English dictionaries appeared as early as the 16th century, before monolingual dictionaries of either language. The first of these French-English works was published anonymously in 1571. Though some researchers, including Anderson, have attributed this dictionary to Lucas Harrison or Thomas Chaloner,[17] many credit Claudius Holyband with the work. According to Cormier and Francœur (2002: 243), "Holyband was undoubtedly responsible for the first French-English bilingual dictionary, *A Dictionarie French and English*."[18]

[16] Please refer to the bibliography and appendices at the end of the thesis for the complete titles and title pages of the dictionaries studied.
[17] See Cormier and Francœur (2002).
[18] See Cormier and Francœur (2002) for support of this hypothesis.

Holyband was a Huguenot born in France, but who spent much of his life in England. In addition to his likely authorship of the aforementioned work, Holyband also published *The Treasurie of the French Tong* in 1580, which he later developed into *A Dictionarie French and English*, published in 1593.

As it would turn out, the Huguenot tradition would play a large role in the field of bilingual lexicography. "Of the nine bilingual (French-English) dictionaries published in Europe between 1550 and 1700, seven were produced by French-speaking Protestants who settled in England: Claudius Holyband (?-1597), Guy Miège (1644-c.1718) and Abel Boyer (1667-1729)" (Cormier and Francœur 2002: 240-241).

Holyband's work would serve as inspiration for the first of the five dictionaries studied in this section, that of Randle Cotgrave (Cormier and Francœur 2002: 247).

3.1 Cotgrave: A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues (1611)

As observed by Anderson (1972), very little bibliographical information is available for Randle Cotgrave. This author does report, however, that Cotgrave was admitted to Cambridge University in 1587, and gives a brief discussion of his employment at the time of the compilation of his work.

A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues, "qui compte parmi les dictionnaires les mieux étudiés qui soient" (Hausmann 1990: 2957), was published in 1611 in London. According to Smalley (1948: 32), it went through five editions, the last one being published in 1673.

> The bilingual English-French dictionary saw no equal coverage in range and scope prior to Cotgrave. [...] Lexicographers who succeeded Cotgrave, such as Miège and Boyer, were critical of him, but their criticism was

> minor, as Cotgrave had established for them a solid basis on which they could develop their own compilations (Anderson 1972: 38-39).

It is debatable whether Miège's criticism of Cotgrave may rightly be called "minor;" in fact, Cormier and Francœur (2002: 248) describe it as "severe." It is certainly true, however, that Cotgrave laid the groundwork for subsequent lexicographers. Cotgrave's dictionary was, in fact, quite complete and innovative, as highlighted by Smalley (1948: 20):

> Cotgrave's chief claim to recognition as a lexicographer rests on the fact that although [...] his book was originally planned for the use of students or readers of French classical texts, he copiously enriched its vocabulary with material new to the dictionary of the day. This material included, besides the neologisms of Rabelais and Du Bartas and several other writers whose works had been neglected by previous lexicographers, enough words from technical and popular sources to make up about two-fifths of his entire vocabulary. This is a substantial contribution to the development of dictionary material [...].

It is to be noted that the preface to Cotgrave's work is the only one of the five studied in this category to not have been written by the compiler of the dictionary in question. While Cotgrave was himself the author of the dedication to his work, it was Jean de l'Oiseau de Tourval[19] who authored the preface.

3.2 Miège: A New Dictionary French and English (1677), A Dictionary of Barbarous French (1679), and The Great French Dictionary in two Parts (1688)

Guy Miège was born in Lausanne, Switzerland, in 1644, and immigrated to England in 1661. In his capacity as assistant to the English ambassador to Russia, Sweden and Denmark, Miège traveled a great deal, which would contribute to his geographical and political writings on these countries (Anderson 1972: 40).

[19] According to Smalley (1948: 31), this "friend of Cotgrave" was a translator who some have credited with "making the first translation of an English work into French."

Miège's *A New Dictionary French and English, with another English and French* was published in 1677 in London: "With its synchronic perspective, it reflected the usage of the time and described contemporary literary reality" (Cormier and Francœur 2002: 247). However, the work was not well received, prompting Miège to publish *A Dictionary of Barbarous French* in 1679, which, by Miège's own admission, drew largely from Cotgrave's *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues*. Following this publication, Miège's went on to produce *A Short Dictionary English and French, with another French and English* in 1684, a condensed version of *A New Dictionary*.[20] In 1688, Miège published *The Great French Dictionary*, the third of his dictionaries to be considered in this study. It is noted that Miège "indisputably helped to advance French-English bilingual lexicography in Europe" (Cormier and Francœur 2002: 248). Miège served an important role in the development of this tradition, most especially as the innovator of the bidirectional model in bilingual French-English lexicography, which would become the standard from the end of the 17th century onwards.[21]

3.3 Boyer: The Royal Dictionary in Two Parts (1699)

Abel Boyer was born in Castres, France in 1667. Upon the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, Boyer and his family moved to Amsterdam (Cormier and Francœur 2002: 249). Boyer traveled to England in 1689 and soon began to work as an English tutor. Through one of his employers, Boyer became acquainted with Princess Anne of Denmark, and it is to her son, the Duke of Gloucester, that Boyer's *Royal Dictionary*,

[20] As our study is restricted to the analysis of unabridged works, Miège's *A Short Dictionary* was not included.

[21] The term "bidirectional" refers to bilingual dictionaries divided into two sections: one French to English and the other English to French. Prior to Miège, bilingual lexicographers had produced only unidirectional dictionaries, with a single section from French to English (Anderson 1978).

published in 1699 in London, is dedicated (Cormier and Francœur 2002: 250). As evidenced by its numerous reeditions, Boyer's dictionary gained success beyond that of his predecessors. In fact, remarks Hausmann (1990: 2957), this work would become "l'un des plus grands succès dictionnairiques de tous les temps."

3.4 Conclusion

Each of the three groups of prefaces studied is unique; in the case of the bilingual French-English works, this distinctiveness lies largely in the fact that these dictionaries, unlike their monolingual counterparts, were not the first of their kind. Thus, in addition to providing historical information on the dictionaries studied as well as the compilers themselves, we have given information on the author of the precursor to these works, Claudius Holyband, the first compiler of this type of dictionary, which appeared in the 16th century.

It is interesting to observe that these16th century works, along with all but one of the dictionaries studied in this thesis, were written by French-speaking Protestants.[22] Nor does the similarity among the compilers of the first bilingual French-English dictionaries end there, as Holyband, Miège and Boyer were all language teachers in some capacity. In Chapter 6, we will observe that this common profession links Miège and Boyer in certain instances in regards to the subtopics that they address in their prefaces.

[22] The exception being Cotgrave, "Gentilhomme Anglois," as we are told in the preface to his work.

Conclusion to PART I

In this section, we have seen that the historical context surrounding the publication of monolingual English, monolingual French, and bilingual French-English dictionaries differ significantly from one another, and may give rise to varying approaches adopted by compilers within these categories.

The first monolingual English dictionaries are specialized. These works, written in the 'hard word' tradition, strive to explain "difficult terms," including scholarly language and borrowed words. For their part, the monolingual French dictionaries are the first general monolingual dictionaries of the language. Since these three works all emerged directly or indirectly from the Académie, we note how the publication of each one affected the others. The bilingual French-English dictionaries are the only works studied that were not the first of their kind. In this case, we can see how common backgrounds among these lexicographers, with the exception of Cotgrave, mark this category of dictionaries: Holyband, Miège, and Boyer were all French-speaking Protestants as well as teachers of language.

In Part I, we have also endeavoured to present the individuality of each group of dictionary. For example, despite the fact that all five bilingual dictionaries studied were published in London, four of which by francophone compilers, we note that these lexicographers led quite different lives from either their monolingual English or French counterparts. We can therefore see the emergence of three distinct lexicographic traditions in the 17th century.

PART II. ANALYSIS OF THE PREFACES

In this section, we will examine the prefatory discourse of the monolingual English, monolingual French, and bilingual French-English dictionaries published during the 17th century. We will note the similarities and differences among them, thus observing the extent to which the prefatory material of these works is influenced by the lexicographic milieu from which the dictionary in question emerged. We will see that, despite the unique features of each group of dictionaries studied, there are distinct similarities among them in terms of prefatory discourse.

In each chapter, we will begin by providing an overview of each preface individually, making note of its unique features, such as topics that are dwelled upon, or tone of the text. We will then provide a synopsis of how these prefaces as individual texts relate to each other, for example, how the chronology of their publication may influence which topics are treated with the most consideration.

We will then provide a thematic analysis of each group of prefaces as a whole. Within the general groupings of dictionary content and scope, lexicographic context, and linguistic context, we will observe which subtopics are common to the prefaces in each group, and how these issues are treated.

At the end of this section, we will provide a conclusion outlining how the prefaces of the three groups of dictionaries relate to one another, discussing, for example, which topics and subtopics are treated in each group of preface, and how these compare to what is addressed in the front matter of the other categories of text. In bringing to light themes that are common to the prefatory material of these three groups of dictionaries, we will demonstrate that despite the different lexicographic environments from which they

emerged, the prefaces of these works convey essentially the same type of information, and focus on the same broad, and in some cases, specific, issues.

Chapter 4. Monolingual English Dictionaries

In this chapter, a total of six prefaces will be explored. It should be observed that in the case of Phillips's *The New World of English Words*, there are two texts that will be considered in the thematic analysis later in this chapter. One will be referred to simply as the preface, while we will refer to the other as the "Advertisement to the Reader."[23] These two texts will be considered under one heading, however, in the *Overview* section.

It should equally be observed that the length of the prefaces studied varies significantly, which should be kept in mind when considering the content of the texts. Cawdrey's preface is four pages long, while Bullokar's and Cockeram's are nearly three. The prefaces of Blount and Phillips are substantially longer at approximately nine and eleven pages respectively, with Phillips's "Advertisement to the Reader" counting for an additional two. Coles's work is fairly concise in comparison at approximately four pages.[24]

4.1 Overview of the Prefaces Studied

We will now examine the main features of the prefaces of the monolingual English dictionaries individually.

4.1.1 Cawdrey's preface to A Table Alphabeticall

In the preface to *A Table Alphabeticall*, Cawdrey dwells largely on word choice. In fact, the text consists mainly of a discussion on the benefits of using what we might call "plain

[23] This second text is fully entitled, "A Brief and Familiar Advertisement to the Reader."
[24] Information on the length of the prefaces in this and in following chapters takes into account only the prefaces proper, and does not include the title pages or dedications of the works.

English" as opposed to new or borrowed words. Noting that Cawdrey's target audience consists mainly of "untutored" readers, Peters (1966: xiii) observes that it is "pedagogically" that the author "advises his audience to use the 'plainest & best kind of speech' and to employ primarily 'such words as wee vse.'"

Cawdrey promotes the use of language as a simple tool for communication. He sees the noblest form of language as being that which is most simple and direct. However, he operates on the premise that foreign, or "outlandish,"[25] words can never fulfill this goal. It is true, however, that in some instances, borrowed words communicate concepts more clearly than equivalent words in the mother language. An obvious example is when a foreign word is used to describe a foreign concept (see Blount's "To the Reader" section for further examples).

This is not to say that Cawdrey makes no place for borrowed words in his dictionary. In fact, the "hard usuall words" to which Cawdrey refers are specified on his title page as being those borrowed from other languages. It is true, however, that "Cawdrey […] was opposed to the great influx of 'inkhorn terms'; his chief concern was with 'hard usual words'. Cawdrey's immediate successors stressed the more eccentric and ephemeral words" (Wells 1973: 17).

4.1.2 Bullokar's preface to An English Expositor

The main focus in Bullokar's preface is less obvious than in the case of Cawdrey's—this is perhaps due at least in part to Bullokar's more moderate tone. It is possible to identify,

[25] No page numbers will be given for quotes directly from the prefaces studied, since neither these texts, nor their corresponding dictionaries, are paginated.

however, that the "To the Courteous Reader" section of *An English Expositor* treats two main topics. As with Cawdrey, the first is the issue of word choice.

Bullokar mentions his own experience with borrowed words, "sundry olde words," and specialized terms. Unlike his predecessor, however, Bullokar displays a much more positive attitude about these terms in his preface:

> Like Cawdrey, Bullokar, in 'To the Courteous Reader,' seems to show familiarity with the traditional discussion of the English vocabulary. Bullokar, however, seems more sympathetic than Cawdrey to the custom English writers have of usurping 'strange words' from foreign languages; and Bullokar emphasizes more than his predecessor the necessity of giving special attention to hard words of foreign origin and to 'olde words growne out of use' (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 21).

Curiously, the second topic that is largely treated in Bullokar's *To the Courteous Reader* is that of potential criticism of his dictionary, to which a large portion of the preface is devoted. Though the author welcomes comments from the "judiciall or courteous Reader," addressee of the preface, about any oversights in the dictionary, he discourages any "over curious Criticke" from being unnecessarily judgmental.

4.1.3 Cockeram's preface to The English Dictionarie

While the preface to *The English Dictionarie* opens with a comment on the author's predecessors,[26] Cockeram is chiefly concerned in this text with the organization of his work, though this focus betrays the author's broader preoccupation with word choice.

According to his "Premonition from the Author to the Reader," Cockeram's goal is to help his readers toward a more refined use of English. Like Cawdrey and Bullokar,

[26] Cockeram notes that while he is aware of the value of their work, he is confident he has improved upon what has already been done. This is especially interesting based on the author's significant copying from *The English Expositor* (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 29-31).

Cockeram's preface is largely focused on vocabulary and, as in the case of Cawdrey, what the author views to be the proper use of language. Unlike Cawdrey, however, Cockeram appears to glorify "elegant" over plain speech, though not at the expense of being understood.

> Though mention is made on Cawdrey's title page of 'the true writing', i.e. the spelling of ["hard usuall English wordes"], their real reason for being was to give the meaning of the 'hard words'. This was always the primary purpose of these books, but as early as 1623 a second aim, characteristic of its time and of the attitude toward English style, appeared. This is found in a book by Henry Cockeram which was divided into three parts, the first explaining the hard words, the second giving the elegant equivalents of 'vulgar' words, and the third devoted to mythology. The purpose of the second part was to enable anyone who used it to transmute plain, simple writing into stately and ornate language (Hulbert 1968: 18-19).

4.1.4 Blount's preface to the Glossographia

The most striking feature of Blount's preface to his *Glossographia* is its contemplative look at language in general. The text opens with Blount explaining his personal motivation for compiling a dictionary, that is, his perplexity in reading when faced with certain borrowed words. He illustrates this point through numerous examples, and then goes on to provide, in great detail, the specific disciplines for which specialized words have been given in his dictionary.

Blount's discussion of language continues as he notes the two objections that he encountered in the compilation of his work. The first was that, due to the changeable nature of language, his task would be never-ending. To this he responds by simply acknowledging this fact as being an essential part of language that in no way marginalizes the necessity for a dictionary: "Blount, more than his predecessors, if we

can judge from his 'To the Reader,' seems to have thought of language as a living, growing organism changing from year to year" (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 45).

The author also addresses the argument that foreign words should not be included in a dictionary by alluding not only to their usefulness, but also to their popularity among "our best modern Authors."

Blount's reply to these objections illustrates his favourable attitude toward new and borrowed words. His response to the first objection illustrates his openness to language change in general, and his response to the second illustrates his appreciation for borrowed words. Though Jones (1953: 275) ascribes to Blount a "dislike of loan words," this attitude is not evident in the preface of the *Glossographia*. In fact this text makes no overtly negative judgment of the process of borrowing, and in this way takes a descriptive approach that is certainly more innovative than conservative. Starnes and Noyes (1991: 46) remark, "In his address, Blount seems to have been cognizant of the traditional discussion of the English vocabulary and aligns himself with the liberal-minded who approve new words."

They also note Blount's contribution to the practice of introducing new or borrowed words, however, "It is a question how much credit should be given Blount for the practice of introducing new words. He introduced a great many, not always with discrimination. His stout defense of his practice, in the address to the reader, may well be an attempt to justify a *fait accompli* inadvertently through his wide borrowing. Whatever the motive is, the defense is worthy of note" (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 45).

The prefatory material of the *Glossographia* closes with a verse written by "J.S." and dedicated to Blount, which also consists of a general discussion of the English language, including history, and the practice of borrowing.

4.1.5 Phillips's preface to The New World of English Words

Perhaps even more than that of Blount, Phillips's preface centres on a discussion of language in general. Phillips gives as a reason for this, "I thought it in vain to publish to the world a Dictionary of hard Terms, if I did not withall lead men the way to the right use of it."

In the text, Phillips treats such questions as whether a distinction should be made between a language and a speech, and at what point a language should cease to be qualified as a dialect of its "Mother Tongue."

A significant portion of Phillips's preface is devoted to the history of English, with the author going as far back as Babel in his discussion of this topic. Phillips also addresses the etymology of English, showing in great detail how it has originated from other languages. There is also a discussion of the Greek and Latin languages specifically, from the point of view of etymology.

Phillips also alludes to his predecessors, and relates their work to his own choices in *The New World*. In fact, this discussion of predecessors is one of the main features of Phillips's "Advertisement to the Reader," the last of the prefatory texts in his dictionary. In the "Advertisement," Phillips does make mention of word choice, and touches on the issue of the necessity for dictionaries, however the most striking element of the text is his reference to his predecessor Blount. He criticizes Blount's preface, as well as his practice

of including quotes in his dictionary. Phillips further claims to have accomplished what his predecessor could not, that is, compiling a comprehensive "Encyclopedy." This caused considerable animosity between Phillips and Blount, the latter of whom wrote a work entitled *A World of Errors*, in which he accuses Phillips of significant plagiarism of the *Glossographia*. It would appear that Blount's accusations were founded: Starnes and Noyes (1991: 56) observe that Phillips, "even more than his predecessors, was dependent upon the work of other compilers. He took freely and without acknowledgment whatever he deemed suited to his purpose."

4.1.6 Coles's preface to An English Dictionary

In the preface to Coles's *An English Dictionary*, the author discusses the choices for his own dictionary, but these are often related to the choices of his predecessors. In fact, a lengthy criticism of the work of his predecessors takes up most of this text. Coles gives examples of wrong definitions, especially those found in Phillips's dictionary.[27] He goes on to note the considerable increase in the number of entries provided in his work over that in either the *Glossographia*, or *The New World*.

Coles's criticism of his predecessors gained some notoriety, as evidenced by the following statement: "Coles is [...] remembered in connexion with a preface he wrote for a dictionary of hard words which he produced in 1676. In this preface he made some sharp criticisms of his predecessors in the field of lexicography, and cited [dictionary entries] to show the ignorance displayed in some dictionaries" (Mathews 1966: 25).

[27] Though it is noted in Starnes and Noyes (1991: 58-59) that Coles was largely dependent on the work of Phillips, both in terms of his "phrasing" and his definitions.

4.1.7 Synopsis

It is not surprising that in these latter two prefaces, there is more of a focus on predecessors than in the earlier texts studied. After all, the first compilers studied in this category had very few, if any,[28] direct predecessors as such. This is not to say that they did not draw from the work of the bilingual compilers who came before them. Phillips was by no means the only author to make use of the work of others without acknowledgment: "there is ample evidence that scores of definitions were borrowed from Latin-English dictionaries by the earliest English lexicographers, Cawdrey, Bullokar, Cockeram. Blount and others" (Wells 1973: 16). Cawdrey, in fact, may be said to have initiated the practice of copying without acknowledgment: "Cawdrey himself set the pattern by adopting much of his material from Coote's *The Englishe Scholemaister* and from Thomas Thomas's *Dictionarium Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae* (?1588). Later lexicographers followed suit" (Burchfield 1985: 82).

This practice of copying may partly account for the similarities between the prefaces of Blount and Phillips in terms of their reflection on language. As mentioned above, Phillips was largely dependent on Blount's *Glossographia*. Though he criticizes elements of his predecessor's preface, it is possible that Phillips took some inspiration from this text as well.

The first three lexicographers studied in this category share the important characteristic of a significant focus on word choice in their prefaces, though the specifics of the words they favour, and how ready they are to prescribe proper usage, may differ among them. As with the prefaces that dwell on their predecessors, this may have to do

[28] While Bullokar and Cockeram would have had one and two direct predecessors respectively, Cawdrey would have had none.

with the chronology of their publication. As the authors of the first monolingual dictionaries, they may have felt more bound to justify their choices, both of methodology and nomenclature.

4.2 Main Topics Treated in the Prefaces

Having examined the individual features of each preface, we now turn our attention toward the three broad issues of dictionary content and scope, lexicographic context, and linguistic context, looking at subtopics within each of these. We will also observe how common themes may be treated differently among the prefaces.

4.2.1 Dictionary Content and Scope

In the prefaces of the monolingual English dictionaries studied, reflections on the content of the respective compilation typically centre on a discussion of target audience, or of what may be called the purpose of the dictionary.

4.2.1.1 Target Audience

Though the authors of the first monolingual English dictionaries do not dwell on the identity of their intended readers—the issue of target audience is mentioned in a cursory manner, often on the title page or in the epistle of the dictionary—this topic is mentioned in all of the prefaces studied in this category, with the exception of that of Coles.

The nature of the target audience is fairly consistent among the prefaces. The focus on women is of particular note. Cawdrey, Bullokar, and Cockeram make mention of “Ladies” and “Gentlewomen” as potentially benefiting from their dictionaries, Cawdrey

and Cockeram on the title page and Bullokar in the dedication.[29] Cockeram adds to this group "young Schollers, Clerkes, Merchants; as also strangers of any Nation," and Cawdrey expands his target audience to include "any other unskilfull persons."

Blount and Phillips target a more general audience; on the title page of the *Glossographia*, the intended readership is identified simply as "all such as desire to understand what they read." This group is further specified in the "To the Reader" section: "It is chiefly intended for the more-knowing Women, and less-knowing Men; or indeed for all such of the unlearned, who can but finde in an Alphabet, the word they understand not." In other words, Blount's *Glossographia* is intended for the everyman, though he does put a certain emphasis on women, and also expresses that "the best of Schollers may in some part or other be obliged by it."

Phillips makes only a perfunctory mention of his target audience. He provides a highly general portrait of his intended readers, stating on his title page that his work is "very necessary for Strangers, as well as our own Countrymen, for all Persons that would rightly understand what they discourse, write, or read."

Based on statements from the prefatory material of the first monolingual English dictionaries, Hayashi (1978: 41) proposes that the intended audience of these dictionaries can be classed into three groups: "(1) untutored Ladies and gentlewomen; (2) untutored clerks, merchants and other craftsmen and tradesmen, and (3) untutored strangers and travellers of other nationalities than English."

[29] Burchfield (1985: 18) notes, "as little effort was made to educate women in Latin and even French, they were not so well equipped for comprehending the borrowed 'hard words' as were men who had had grammar (i.e. Latin) school and university training and who therefore could supply the meaning of the Latin word in the passage in which the borrowed expression appeared."

4.2.1.2 Purpose of the Dictionary

This desire to cater to an untrained target audience relates to the focus of these dictionaries on 'hard words,' and to what may be called their purpose. All of the prefaces studied indicate that this purpose involves aiding the reader in understanding difficult words, which suggests the highly practical nature of monolingual English dictionaries during the 17th century.[30]

Though all the prefaces studied suggest a common overriding purpose, there is some variation of the specifics of this goal. In his dedication, Bullokar mentions the hope that his dictionary will serve as a source of "entertainment." Cockeram's goal is to help his target audience toward a "more speedie attaining of an elegant perfection of the English tongue, both in reading, speaking, and writing," as well as an "understanding of the more difficult Authors." Cawdrey's focus is on everyday language—he seeks to enlighten his readers on words that may be encountered in "Scriptures, Sermons, or elsewhere." On his title page, Cawdrey claims to provide "the true writing, and understanding of hard usuall English wordes, borrowed from the Hebrew, Greeke, Latine, or French. &c." Thus, the purpose of his dictionary as outlined on the title page relates specifically to borrowed words. This focus is reiterated in the dedication of *A Table Alphabeticall*. Similarly, Phillips promises on his cover page, preceding the title page, the "Terms, Etimologies, Definitions of hard words, as they are derived from other Languages," and the purpose of Blount's *Glossographia* is to help interpret "all such Hard Words, Whether Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, French, Teutonick, Belgick, British or Saxon; as are now used in our refined English Tongue." The purpose of Coles's dictionary is also related to borrowed words. The title page of *An English Dictionary* promises to provide the

[30] See Chapter 1 for the history of the 'hard word' tradition.

etymology of words borrowed from "Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, or any other Language." Coles further alludes to this purpose in his "To the Reader" section: "we bring home fashions, terms and phrases from every Nation and Language under Heaven. Thus we should fill one another with Confusion and Barbarity, were it not for some such faithful Interpreter as is here presented."

An extension of the purpose of the dictionary as outlined by Coles is to provide terms related to the specific disciplines of "Divinity, Husbandry, Physick, Phylosophy, Law, Navigation, Mathematicks, and other Arts and Sciences."

Like Coles, Blount makes reference on his title page to technical as well as borrowed terms. He makes specific mention of the disciplines of "Divinity, Law, Physick, Mathematicks, Heraldry, Anatomy, War, Musick, Architecture; and of several other Arts and Sciences." Blount's focus on borrowed words and "terms of art"[31] is likely a result of his own experience with language. The first paragraphs of the "To the Reader" section outline his personal motivation for writing the *Glossographia*, that is, his confusion when faced with borrowed terms, especially those proper to specific occupations.

Phillips also emphasizes specialized terms. On his title page, he claims that *The New World* contains:

> All those terms that relate to the Arts and Sciences; whether Theologie, Philosophy, Logick, Rhetorick, Grammer, Ethicks, Law, Natural History, Magick, Physick, Chirurgery, Anatomy, Chimistry, Botanicks, Mathematicks, Arithmetick, Geometry, Astronomy, Astrology, Chiromancy, Physiognomy, Navigation, Fortification, Dialling, Surveying, Musick, Perspective, Architecture, Heraldry, Curiosities, Mechanicks, Staticks, Merchandize, Jewelling, Painting, Graving, Husbandry, Horsemanship, Hawking, Hunting, Fishing, &c.

[31] Jones (1953: 273) notes: "technical expressions peculiar to learning, science, trades, or arts" were referred to as "terms of art" by the Elizabethans.

Interestingly, in addition to the purpose of his dictionary, Phillips outlines a main purpose of his preface: “my intention is, as an Introduction to the particular scope and design of this Book, to speak something in general of the Original of our English Tongue.” He then proceeds to give an overview of the history of the English language (see below).

4.2.2 Lexicographic Context

Many of the texts studied make some mention of what was happening in lexicography at the time of publication of their respective works. In the monolingual English prefaces, this is illustrated through discussion of predecessors.

4.2.2.1 Predecessors

The issue of predecessors is another feature addressed in many, though not all, of the prefaces.

Being the first to publish monolingual dictionaries of English, it is not surprising that neither Cawdrey nor Bullokar make mention of their predecessors, who would have been the authors of bilingual dictionaries.

Cockeram is the first of the lexicographers studied to acknowledge his predecessors in his preface, though not by name. His attitude toward them seems initially to be one of reverence, as he recognizes their “praise-worthy labours.” On the other hand, he claims to have “not only fully finished, but throughly perfected” what others have begun. Though we are studying the 1637 edition of the work, it is interesting to note that there were in fact two issues of the first edition of *The English Dictionarie*, with different printers. One of these made reference on the title page to both Cawdrey’s *A Table Alphabeticall* and

Bullokar's *An English Expositor*, however by the time of the second edition, this mention had been omitted (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 26-27).

Phillips's mention of his predecessors is also two-fold: he acknowledges that the earlier dictionaries were compiled "not without some diligence," but also claims to have improved on these, adding sections that "others have omitted in all their former undertakings," including a poetical and a geographical dictionary. Phillips makes a direct criticism of one of his predecessors in particular. He alludes to the statement in the preface of an earlier work that a proper English dictionary would require "an Encyclopedie of knowledge, and the concurrence of many Learned heads," the essence of which Phillips claims to have captured. He attributes this quote to "H.B.," however, it can in fact be found in Thomas Blount's preface. Phillips also criticizes the "To the Reader" section of "one of our late Writers"—again referring to Blount, whom he accuses of "wasting so much of his Readers time and patience."

Ironically, it appears that Phillips made use of much of Blount's material, suggesting that his criticism of the latter may not be genuine: "[…] for his title, much of his 'Advertisement to the Reader,' and for hundreds of his definitions, Phillips is directly dependent on Blount. Apparently attempting to conceal his indebtedness, Phillips, in his 'Advertisement,' seeks to disparage and discredit the work of Blount" (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 50).

For his part, Blount provides frank, if not exhaustive, acknowledgment of his predecessors. Osselton (1990: 1949) writes, "Though plagiarism was clearly the norm, and there are even some contemporary accusations of it [...] there are also early instances of honest acknowledgement: Blount lists Cotgrave, Dasypodius and Hexham among ten

source-books, and says disarmingly 'I profess to have done little with my own Pencil.'" Starnes and Noyes (1991: 47) recognize Blount as being the first English compiler to credit the sources of which he made use. They also note, however, that the majority of the author's copying came from un-cited sources,[32] and suggest that, as with Phillips, Blount's list of acknowledgment was "a means of concealing his chief obligations" (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 39).

In his preface, Coles is fairly critical of his predecessors. This criticism appears as early as the title page—the subtitle of Coles's dictionary establishes a direct comparison between his predecessors and himself: "Containing Many Thousands of Hard Words (and proper names of Places) more than are in any other English Dictionary or Expositor." At the beginning of his "To the Reader" section, Coles claims to be aware of "what's already done," and judges the dictionaries of his predecessors to be lacking: "I know their difference and their Defects. Some are too little, some are too big; some are too plain (stufft with obscenity not to be named) and some so obscure, that (instead of expounding others) they have need themselves of an Expositor." In fact about one third of Coles's address to the reader consists of a description of the shortcomings of his predecessors, on the level of what he deems to be poor organization, or erroneous senses.

The prefaces studied suggest that there was a significant degree of unacknowledged copying among the compilers of 17th century English dictionaries. It is, however, important to observe that the degree of such plagiarism varies among the authors. While some make no mention of predecessors, others acknowledge a general debt; still others provide names of sources, though not exhaustively.

[32] More specifically, the work of bilingual lexicographers Thomas Thomas and Francis Holyoke (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 40).

4.2.3 Linguistic Context

In this category of prefaces, there is much discussion on language itself. Three of the prefaces studied include reflections on the history of English, while an expression of the authors' views on new or borrowed words, as well as a tendency toward either a prescriptive or descriptive attitude, may be observed in each of the texts studied.

4.2.3.1 History of English

Three authors in this category addresses the issue of the history of English in their prefaces, and in these three cases, the subject is approached in different ways.

Phillips appears to draw upon the history of English in some part as support for his opinions. He notes that some make a distinction between a *language* and a *speech*, where a *language* may "degenerate" into a *speech* over time. Phillips does not see this distinction as useful, and expresses his position by showing that there is no language that is completely uncorrupted by another, a fact that confirms any *language* as a *speech*. He illustrates this point with information about the history of Latin, and touches on the very origin of language itself by stating, "to find out the original and most unchanged Languages, we must have recourse as far backward as the confusion of Babel, which was the first nativity of Tongues; and so make a vain search for things which perhaps are no where now extant." Phillips also mentions his intention of discussing "the basis or foundation of [the English language], of the reason of its several changes, and how far it participates of other Languages, and of the peculiar Idiome or property thereof." Here we can see the emphasis placed on the relation of English to other languages. This quote

suggests the link that exists between the author's focus on the history of English and his position on borrowed words.

The relation between the inclusion of a history of English and a discussion of the etymological basis of English is perfectly exploited by Phillips's preface. His discussion of the various conquests that affected the English language flows seamlessly into a list of examples illustrating that "almost all the chief material words, and those which are oftenest used in the most familiar, and vulgar discourse, are all, either meer Dutch, or palpably derived from the Dutch."

Similarly, Blount's position on foreign words is suggested by the inclusion of a history of English in the prefatory texts of his *Glossographia*, though in a different way from that of Phillips. The history of English is presented in a text written by "J.S" as a sort of dedication to Blount, and consists of a rhyming verse presenting an overview of English, including its history as well as examples of its diverse origins. One guesses by its form that the aim of this text is esthetic rather than informative. In this way, the history of the English language plays a different role than in Phillips's text. It does, however, infer Blount's position on the use of foreign or borrowed words. This section includes such phrases as:

> […] as with Merchandize, with terms it fares,
> Nations do traffick Words, as well as Wares,
> Bon-jour usurps upon our plain Good-morrow,
> 'Tis Neighborhood's best praise to lend and borrow.

The above quote casts a favourable light upon the practice of borrowing words. Though this section is not signed by Blount himself, it is surely written in accordance with his views.

The history of English is mentioned only in passing in Coles's preface. He states briefly that changes to the English language are "owing to the Conquests, especially of Sax and Normandy." Coles does not dwell on this point, but does draw on it to show the importance of a foreign influence on English, especially from France.

Though the history of English is treated in only three of the prefaces studied, this subject does, in these instances, play a fairly substantial role. The approach taken with respect to the history of English gives insight into the authors' basic ideas of what is essential to the study of language—and in the cases of Phillips and Blount, into their views on certain groups of words.

4.2.3.2 New and Borrowed Words—Conservatives vs. Innovators

The prefaces of the dictionaries studied shed light on the authors' opinions on certain language, specifically new or borrowed words. In some cases, the author's prescriptive approach betrays his personal language preference; in others, language is discussed in a purely descriptive manner, with the author's preference being communicated only implicitly. Often times, a prescriptive approach among the prefaces studied goes hand in hand with a conservative, as opposed to an innovative, attitude about language on the part of the author.

In the "To the Reader" section of *A Table Alphabeticall*, Cawdrey adopts a highly conservative approach, making a negative judgment of new or borrowed words. He criticizes the use of "outlandish English," and suggests that in a public situation, speakers should "never affect any ynckhorne termes, but labour to speake so as is commonly received, and so as the most ignorant may well understand them." Cawdrey further

illustrates this point both through scorn ("Doth any wise man think, that wit resteth in strange words […]?"), and sarcasm ("Do we not speak, because we would have other to understand us? or is not the tongue given for this end, that one might know what another meaneth?"). He suggests that a distinction should be made between the types of English used: "some is learned English, & othersome is rude English, or the one is Court talke, the other is Country-speech." Otherwise, Cawdrey proposes, all "Rhetorique" must be "banished" to avoid confusion.

Further illustrating Cawdrey's prescriptive approach is the presence in his preface of four criteria for the proper use of language. The content of these rules displays the author's conservative attitude:

i. Words should be "proper unto the tongue wherein we speake."

   Presumably, Cawdrey means to say that borrowed words should not be used.

ii. The language used should be "plaine for all men to perceive."

iii. Words should also "be apt and meete, most properly to set out the matter."

   Cawdrey advises the reader to choose the simplest words. He clarifies at the end of this list that "apt words" are those "that properly agree unto the thing, which they signifie, and plainly expresse the nature of the same."

iv. Translated words should "be used to beautifie the sentence, as precious stones are set in a ring, to comend the gold."

> Here, Cawdrey may be conceding that there is a place for borrowed words in language, but only inasmuch as they enhance the mother tongue.

It is possible that the prescriptive nature of Cawdrey's preface is due at least in part to the fact that his is the first monolingual English dictionary—his strict approach may suggest an attempt to gain credibility for his work. Perhaps by providing distinct rules for language use, Cawdrey is seeking to assert the practical value of his dictionary as a useful document.

In his preface, Bullokar is not overly forthcoming with his opinion on borrowed words, but the few instances where he acknowledges their usefulness suggest that he is fairly well disposed to the process of borrowing. Bullokar mentions the "great store of strange words, our speech doth borrow, not only from Latine, and Greeke, (and some from the ancient Hebrew) but also from forraine vulgar Languages round about us." This quote refers to the word choice in *An English Expositor*, which Bullokar justifies by acknowledging the benefits of, and in fact the necessity for, new or borrowed words: "it is familiar among best writers to usurpe strange words, (and sometimes necessary by reason our speech is not sufficiently furnished with apt terms to expresse all meanings)."

Bullokar's apparent acceptance of the process of borrowing marks a difference between the preface of his dictionary and that of Cawdrey's *A Table Alphabeticall*. Bullokar makes no suggestion in his preface as to the proper use of language. He neither criticizes, nor directly recommends any particular category of words. In this way, his text exhibits a purely descriptive attitude toward language.

Cockeram makes no specific reference to new or borrowed terms in his preface, however a certain attitude toward language can be observed. The author takes a fairly prescriptive approach in the section entitled “A Premonition to the Reader.” Within the category of “Vulgar words,” Cockeram includes “mock-words,” which according to him, “are ridiculously used in our Language,” and “fustian terms,” “used by too many who study rather to be heard speake, than to understand themselves.” These value judgments highlight Cockeram’s narrow views on language. His prescriptive attitude is further illustrated by references both in his dedication and his address to the reader to the “choisest” language, by which, he claims, English is “inriched.”

In the preface to his *Glossographia*, Blount makes no overtly negative judgment of the process of borrowing, and in this way takes a descriptive, as well as an implicitly innovative, approach. It is to be noted, however, that Blount’s liberal attitude on borrowing is not initially clear from his address to the reader, which includes a quote by Seneca criticizing the over-use of new words. This would seem to indicate that Blount holds this same view, however his subsequent statements suggest otherwise. For example, Blount observes, “Common Tongues, like leaves, must of necessity have their buddings, their blossomings, their ripenings and their fallings.” This quote illustrates Blount’s acknowledgment of the natural evolution of language.

Blount addresses the objection that the use of foreign words is to be discouraged, on the basis that such use glorifies novelty over meaning. He claims that this argument is “confuted by our best modern Authors, who have both infinitely enriched and enobled our Language, by admitting and naturalizing thousands of foraign Words.” This can be seen as a refutation of any criticism of borrowed words. Blount’s inclusion of *Galen’s*

Axiom, "Who ever is ignorant of words shall never judge well of things," further illustrates his opinion that awareness of all language, including new or borrowed terms, is to be encouraged.

In his address, Blount clarifies that it is not his intention "to become an Advocate for the use of [foreign] Words." This suggests that despite his seemingly favourable attitude toward the process of borrowing, his aim in the dictionary with respect to new or borrowed words is descriptive. Blount points out that it is up to each individual to choose whether or not to use new or borrowed language, but asserts that, "certainly, at least to understand [foreign words], can be no unnecessary burden to the Intellect." In other words, if Blount's approach is prescriptive in any way, it is only in the measure of encouraging his readers to increase their knowledge of all language.

Neither Phillips nor Coles takes a firm stance on the issue of new or borrowed words. The difference between the two authors is that Phillips's position seems to shift throughout the introductory texts of *The New World of English Words*, while Coles avoids taking a definite position at any point in his preface.

In the first of his three dedications, Phillips takes a fairly critical view of language. He remarks that the contributors of his dictionary wished "to preserve [English] from the barbarismes and ruinous deformities of the times." Presumably this quote refers to new or borrowed words, yet Phillips also mentions that he has "stript away those obsolete termes that have defaced our language," suggesting that he is no more in favour of old words than new. Taken together, these two statements suggest that Phillips has a very narrow range of tolerance for language.

Phillips's attitude appears decidedly more accepting in the preface to his *The New World*. He takes a much more favourable approach toward old as well as newer words. Phillips claims, "all those ancient Authours that have written the best things, have left them to posterity in the purest and most genuine Language," thus glorifying old words. He also acknowledges the talent of contemporary authors, and remarks that they have "refin'd" English to the point of rendering it one of the most "fluent" and "elegant" languages of Europe. These statements contradict the narrow range of acceptability for language suggested by the dedications in *The New World*—whereas Phillips condemns "obsolete termes," as well as modern "deformities" in the first of his dedications, he praises both old and newer words in the preface. Phillips's statement that it is "an equal vice to adhere obstinately to old words, as fondly to affect new ones" may suggest, however, a slight preference for the latter group.

In his preface, Phillips also expresses a generally positive attitude toward the practice of borrowing itself. He acknowledges that borrowed words, "especially coming from the more southerly and civil Climates," can contribute to the "sweetening and smoothing of those harsh and rough accents which are peculiar to most northerly Countries." He moderates this apparent favour toward the practice of borrowing later in the preface by stating, "Whether this innovation of [foreign] words deprave, or inrich our English tongue is a consideration that admits of various censures, according to the different fancies of men." This neutral statement is representative of a descriptive approach. Despite Phillips's seeming approval of borrowed words, he does not try to actively encourage their use, pointing out that the value of these words is a matter of personal preference.

In his "Advertisement to the Reader," Phillips makes reference to a *Maxim from the Learned*: "That he that is ignorant of words, shall never have his minde rightly instated to judge of things." The inclusion of this maxim, which appears to be a variation of *Galen's axiom,* found in Blount's address to the reader, further indicates a certain descriptive attitude toward language on the part of Phillips.[33] This statement also suggests that like Blount, Phillips is amenable to the practice of innovation over conservatism.

Phillips's preface is not purely descriptive, however. For example, he expresses the opinion that some distinction should be made in dictionaries between words that ought or ought not to be used, otherwise, he claims, the reader may be inclined to "suck in barbarisme as soon as Elegance." Phillips notes that there are some words in *The New World* that he himself "would not recommend to any for the purity, or reputation of them." Thus, in a truly prescriptive act, he chooses to mark these with an "Obelisck" to warn the reader against their use.

Overall, the main characteristic of the introductory texts of *The New World* is their variability, with Phillips's position on various groups of words shifting between critical and favourable. This may suggest that his statements are not reflective of his personal point of view, but are rather an attempt at pleasing readers of various opinions. It has been observed that Phillips was inclined to draw freely from the work of his predecessors (Starnes and Noyes 1991: 56); this suggests a preoccupation with the success of *The New World*, which may also have influenced the contents of Phillips's preface.

Rather than switching from one approach to the other, Coles simply refrains from displaying either an overtly positive or negative position on new or borrowed words.

[33] The fact that this *Maxim* can be found in Blount's preface also suggests Phillips's dependence on the work of his predecessor.

Though it can be inferred that Coles's preference lies with older rather than modern terms, his stance on this issue is more implied than stated in his address to the reader.

Coles begins his preface by suggesting that the nature of peoples of different geographical locations is closely linked to features of their speech, for example, "The Spanish and the Spaniard both are Grave." With regard to English, he claims that the language is "moderate," and that any "excess […] must be attributed to the accession of something Foreign." It may be that he is merely alluding to the fact that initially, English absorbed a great deal from foreign languages, however this statement would seem to imply a value judgment of English as compared to other languages. Supporting this point of view is Coles's allusion to the "Confusion and Barbarity" caused by foreign alterations to English. Though not explicitly, these comments tend to glorify an unaltered form of English. Though Coles does not directly advise the reader to use or avoid certain language, his opinion regarding the use of borrowed words may be inferred to be negative.

At the end of his address, Coles invites those readers who prefer "expressions that are more polite [than 'Old Words' or 'other vulgar terms']" to compile their own vocabulary. In this way, the address to the reader ends on a fairly descriptive note, with Coles acknowledging that there is room for personal preference in language, and that the readers of his dictionary must make their own choices about which terms to use or avoid.

Though the prefaces studied differ in terms of their levels of prescriptivism, as well as conservatism, it is interesting to note that all of the authors studied are to some degree working on a descriptive level. By creating a monolingual English dictionary, they are of

necessity describing words of foreign origin, whether or not they condone such borrowing.

4.3 Conclusion

We began this chapter by giving an overview of each of the prefaces in this category. This brought to light the distinctive features of each of these texts, for example, Cawdrey's insistence on plain language, Bullokar's more moderate tone, Cockeram's preoccupation with elegance in speaking and writing, Blount's consideration of borrowed words, Phillips's detailed history of English, and Coles's focus on the choices of his predecessors to justify his own. We also observed, however, similarities among the texts even when examined in an individual light, such as a preoccupation with word choice in the prefaces of Cawdrey, Bullokar, and Cockeram; contemplation on language in the works of Blount and Phillips; and a focus on predecessors in the texts of Phillips and Coles. We then went on to analyze the prefaces within this group as a whole, from a thematic point of view.

As a whole, the prefaces of the first monolingual English dictionaries share common themes, such as target audience and purpose of the dictionary within the broader issue of dictionary content and scope; discussion of predecessors within the topic of lexicographic context; and a focus on the history of English and the debate over new or borrowed words within the topic of linguistic context. In some cases, however, there is opposition among them as to how they treat these subjects. For example, the authors appear to be divided on the question of innovation vs. conservatism, with Cawdrey at one extreme, and Blount at

the other. Furthermore, the lexicographers express their preference for certain language in different ways, adopting either a prescriptive or descriptive method.

Overall, these texts share the common characteristic of being very personal in nature. Thus the prefaces reveal much about the lexicographers themselves, most especially highlighting their beliefs on language. For example, while all the lexicographers of necessity deal with borrowed words to some degree in their dictionaries, their personal opinions on the use of these words vary.

Despite certain differing viewpoints, it appears that each of the lexicographers studied recognizes the importance of his task, and strives to provide his readers with what he considers to be the best possible language guidance.

Chapter 5. Monolingual French Dictionaries

In this chapter, we will examine the prefaces of the first three dictionaries of the French language, that is, Richelet's *Dictionnaire françois*, Furetière's *Dictionaire Universel*, and the Académie's *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*.

It is interesting to observe that, unlike the prefaces of the monolingual English dictionaries studied, the type of authorship of the prefaces studied in this section varies.[34] Though this may account for some differences among the texts studied, we will see that there are definite thematic similarities among them.

It should also be noted that, as in the previous chapter, the length of preface varies among the texts studied. Richelet's preface is just over three pages long, and the prefaces to the *Dictionaire Universel* and the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* are eleven and nine pages respectively.

5.1 Overview of the Prefaces Studied

In the present section, we will explore the distinctive features of each of the three prefaces within the category of monolingual French dictionaries.

5.1.1 Charpentier's preface to Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie[35]

The overriding feature of the preface of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* is its focus on methodology, including an explanation as well as a justification of the choices made in

[34] See Chapter 2 for more on this topic.

[35] In this chapter, the overviews of the prefaces are not presented according to the chronology of publication of the three dictionaries. The reason is that Richelet's preface, presented last, finds itself "between" the other two prefaces in several dimensions, thus, the prefaces are introduced in reverse chronological order for ease of discussion.

the work.[36] This is not surprising in view of the high expectations that the Académie, as well as the greater public, had for the project—expectations that, as it would turn out, would not be met. The fact that there is no direct mention of the Académie's predecessors in the preface may be due to the fact that, in title at least, these latter works were specialized, and thus of a different nature. It is likely, however, that in addition, the awkwardness surrounding the Furetière affair was not a subject that the Académie wished to bring to light in its preface.

Chrétien et al. (2001: 86-87) identify two main goals of the preface to the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*: one is the presentation of the content of the dictionary, and the other, praise of Richelieu as well as "l'ordre établi." In addition to these two main functions, "La préface de 1694 révèle aussi les préoccupations linguistiques et lexicographiques des auteurs du *Dictionnaire*. En effet, une importante part y est consacrée (présentation, nomenclature, orthographe, etc.)" (Chrétien et al. 2001: 87).

The Académie's preface also demonstrates a relatively prescriptive attitude as compared to the other works, which fits in with the original goals not only of the dictionary but the Académie itself.[37] In keeping with these intentions, "c'est l'Académie qui a fourni à la conscience française l'idée du *Dictionnaire* détenteur de vérité" (Seguin 1999: 244). As remarked by Chrétien et al. (2001: 87), the preface of the Académie is also highly conservative in what it prescribes: "La Compagnie voit son conservatisme confirmé dans la préface, ce qui est assez peu surprenant puisqu'elle est sous le joug de l'ordre établi."

[36] Chrétien et al. (2001: 92) support this point in their comparison of the preface of the first edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* with the 1798 edition: "les deux textes introductifs présentent sans conteste des intentions différentes: le premier désire justifier les choix lexicographiques de la Compagnie tandis que le second, aux visées politiques déclarées, tente plutôt de légitimer l'Académie elle-même."
[37] See Chapter 2.

It is interesting to note that within the Académie, there was enough significance attached to the preface of the dictionary that there was competition over who would write it: “Deux académiciens, François Charpentier et François-Séraphin Régnier-Desmarais, ont rédigé chacun une préface pour cette première édition du *Dictionnaire*. Ils se disputent ce privilège, car «[d]es flatteries éloquentes et adroites pouvaient attirer l’attention du Maître et faire la fortune de celui qu’elles mettraient en lumière»” (Chrétien et al. 2001: 86).

Initially, Régnier-Desmarais, as *secrétaire-perpétuel* (Beaulieux 1967: 40), had been chosen to write the preface and the dedication of the dictionary, however, seizing the opportunity of the latter’s absence at the time of printing, Charpentier substituted his own preface. He also claimed to have authored the dedication, however, “des documents originaux—dont trois Préfaces et quatre Epîtres demeurées en projet—éclairent la contribution de divers auteurs” (Benhamou et al. 1997: 20).

Because the Académie was composed of many individuals, we cannot assume that the preface to *Dictionnaire de l’Académie françoise* reflects the beliefs and values of each person (Chrétien et al. 2001: 86). It is also true that since the dictionary had many contributors, the preface may fail not only to reflect the views of each individual in the group, but also the true content of the dictionary itself:

> Les propos tenus dans la préface ne peuvent [...] rendre compte des diverses opinions des rédacteurs des articles. Qui plus est, le discours de la préface ne coïncide jamais parfaitement avec le contenu réel du dictionnaire ni avec les idées qui ont présidé à son élaboration. Il reste que la préface de l’édition de 1694 du *Dictionnaire* semble représenter assez fidèlement les idées de la Compagnie (Chrétien et al. 2001: 86).

We may suppose that, since it was allowed to be published, and in fact to replace a previous attempt, the preface reflects the values of the Académie as a whole, as much as

can be expected, given the required conformity of the time (Rey 1978: 92). Furthermore, as is the case with any large body, it cannot be assumed that all of the precepts held will perfectly represent the attitude of each individual.

5.1.2 Bayle's preface to the Dictionaire Universel

Because Furetière's dictionary did not appear until after his death, he did not write the preface to *Dictionaire Universel*. Rather, it was Pierre Bayle who authored the text. As with the dictionary of the Académie, this presents a situation whereby the preface cannot perfectly reflect the ideas behind the compilation of the dictionary. In both cases, it may be difficult to distinguish what is reflective of the views of the compiler(s), and what is specific to the author of the preface. In the case of Bayle's text, this ambiguity comes through partly in the grammar of the text: "Le ON de la préface [du dictionnaire de Furetière] exprime cette connivence de Bayle avec l'auteur du *Dictionnaire Universel*." Giving an example in which "on" is the pronoun used, Collinot (1985: 19) remarks, "Cette suite de verbes qui décrit l'activité du lexicographe a pour sujet unique un ON où il est bien difficile de faire la part de l'Auteur et celle de son Préfacier."

Bayle notes the qualities not only of the *Dictionaire Universel*, as well as Furetière as the author, but also of language itself. Perhaps the most contemplative of the three texts studied, Bayle's preface focuses not only on the dictionary itself, but also on language. The text includes a discussion on living versus dead languages, especially from the point of view of a compiler, as well as comments on the benefits of the French language.

Inevitably, a significant section of Bayle's preface is devoted to a discussion of the Académie, and especially of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. Seguin (1999: 246) notes of

Bayle, “Il oppose [...] l’ouvrage [de Furetière] au *Dictionnarie de l’Académie* dont la nomenclature est le résultat d’un jugement de «bel usage» et rejette les «termes du palais.»”

This opposition of Furetière’s dictionary to that of the Académie, both according to Bayle and to Furetière himself in earlier texts, extends to the methodology of the two works: “Les principes de méthode du *Dictionnaire* de Furetière sont exposés dans la préface (de Pierre Bayle) [...] et dans les nombreux textes de l’auteur, justifiant et commentant ses options, pour les opposer à celles du *Dictionnaire de l’Académie*. Leur mise en œuvre est évidemment inscrite dans le texte même du dictionnaire” (Rey 1978: 85).

The relative lack of prescriptivism in Bayle’s preface, as compared to that of the Académie, is reflected in Rey’s (1978: 71-72) observation that “La réunion de Furetière et de Pierre Bayle—qui reste anonyme—est exemplaire, en ce qu’elle oppose une vision critique, érudite et rationnelle du langage et des discours culturels à la vision puriste de l’Académie. [...] Bayle souligne l’opposition des intentions: pour Furetière, le vocabulaire est un outil; pour l’Académie, la beauté de la langue (et sa pureté, par sélection rigoureuse) prime.”

Also lending credence to this viewpoint is the observation on the way that the target audience of Furetière’s dictionary is addressed. Collinot (1985: 19) remarks that even typographically, the “public des Lecteurs” addressed in Bayle’s preface is in opposition to the “«Public» de [l’Académie], ensemble de citoyens-sujets.”

5.1.3 Richelet's preface to the Dictionnaire françois

The main goal of Richelet's preface appears to be the presentation of his method for the *Dictionnaire françois*, including the organization and content of the work.[38] It is possible that such a detailed plan of the work in the preface was a way of making clear to the Académie his specified intentions, so as not to attract the ill favour of the group. This does not stop Richelet from drawing attention to the length of time taken for the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* to appear, however the author is careful to praise the work itself.

Unlike Furetière, Richelet was himself the author of his own preface. As in the cases of both the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* and the *Dictionaire Universel*, however, the preface of the *Dictionnaire françois* does not necessarily reflect the views of all parties involved in the compilation of the project. This is due to the fact that though the dictionary bears only Richelet's name as its author, the project included several other collaborators.[39]

Relatively little has been written on Richelet's preface, as compared to that of Bayle and the Académie. In all likelihood, this text has been overshadowed by the overall influence of the Académie française, as well as the drama surrounding the publication of Furetière's *Dictionaire Universel*. In comparison to the latter, Richelet's dictionary was published without much ado; as Rey (1978: 51) observes, "Pour Richelet, les choses vont se passer en douceur; avec Furetière, ce sera la bagarre."

The dictionary of Furetière and that of the Académie are often presented as direct opposites, leaving the *Dictionnaire françois*, which finds itself somewhere in the middle,

[38] Interestingly, this is also a common characteristic among the first monolingual English compilers, Cawdrey, Bullokar, and Cockeram (see Chapter 4).
[39] See Chapter 2.

out of the equation: “Le contraste entre le *Dictionaire Universel* de Furetière (1690) et le *Dictionnaire de l’Académie* (1694) est frappant. D’un côté, un immense appétit de savoir encyclopédique, de l’autre une synchronie du présent vue de l’intérieur d’un milieu donné” (Seguin 1999: 246). Insight may be gained into how Richelet’s preface fits in with the other two, however, in examining some observations on how the three works relate to each other.

5.1.4 Synopsis

Despite certain thematic similarities, each of the prefaces studied within the category of monolingual French dictionaries is of course unique, much like the dictionaries themselves.[40]

Based on their title pages, Collinot (1985: 15) draws some conclusions about the intentions of the three works. “[L’] apparat de la page de titre [du *Dictionnaire de l’Académie*] rejette quelque peu dans l’ombre [le *Dictionnaire françois*] et [le *Dictionaire Universel*]. Le premier affirme sa prééminence par le fait qu’il lui suffit de se parer du seul titre de Dictionnaire pour l’être effectivement, les deux autres justifient leur titre en l’explicitant largement.” Here it is important to remember, however, that the title pages of both Richelet’s and Furetière’s dictionaries were part of the “ruse” used to ensure that their works would be published.[41] Richelet’s dictionary stayed true to its intentions of focusing on specialized terms, though the same may not be said of the *Dictionaire Universel*. Collinot remarks that the title pages of the three dictionaries studied indicate the following:

[40] See for example Collinot (1985: 17) for a discussion of the *destinateur/destinataire* of each of the three prefaces.
[41] See Chapter 2 for more on this subject.

> Si [le *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*] est l'œuvre d'une institution d'état veillant à la santé de la langue, [le *Dictionaire Universel*] est le dictionnaire «contenant *tous* les Mots […] & les Termes de *toutes* les Sciences et des Arts», [le *Dictionnaire françois*] annonce un programme plus restreint, il ne retient que les termes les plus connus des Arts et des Science (Collinot 1985: 15).

The highly detailed list of the areas of specialization covered in his dictionary, found on the title page of Furetière's dictionary, also serves to illustrate his "encyclopedic" intentions.

As noted above, Richelet's dictionary is somewhere in between that of Furetière and the Académie on several dimensions. In some cases, Richelet's and Furetière's dictionaries find common ground: "Le dictionnaire de l'Académie est prescriptif; ceux de Richelet et de Furetière sont, chacun à leur manière, des ouvrages descriptifs" (Bray 1990: 1800). It is to be observed that this conception of the *Dictionnaire françois* as a descriptive rather than prescriptive work is fairly recent.[42] Indeed, there are certain prescriptive tendencies in Richelet's preface, despite the author's claims to the contrary (see below).

In some cases, despite certain similarities in the context of their publication, the *Dictionnaire françois* and the *Dictionaire Universel* are in opposition to each other. For example, while the dictionary of Furetière treats the subject of the "usage institutionnel de la chose désignée, abordant par ce biais une critique de la société et de certaines de ses institutions," the dictionaries of the Académie and Richelet remain "dans le domaine de la langue" (Collinot 1985: 24): "pour [Richelet] et [l'Académie], la tâche principale du lexicographe est d'étiqueter les emplois des mots et des phrases citées, selon leur sens et leur usage. L'art de la définition revêt ici un aspect rhétorique au moins aussi important

[42] See Bray (1990: 1796) for discussion.

que l'aspect sémantique" (Collinot 1985: 21). In fact, this is one area where Richelet's dictionary stands alone: Bray (1990: 1797) notes that according to Stefenelli, "en ce qui concerne le marquage des archaïsmes le dictionnaire de Richelet offre une information beaucoup plus sûre que ceux de Furetière 1690 ou de l'Académie 1694."

Quemada (1997: III) remarks that each of these dictionaries is individual:

> Par ses caractères propres, chacun de ces ouvrages est bien, à titre égal, dans sa catégorie, un 'premier' dictionnaire de notre langue classique: le Richelet, pour la *lexicographie descriptive*; le Furetière, pour la *lexicographie encyclopédique*; et le Dictionnaire de l'Académie, pour la *lexicographie normative* dont il est le chef de file incontesté.

It is not surprising then, that dictionaries with different purposes will be introduced by unique prefaces. The fact that each of these prefaces was written by one individual, as opposed to collaboratively, also contributes to their distinctiveness. It is true, however, that there are definite similarities among the prefaces studied. We will look at some of the shared features of these texts in the following section.

5.2 Main Topics Treated in the Prefaces

The issues of dictionary content and scope, lexicographic context, and linguistic context will be explored in this section.

5.2.1 Dictionary Content and Scope

Some discussion of the scope and content of the dictionary is included in each of the prefaces studied. In addition to the consideration of target audience, the issues of choices for the dictionary, both on the level of content and organization, are included in this section.

5.2.1.1 Target Audience

Though not a subject that is dwelled upon, target audience is a issue that is alluded to in all of the prefaces studied in this category, and in fact in nearly all of the prefaces considered in this thesis.[43]

Charpentier's text clearly states that the target audience of the Académie's dictionary includes both native and non-native speakers of French:

> Le Dictionaire de l'Academie ne sera pas moins utile, tant à l'esgard des Estrangers qui aiment nostre Langue, qu'à l'esgard des François mesmes qui sont quelquefois en peine de la veritable signification des mots, ou qui n'en connoissent pas le bel usage, & qui seront bien aises d'y trouver des esclaircissemens à leurs doutes.

Similarly, the prefaces of both Furetière's and Richelet's dictionaries allude specifically to a foreign audience. After illustrating the popularity of the French language throughout Europe, Bayle remarks in the preface to the *Dictionaire Universel*: "Ce sera un grand moyen à ce livre-cy de répandre sur plus de nations les lumieres qu'il contient, & d'acquitter cette langue auprés de ceux qui luy rendent tant d'honneur." Though not mentioned on the title page of his dictionary, Richelet refers to his target audience throughout the preface. This audience includes mainly "[les] honnêtes gens qui aiment notre Langue," however, Richelet does make specific mention of foreign speakers of French. In fact, this consideration of foreign users of the dictionary influences in part the way that Richelet's dictionary is organized: "En faveur des Etrangers, on a ajouté aux mots, & aux phrases des bons Ecrivains le genre de chaque nom avec la termainaison féminine des adjectifs, & l'on en a donné des exemples." Such reflections on the organization and content of the dictionaries make up a significant part of the prefaces studied.

[43] See Chapters 4 and 6.

5.2.1.2 Content

Richelet's discussion of these matters begins as early as the first paragraph of his preface, in which he notes that he has selected words from "nos plus excellens Auteurs," and that his work includes "leurs mots les plus-reçus, aussi-bien que […] leurs expressions les plus-belles." Richelet further explains that specific sources for these words and expressions are indicated.

The inclusion of "les Termes les plus connus des Arts & des Sciences" in Richelet's dictionary, as promised on the title page, is further mentioned in the preface to this work. The author notes, "on y fait entrer les termes ordinaires des Arts, & presque toutes les remarques qui jusques ici ont été faites sur la Langue." Furthermore, these specialized terms are marked distinctively as such. Though not explicitly, this does suggest a focus on 'hard words,' a tradition in 17th century English lexicography.[44]

This focus on specialized terms, also present among many of the monolingual English dictionaries studied, can also be found in the preface of Furetière's dictionary. On the title page of the latter, it is observed that the dictionary includes not only terms "tant vieux que modernes," but also specialized terms, those proper to the sciences and the arts. These specialized terms are mentioned in detail; specific reference is made to such disciplines as philosophy, logic and physics, and medicine. Bayle remarks in the preface to Furetière's dictionary that in fact, "le langage commun n'est icy qu'en qualité d'accessoire. C'est dans les termes affectez aux Arts, aux Sciences, & aux professions, que consiste le principal."[45]

[44] See Chapter 1.
[45] See Chapter 2 for infrmation on the restrictions imposed on both Furetière's and Richelet's dictionaries by the Académie.

Conversely, the dictionary of the Académie opts not to include old words that are no longer in use, nor specialized terms of science or art. The contents of this dictionary are restricted to "la Langue commune, telle qu'elle est dans le commerce ordinaire des honnestes gens, & telle que les Orateurs & les Poëtes l'employent." Charpentier further notes that the dictionary gives "la Definition de tous les mots communs de la Langue dont les Idées sont fort simples." There are, of course, exceptions to this rule. Some specialized terms are included if they are popular enough to have entered into everyday language; also, old words are included if they are still in use. In an act of prescriptivism, terms are marked if they are beginning to become obsolete, or if they are not "du bel usage." It is also to be remarked that terms "qui blessent la Pudeur" are not included in the dictionary of the Académie.

Justifying the Académie's choice of omitting the majority of specialized terms from the dictionary, and likely making a subtle reference to Furetière's competing work, Charpentier claims in his preface that it is more of a challenge to define simple as opposed to complex notions. It is stated that in the case of "[l]es termes des Arts & des sciences," the definition is clearer than the concept defined, whereas in the case of "les termes communs," the opposite is true.

All three of the prefaces studied make special reference to proverbs. Richelet notes that proverbs are included under the headword to which they are related, and the title page of Furetière's dictionary promises to explore "l'Origine de plusieurs Proverbes." The reason for this emphasis on proverbs is perhaps best summarized in the preface of the dictionary of the Académie: "Les Proverbes ont esté regardez dans toutes les Langues comme des Maximes de Morale qui renferment ordinairement quelque instruction."

Though some proverbs only occur “dans le style familier,” these, as well as “les façons de parler Proverbiales,” are included in the dictionary of the Académie.

5.2.1.3 Organization

In all of the prefaces studied, there is some discussion of the elements included within each entry, that is, the microstructure of the work. In Furetière’s dictionary, each definition is said to be enhanced “par des exemples, par des applications, par des traits d’Histoire.” In addition to the definition of each term, the dictionary of the Académie includes synonyms, as well as any epithets “qui conviennent le mieux au Nom substantif, & qui s’y joignent naturellement.” Richelet’s preface also highlights the content and organization of each entry:

> A l’égard de chaque mot, on a observé cét ordre. On a commencé par le sens propre avec les façons de parler qui se raportent à ce sens. On y a joint le figuré avec ses phrases. On a accompagné cela de quelques proverbes, au cas que sur le mot il y en ait eu de raisonnables, & on a marqué si le mot est un terme d’art, s’il est vrai qu’il en soit un.

There is also a focus on the organization of the work as a whole, or macrostructure of the dictionary, in Charpentier’s preface to the work of the Académie. The author notes that the dictionary is arranged according to the roots of words, with each of these followed by its respective derivative and composite words. There are exceptions to this rule; for example, words arising from a “mot Primitif” that is no longer used in the French language are included without their root word. The typical order followed in the dictionary of the Académie is explained in the preface:

> Dans cet arrangement de Mots, on a observé de mettre les Derivez avant les Composez, & de faire imprimer en gros Caracteres les mots Primitifs comme les Chefs de famille de tous ceux qui en dependent, ce qui fait qu’on ne tombe gueres sur un de ces mots Primitifs qu’on ne

> soit tenté d'en lire toute la suite, parce qu'on voit s'il faut ainsi dire l'Histoire du mot, & qu'on en remarque la Naissance & le Progrez; & c'est ce qui rend cette lecture plus agreable que celle des autres Dictionnaires qui n'ont point suivi l'ordre des Racines.

In a final note on the organization of *Dictionnaire françois*, Richelet's address to the reader is followed by a key denoting the markings used throughout the dictionary to indicate whether a word or expression is used figuratively, or informally, "dans le stile simple, dans le comique, le burlesque, ou le satirique." It is to be observed that this indicates a certain prescriptive tendency on the part of the author, despite his statement, "Je ne prétens prescrire la loi à personne."

Interestingly, this key also includes an explanation of the *accent circonflexe*, the *accent grave*, and the *accent aigu*, now commonly used in French. In this list, Richelet also includes a note on the pronunciation of the simple *e*, indicating that at this time, the issue was under some debate. Richelet remarks, "Force gens supriment tout à fait cet *e* obscur lorsqu'ils parlent, ou qu'ils lisent, mais les hommes savans dans la Langue condannent cette prononciation, & sur tout lorsqu'on lit de la poësie."

5.2.2 Lexicographic Context

Within the broader topic of lexicographic context, we will consider in this section the authors' discussion of time taken to complete their respective dictionaries, as well as praise of the Académie française.

5.2.2.1 Time Taken for Completion

There is mention made in all of the prefaces studied of the time taken to compile the respective dictionaries. For example, Bayle assures the reader that despite its vastness, Furetière's dictionary was not produced in undue haste. In the preface, Bayle makes

mention of a stereotype regarding the working style of French scholars: “les François […] semblent, à n’en juger qu’à veuë de pays, beaucoup plus propres à des études proptement expediées, qu’à celles qui demandent une longue & infatigable application.” Refuting this notion, the author refers to some of the scrupulous works compiled by French authors, such as the dictionaries of Robert and Henry Estienne.

Similarly, Charpentier also addresses the issue of the lengthy time taken to complete the *Dictionnaire de l’Académie*, citing outside contributing factors. For example, it took approximately two years for the Académie to gain official status, and many more for the group to have an official place to meet. Furthermore, in its early years, the Académie still had to work out the details of its proposed activities. And, of course, the lengthy philosophical as well as grammatical debates on each entry only slowed the process further; debates that, according to Charpentier, were essential to a scrupulous compilation.

The time taken for the publication of the *Dictionnaire de l’Academie française* is mentioned in Richelet’s preface as well, perhaps as justification of his own schedule. He remarks, “Un Dictionnaire est l’Ouvrage de tout le Monde. Il ne se peut mêmes faire que peu à peu, & qu’avec bien du tems. Des personnes illustres dans les lettres travaillent depuis prés de 43 ans à un Ouvrage de cette nature, & toutefois ils n’en sont pas encore venus à bout.”

5.2.2.2 Praise of the Académie

It is to be noted that Richelet’s discussion of the time taken for the Académie to complete its work does not indicate a critical attitude toward the institution. The author alludes to the importance of the *Dictionnaire de l’Académie*, noting that his work may be useful to

readers until the former is published: “En attendant que leur travail paroisse, & vienne heureusement remplir les vœux du public, on met en lumiere ce Dictionnaire.”

Similarly, Bayle praises the work of the Académie, despite the animosity that existed between Furetière and this group,[46] “Nous faisons des vœux ardens pour l’heureuse naissance de cet Ouvrage,” and credits the Académie with being “la cause ou immediate, ou mediate de toute la politesse du François.” He further claims that Furetière’s dictionary is not designed to compete with that of the Académie, since the two works have different aims. It is remarked that the dictionary of the Académie, as well as the Académie itself, “n’ont jamais eu d’autre but que de travailler à polir la langue Françoise, et principalement par rapport à des ouvrages d’esprit, tant en vers qu’en prose, à des pièces d’Eloquence, à l’Histoire, &c.” Conversely, notes Bayle, Furetière “ne s’est pas proposé les termes du beau langage, ou du stile à la mode, plus que les autres. Il ne les a fait entrer dans sa Compilation que comme des parties du tout qu’il avoit enfermé dans son dessein.” Though this issue is not dwelled upon, this quote does imply a certain descriptive attitude on the part of Furetière.

5.2.3 Linguistic Context

As in the case of the prefaces of the monolingual English works, the texts in this category contain some discussion of language in general. In this section, we will consider reflections within the prefaces on two subtopics: orthography, and the comparison of modern vs. classical languages, especially as related to praise of the French language.

[46] See Chapter 2 for more on this topic.

5.2.3.1 Orthography

The items in Richelet's key are indicative of a subject that is addressed in the prefaces studied: that of spelling. Because French orthography was not yet standardized in the 17th century, both Richelet and Charpentier see fit to discuss in their prefaces the spelling systems adopted in their respective dictionaries. It is interesting to observe that different spelling choices are made in these two works.

Nearly one third of Richelet's preface is devoted to the issue of spelling considerations. He notes, "Touchant l'Ortographe, on a gardé un milieu entre l'ancienne, & celle qui est tout à fait moderne, & qui défigurent la Langue." Richelet then goes on to discuss his specific choices in this area:

i. Letters that are not pronounced are often omitted (*advocat* → *avocat*)
ii. In some cases, the letter *s* is omitted, with the preceding *e* being replaced by an *é* (*respondre* → *répondre*)
iii. In other cases, the accent ˆ may be added to the letter, presumably a vowel, preceding an omitted *s* (*tempeste* → *tempête*). Richelet remarks, "Cette derniere façon d'ortographier est contestée. Neanmoins, parce qu'elle empêche qu'on ne se trompe à la prononciation, & qu'elle est authorisée par d'habiles gens, j'ai trouvé à propos de la suivre si ce n'est à l'égard de certains mots qui sont si nuds lorsqu'on en a oté quelque lettre qu'on ne les reconnoit pas."
iv. In nearly all cases, the *y grec* becomes an *I*

v. Generally, double letters are avoided: “On retranche la plu-part des lettres doubles et intutiles qui ne défigurent pas les mots, lorsqu’elles en sont retranchées.”

Similarly, the preface of the *Dictionnaire de l’Academie française* outlines the spelling choices made in this dictionary. Unlike Richelet, “L’Académie s’est attachée à l’ancienne Orthographe receuë parmi tous le gens de lettres, parce qu’elle ayde à faire connoistre l’Origine des mots.” Hence, *temps* is written with a *p*, and *honneste* with an *s*, so as to suggest their respective Latin roots, *tempus* and *honestus*.[47] There are exceptions to this rule, as Charpentier points out, since spelling is dictated by usage: “il faut reconnoistre l’usage pour le Maistre de l’Orthographe aussi bien que du choix des mots. C’est l’usage qui nous mene insensiblement d’une maniere d’escrire à l’autre, & qui seul a le pouvoir de le faire.” When there is more than one way of spelling a word in the dictionary, “celle dont il sera escrit en lettres Capitales au commencement de l’Article est la seule que l’Academie approuve.”

Unlike Richelet’s text, Charpentier’s preface seems to suggest a fairly negative view of symbols such as the *accent circonflexe*. Highlighting the conservatism of the group, the preface of the Académie criticizes those individuals, especially printers, who omit certain letters and insert accents to replace them “parce que ce retranchement oste tous les vestiges de l’Analogie & des rapports qui sont entre les mots qui viennent du Latin ou de quelque autre Langue.”

The discrepant spelling systems adopted by Richelet and the Académie are also due to a difference of opinion in how spelling and pronunciation should be related. The

[47] It is interesting to note that in modern day French, the spelling of the first of these examples, *temps*, remains, though the spelling of the second term, *honneste*, has been modified.

spelling choices made by Richelet would indicate that this author sees spelling and pronunciation as being inherently linked. Conversely, the preface of the Académie claims that it is impossible for orthography to perfectly represent pronunciation, claiming that the only way to truly grasp the pronunciation of a language is to be immersed in it. Charpentier does assure readers, however, that notes have been made on entries whose spelling is very far removed from their correct pronunciation. He then goes on to give examples of letters which may cause problems in this regard, and the proper pronunciation of these letters in given linguistic contexts are explained.

In addition to the question of orthography, the preface of the Académie also addresses the issue of grammar, explaining how it relates to the contents of the dictionary. For example, after every verb in the dictionary, the "Participe passif" that is formed of it is included. This focus segues into a discussion on the nature of "Participes passifs" and "Participes actifs," including an explanation of how these are used, and how they are represented within the dictionary.

The preface to *Dictionaire Universel* is the only text of the three that does not include a discussion of orthography.

5.2.3.2 Modern vs. Classical Languages & Praise of the French Language

Because the three works studied are among the first monolingual dictionaries to be compiled in a living language, it is not surprising that the prefaces of these dictionaries all contain some discussion of their antecedents, that is, dictionaries of the classical

languages of Latin and Greek. In fact, two of the three prefaces studied contain a lengthy comparison between the compilation of a dictionary in a modern language as opposed to a classical language.

In the preface to the *Dictionaire Universel*, Bayle acknowledges the difference between compiling a French dictionary, and a dictionary in a dead language, such as Latin, and the relative difficulty of the latter task. Besides the obvious fact that it is easier to grasp a language, and thus to compile a dictionary, in one's mother tongue, observes Bayle, there is the added complexity of the fact that any dictionary of a dead language is bound to be incomplete. This is due either to certain words not having been recorded in writing, or, even in the case of those that have been, to the loss of certain written records. Supporting this statement, the author points out that the publication of Latin manuscripts often brings to light new words. He goes so far as to suggest that the number of words of dead languages that have been "lost" may in fact equal those that have been recorded: "il est évident que ces langues-là ne sont representées qu'à demi dans les Dictionaires, & qu'elles y perdent necessairement une infinité d'expressions qui n'étoient bonnes que pour l'entretien familier, & qui appartenoient en propre à certains Arts, ou à certaines fonctions de la vie, sur quoi il ne nous reste aucun Traité particulier."

In the preface to the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, Charpentier also draws a comparison between this dictionary and dictionaries of classical languages:

> On peut dire […] que ce Dictionnaire a cet avantage sur tous les Dictionnaires de ces deux Langues celebres de l'Antiquité, que ce que nous avons, n'ont point esté composez dans les bons siecles; Mais par des Modernes, ou par des Autheurs qui ont veritablement vescu durant qu'on parloit encore les Langues Grecque & Latine, mais non pas dans leur ancienne pureté.

It is also mentioned that the dictionary of the Académie was written “dans le siecle le plus florissant de la Langue Françoise.” In light of this statement, Charpentier addresses the question of how one can be sure that a living language has reached its peak. In response, he cites Cicero; according to Charpentier, the scholar correctly judged that, “de son temps la Langue Latine estoit arrivée à un degré d’excellence où l’on ne pouvoit rien adjouster.”

Furthermore, Charpentier judges that French has reached “sa derniere perfection ” based on the qualities of the language itself, for example, “la Gravité & la Varieté de ses Nombres, la juste cadence de ses Periodes, la douceur de sa Poësie, la regularité de ses Vers, l’harmonie de ses Rimes, & sur tout cette Construction directe, qui sans s’esloigner de l’ordre naturel des pensées, ne laisse pas de rencontrer toutes les delicatesses que l’art est capable d’y apporter.”

Such praise of the language may also be found in the preface to Furetière’s dictionary. Bayle remarks that the French language is the first to be assembled in such a scrupulous manner into dictionary form, and remarks that this is as it should be, “puis qu’on ne sauroit raisonnablement luy contester certaines perfections tres-avantageuses qui ne se trouvent point dans les autres langues.” Rather than dwelling on the details of the language, Bayle focuses instead on its popularity: “On l’entend ou on la parle dans toutes les Cours de l’Europe; & il n’est point rare d’y trouver des gens qui parlent François, & qui écrivent en François aussi purement que les François mêmes.” It is to be observed that the significance of this foreign audience is reflected in the inclusion of this group in the target audience of Furetière’s dictionary, as well as the other dictionaries studied.

5.3 Conclusion

In considering the prefaces of the monolingual French dictionaries indivdually, we have seen that each text presents certain distinctive features. Richelet's preface centres on the methodology as well as the organization of his work, while Bayle's text is more contemplative, focusing on a discussion of language itself. Although the Académie's preface also includes some discussion of language, it is chiefly concerned with justifying the choices made in the dictionary. In the latter portion of this chapter, we observed that despite these individual characteristics, the prefaces in this category as a whole treat common themes, such as target audience, as well as content and organization of the work within the broader subject of dictionary content and scope; a discussion of time taken for completion of the work, and praise of the Académie in the topic of lexicographic context; and reflections on orthography as well as the debate on modern vs. classical languages, as well as praise of the French language in the topic of linguistic context.

The fact that all three of the prefaces close with an invitation to readers to communicate faults or suggestions so that the dictionaries may be improved reminds us of the unique context in which these works were published. Being among the first monolingual French dictionaries, there were no direct examples for these dictionaries, or their prefaces, to follow. This may in fact be part of the reason for what variation does exist among the three prefaces studied.

We have then gone on to examine some of the most prominent themes in these prefaces, within the general categories of dictionary content and scope, lexicographic context, and linguistic context. We can see that even within these categories, some of the

specific themes present in the prefaces of the monolingual French dictionaries in this study mirror those addressed in their English counterparts. Examples of such themes include target audience, and observations on the language in question itself—more specifically, a discussion of the history of English, and praise of French, in the monolingual English and monolingual French texts respectively.

Chapter 6. Bilingual French-English Dictionaries

This chapter will be devoted to a thematic study of the prefaces of the five bilingual French-English dictionaries within our corpus. It should be observed that all of the prefaces of these works are written by the authors of the dictionaries themselves, with the exception of *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues*, written by Jean de l'Oiseau de Tourval.[48]

It is also important to note that due to the bilingual nature of the dictionaries studied themselves, the languages of the prefaces vary. The preface to Cotgrave's work is written in French, as is the preface to Miège's *A Dictionary of Barbarous French*. Miège's *The Great French Dictionary* includes one main preface, written in English, as well as two smaller prefaces to the French and English grammatical appendices included in the work.[49] Boyer's dictionary contains an English and a French version of one same preface. In this study, we will make use of the English version.

The prefaces of the bilingual works in our study also vary in terms of their length. The preface to Cotgrave's work is not quite one page long, and Miège's prefaces to *A New Dictionary*, *A Dictionary of Barbarous French*, and *The Great French Dictionary* are all approximately two pages. Both the English and French versions of Boyer's preface are the same length, at approximately six pages.

[48] See Chapter 3 for more on this individual.
[49] In this analysis, we will consider only the first of these three texts, as our study is limited to the prefatory material of dictionaries, and excludes prefaces of other works such as grammatical appendices.

6.1 Overview of the Prefaces Studied

As in the previous two chapters, we will now consider the five prefaces within this category as individual texts.

6.1.1 L'Oiseau de Tourval's preface to A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues

As Anderson (1972: 31) remarks, the preface to Cotgrave's dictionary "provides us with some interesting and important information concerning Cotgrave's method, procedure, and dedication to his public and to his work." However, the most striking feature of the prefatory material to Cotgrave's *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* as a whole may be its tone. In his dedication, Cotgrave's humble references to his dictionary as a "Bundle of words" and a "meane [...] Peece" would suggest that his work was little more to him than a pastime. Though this quality of self-effacement is a common characteristic of the dedications of the works studied, these texts generally do not trivialize the magnitude or potential usefulness of the dictionary itself.

The preface to *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* echoes this modest tone. This is of particular interest because it was not Cotgrave who authored this text. In the preface, the author discusses Cotgrave's concern at finally having to publish his dictionary, "plutot vaincu de l'importunité des ses Amis, & de la necessité que le Public en a, que satisfait en son ame de son propre ouvrage." The text briefly discusses some of the choices made by Cotgrave in his dictionary; in some cases, however, even these statements appear to more in the spirit of defending, rather than simply explaining, the

work. As it would turn out, the defense was largely unnecessary—Cotgrave's work would go on to become quite popular.[50]

In a small "To the reader" section immediately preceding a list of errata of the text,[51] Cotgrave notes that he himself has sought out the faults of his dictionary, as he is "lesse afraid so as to disgrace it, then to deceive those that shall harbor it."

It would appear from Cotgrave's dedication, as well as the preface by L'Oiseau de Tourval, that the author believed that which was mentioned in his epistle, that his work was simply a way to pass the time: "My desires have aimed at more substantiall markes; but mine eyes failed them, and forced me to spend much of their vigour on this Bundle of words."

6.1.2 Miège's preface to A New Dictionary French and English

The majority of Miège's preface to *A New Dictionary* is devoted to a discussion on the author's own method in his work, as well as language in general. The subject of methodology appears, however, to be somewhat of a vehicle for criticism of Cotgrave's *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues*. Miège concedes that the work of his predecessor has some usefulness, but is confident that it can be much improved. Miège's criticism of Cotgrave's work, which contains many archaic terms, is understandable if we consider Miège's own goal of "[describing] a living, flourishing French" (Cormier and Francœur 2002: 248).

[50] Hausmann (1990: 2957) notes that by 1672, a fourth edition of *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* would appear.
[51] As noted by Anderson (1972: 32), "Cotgrave was the first bilingual lexicographer to make extensive use of an errata section."

Miège's view of his predecessors is not entirely negative, however. In discussing the monolingual French counterparts of his work, the author is much more gracious than with respect to Cotgrave's dictionary. For example, in a brief note on the history of the French language found at the beginning of his preface, Miège elaborates on how the Académie has served to "improve" and "refine" the language.

In keeping with the theme of predecessors, Miège also acknowledges his own debt to the work of Father François Pomey[52] at the end of his preface, though not without commenting on the latter author's negative views towards Protestants.

6.1.3 Miège's preface to A Dictionary of Barbarous French

Curiously, Miège's criticism of Cotgrave's *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* would come back to haunt him. As the preface to *A Dictionary of Barbarous French* tells us, this project was conceived in response to criticism of Miège's *A New Dictionary*. The work was denounced for the fact that it was missing some of the features that had made Cotgrave's work popular, such as the inclusion of older terms. In the preface to his work, Miège attributes this criticism to "les Envieux." Still, he would have to concede that he had been overly critical of the work of his predecessor, when in this second project, it is mentioned not only in the preface but also on the title page that *A Dictionary of Barbarous French* was largely inspired by Cotgrave's dictionary. It is this discussion, along with justification on the part of Miège for the failure of his first work, as well as some brief information on methodology, of which the entire preface consists. In order to save face, Miège remarks that not long after he resigned himself to compiling

[52] The work in question was a French-Latin compilation, entitled *Dictionnaire Royal des langues françoise et latine* (Cormier and Francœur 2002: 248).

this new dictionary, this desire among the public for "Barbarous words"[53] began to subside, and his dictionary began to gain popularity. Nevertheless, he tells us, he decided to continue with the project.

6.1.4 Miège's preface to The Great French Dictionary in Two Parts

The preface to *The Great French Dictionary* opens with further justification on the part of Miège as to why his *New Dictionary* initially failed, though as in his previous preface, the author does note that *A New Dictionary* became more popular over subsequent years. Miège does not dwell on this point, and though he mentions "the dangerous Concurrence of Cotgrave's long-settled Reputation," the only other work to which the author alludes, either critically or otherwise, is his own *A New Dictionary*.

As suggested by the detailed title page of *The Great French Dictionary*, Miège's preface is devoted almost exclusively to the "MATTER, and METHOD" of the work. The author often draws comparisons between *The Great French Dictionary* and *A New Dictionary*; for example, the use of alphabetical order in the more recent publication, as opposed to organization by primitive and derivative words (see below).

Unlike the preface *to A New Dictionary*, Miège does not enter into any discussion of language in general, or of specific languages, but rather restricts himself to practical information about the dictionary itself.

[53] According to the title page of this work, Miège considers "Barbarous French" to include "Obsolete, Provincial, Mis-spelt, and Made Words." Later in the preface, the author more generally suggests that such language includes "les vieux Mots François" as well as "Mots de Province."

6.1.5 Boyer's preface to The Royal Dictionary in Two Parts

Boyer's preface is largely concentrated on the topic of his predecessors. This is mirrored by the title page, upon which Boyer makes mention of both the French and English sources for his work.

In the body of the preface, Boyer criticizes what has been accomplished in the field of bilingual French-English lexicography. The author offers little criticism of the work of Cotgrave, remarking that any deficiencies in *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* are likely due to changes in English and French since the time of its publication. Boyer is, however, much more critical of Miège. In fact, Anderson (1972: 40) remarks more generally that "Boyer appears to be an overly severe critic of the works of his predecessors."

In discussing the French and English parts of his dictionary separately, Boyer also alludes to his predecessors in these two areas. He approvingly discusses some of the major works of French lexicography, and interestingly, compares the dictionary of Furetière to that of the Académie, coming out decidedly in favour of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. Boyer's approval of what has been accomplished in monolingual French lexicography does not extend to the work of English compilers. In fact, it is clear from Boyer's preface that he is unimpressed with what has been done in this area. The author notes the efforts of Blount, Phillips, and Coles,[54] among others, but claims that their dictionaries are "Lame and Imperfect Pieces." According to Boyer, however, this is not a reflection on the quality of the English language itself, as "the Architect is only wanting, and not the Materials for such a Building." In fact, remarks Anderson (1972: 48), in his dedication, Boyer appears decidedly convinced of the benefits of the English language:

[54] Curiously, Boyer makes no mention of the works of Cawdrey, Bullokar, or Coles.

"although Boyer was a former French citizen, his dedication strikes a somewhat anti-French and patriotic English note. This is not surprising in view of the reason for his immigration." Despite these criticisms, Boyer does not claim to have completed a perfect English dictionary, and even concedes that this may be impossible for one person to do.

Though Boyer does not dwell on the subject in his preface, he does make mention of his belief that a dictionary should serve a pedagogic purpose. To this end, he includes a detailed bilingual list of symbols to help in dictate the usage of certain words. This constitutes one of the major "methodological innovations" with which Cormier and Francœur (2002: 251) credit the author.

Boyer's is the only one of the five prefaces studied in this section to include both a French and English version. Though we would expect Boyer, being of French nationality, to have written the French version of his preface first, Anderson (1972: 55) notes, "The preface to part II is a French translation of that of part I." It is true that Boyer worked as a translator (Anderson 1972: 48), as well as a language teacher (Cormier and Francœur 2002: 250), and likely had little trouble producing an original preface in English. Despite this fact, the author acknowledges his indebtedness to "the Advice of several ingenious and Learned English Gentlemen," as he remarks that it is to be expected that compilers of bilingual dictionaries will not be equally skilled in both French and English.

6.1.6 Synopsis

When considered all together, the main foci of the prefaces studied reflect the situations in which their respective dictionaries were published. For example, the modest tone in the prefatory material to Cotgrave's compilation may be due in part to the status of the work

as one of the first bilingual French-English dictionaries of his time. In the first of his prefaces, Miège was convinced that he could improve on the work of Cotgrave, explaining his criticism of his predecessor. In the next of his prefaces, the author was forced to admit that he had underestimated the value of Cotgrave's work, at least in the eyes of his target audience. In this text, Miège gives some justification as to the unfavourable reception of *A New World*. The brevity of this text may be due in part to the fact that Miège did not want to dwell on this topic. The preface to *The Great French Dictionary* does not treat the issue of predecessors; perhaps at this point Miège had learned that it was more beneficial to use one's preface for the simple purpose of making clear one's own lexicographic choices. In the preface to Boyer's dictionary, the author's preoccupation with his predecessors is understandable if we consider that by this time, Boyer would have had many preceding works, not only in bilingual French-English lexicography, but also monolingual French and English lexicography, to consider.

6.2 Main Topics Treated in the Prefaces

We will now observe how the subtopics within the broader issues of dictionary content and scope, lexicographic context, and linguistic context, are treated in the prefaces of the bilingal works studied.

6.2.1 Dictionary Content and Scope

In this section, we will explore how the general issue of dictionary content and scope is addressed in the prefaces of the bilingual French-English dictionaries studied. We will see that the subtopics discussed within this category are exactly those that are addressed

in the prefaces of the monolingual French compilations: target audience, content of the dictionary itself, and organization of the work.

6.2.1.1 Target Audience

In Chapters 4 and 5, we observed that though target audience is not a subject that the lexicographers tend to insist upon, all of the monolingual English and French prefaces contain some mention of this topic. While not as prominent in the prefaces of the bilingual French-English dictionaries, there is mention made of this issue in two of the texts studied in this category.

In the case of *A New Dictionary*, it is stated on the title page that this work is "Contrived For the Use both of English and Foreiners." The foreign audience is further highlighted in the preface to this work, when Miège makes note of the benefits of including proverbs in the dictionary:[55] "because English Proverbs may probably take well both amongst English and Foreiners, therefore I was the more free of them in my second Part." According to the preface of *A New Dictionary*, the target audience influences not only the content but also the organization of the work. Miège remarks that the organization of words by their primitives is "a great Conveniency, and must needs be a singular Help to the Learner, who finding by this means the Etymology of Words lying all along before him will easily master the Language." Thus, the target audience of *A New Dictionary* is extended to include the general group of "learners." While this audience could be said to be the target of any dictionary, the difference is that in Miège's

[55] This marks a similarity with the prefaces of the monolingual French dictionaries, all of which contain some specific mention of proverbs (see Chapter 5).

preface the group is made explicit. This focus on learners specifically is likely due in part to his profession as a language teacher (Cormier and Francœur 2002: 246).

Target audience is also mentioned in the preface to Miège's *The Great French Dictionary*. The author claims that his dictionary has "a double Aspect; French to the English, and English to Forreiners. To both Parties equally Usefull; for the one, to get French; and the other, English." The focus on foreign speakers of English is further highlighted by Miège's statement that "as the First Part does here and there give a Prospect into the Constitution of the Kingdom of France; so the Second does afford to Foreiners what they have hitherto very much wanted, to wit, an Insight into the Constitution of England." As with the first of Miège's dictionaries, the target audience of *A Great French Dictionary* is expanded to include the learner when he mentions that the short grammars included in the dictionary, "The Grounds Of The French Tongue" and the "Methode Abbregée, Pour Apprendre L'Anglois," are included "for the Learner's Conveniency and fuller Satisfaction." It is further mentioned that such texts are "very acceptable chiefly to Scholars, and Men of Sense."

6.2.1.2 Content

The content of the dictionary is addressed in the prefatory material of all five of the works studied, and in many cases, there is also some discussion of the organization of the work (see below).

A large portion of the preface to Cotgrave's *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* is devoted to the issue of content. The author of the preface asks readers to trust that any unfamiliar or awkward-sounding words found in the dictionary are indeed

collected from the works of French authors, and not invented by Cotgrave. In regards to references for any such terms, he remarks that Cotgrave "pouvoit bien citer le nom, le livre, la page, & le passage; mais ce n'eut plus icy eté un Dictionaire, ains un Labirinte." Displaying a certain descriptive attitude toward language, the author notes that Cotgrave was right to include these unfamiliar terms in his dictionary: "Ceuz qui ne les sauront pas, les aprendront; Ceuz qui les sauront, jugeront bien que l'ignorance, possible, d'un seul mot, soit substanciel, metaforique, inusité, ou tiré de la varieté des Arts, peut souvent obscurcir tout un sens, & rendre barbares les conceptions les plus gentilles." Thus, the idea is to include these terms, and, "Permis à qui voudra d'en user, ou de les laisser."

In Miège's *A New Dictionary*, the content of the work is addressed as early as the title page, which promises "New Words, Choice Phrases, and Apposite Proverbs; Digested Into a most Accurate Method." This issue is also addressed within the preface of the work, in which Miège discusses the content of his dictionary on the levels of words, phrases, and proverbs. Regarding the first of these categories, he observes,

> There are two sorts of Words, Words in use, and Words not in use. The first are either Common, or High Words, or Terms of Art. Common Words are used by all people in generall that speak the same Language, High (or Choice) Words are most proper to Schollars and best educated persons, and Terms of Art are peculiar to those that profess or speak of any Art.

Miège claims that the first two groups of "words in use" are well represented in his dictionary, and that he has placed a special emphasis on those terms "that are lately come to Use." Additionally, his dictionary includes a significant number of specialized terms,[56] especially those relating to the field of Law. Miège categorizes words that are not currently in use as either "Obsolete, or New-forced Words." He qualifies the first group

[56] In Chapters 4 and 5, we observed this trend among the prefaces of the monolingual English dictionaries, as well as the dictionaries of Richelet and Furetière.

as “Rubbish,” and, not surprisingly, does not include them in his dictionary, though certain older words, those that “may be found […] amongst some of our late Authors,” have been admitted, along with certain “New-coyned words.” It is to be remarked, however, that these terms are marked so as to distinguish them from “words in use.”

Regarding phrases, Miège notes that these have been included in order to illustrate the various meanings of words. Similarly, proverbs have been included “both for diversion and use,” such that “the Reading of [the dictionary] will be no less pleasing than usefull.”[57]

In regards to Miège’s *A Dictionary of Barbarous French*, the discussion of content is largely limited to the title page of the work, upon which are promised those words that Miège considers as “Barbarous” (see above). It is further mentioned in the preface that in addition to older terms, this work includes more specialized terms than *A New Dictionary*, such as those relating to plants and animals.

There is also a focus on specialized terms in Miège’s *The Great French Dictionary*, which is evident even on the title page with the mention of “Hard Words.” In the preface of this work, Miège claims, “As for Terms of Art, wherein the Quarto is very defective, here is in both parts a good Supply of them.” On a general note, Miège remarks that *The Great French Dictionary* contains more material than *A New Dictionary*: “The Second Part [of *The Great French Dictionary*] especially, where the English is the Leader, does so far outdo the same Part in the Quarto-Book, that it exceeds it to the full by two Parts in three.”

The content of *The Great French Dictionary* is further addressed in the preface when Miège makes reference to his inclusion of “Obsolete and Barbarous Words,” despite his

[57] See note 38.

personal dislike of them. As in the case of *A New Dictionary*, Miège points out that many phrases and proverbs are included in the dictionary, and in some cases, short definitions are given: "Most of these, relating chiefly to the Law, are delivered in French in the First Part, and in English in the Second."

Boyer also addresses the issue of content in the preface to *The Royal Dictionary*. He claims that his work "will contain the Terms of both Languages, with more Choice and Plenty than any yet extant." It is to be observed that Boyer credits the quality of his dictionary as partly due to its time of publication, noting "among these sorts of Compositions, the Last are generally the Best, […] adding all the Wealth of others to their own Store."

Like Miège's *A Dictionary of Barbarous French* and *The Great French Dictionary*, Boyer also makes mention in his preface of specialized terms, that is, those relating to arts and science. These are included in *The Royal Dictionary* insofar as they "occur in common Conversation." It is interesting to remark that this is the basis upon which specialized terms are included in the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*.[58]

6.2.1.3 Organization

Though Boyer does claim to draw inspiration from the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*, his dictionary is organized differently from that work. Whereas words in the Académie's dictionary are organized according to their primitives, Boyer's dictionary follows alphabetical order, the author notes, "because I have found [organization by

[58] It is noted in the Académie's preface that the dictionary does not include "les termes des Arts & des Sciences qui entrent rarement dans le Discours."

primitives] to be very perplexing and troublesome to Beginners, whose conveniency ought chiefly to be consulted."[59]

Boyer claims that he has done his best to illustrate "the various Senses of every Word" with phrases; where possible, he has tried to use phrases "that have so different Turns in both Languages," in order to express how the word may be used differently in French and English. Overall, he gives phrases "which Use, the sovereign Umpire of Languages has as it were consecrated, and which are as essential Parts of a Speech, as the very Words of which they are composed."

Miège makes mention of the organization as well as the content of his work in the preface to *A New Dictionary*. The author states that in the dictionary, "Derivatives are reduced to their Primitives. So that the Primitive go's as a Leading Word in Capitals, and its Derivatives that come after in smaller Characters. By which means one hath a curious and distinct Prospect of every Primitive, with all its Off-spring together." As a caveat, he assures the reader, "I have taken care however to put in the Derivatives in their Alphabeticall Order, where they have a Star before them that leads you to the Primitive, which is to be found most times in the same page."

The preface to *The Great French Dictionary* also includes some discussion of the organization of the work. Miège compares his dictionary to *A New Dictionary* not only on the level of content but also organization when he remarks, "Neither is the Material Part of this Work the only Thing, wherein It doth infinitely exceed and surpass the First. For the Form and Method it self lays a great Claim to it." Whereas in *A New Dictionary*,

[59] Though the target audience is not made explicit in Boyer's *Royal Dictionary*, his consideration of "Beginners" in this quote indicates that like Miège, his dictionary is designed with learners of the English or French in mind. This is not surprising in view of the fact that both Miège and Boyer were language teachers (see above).

words are organized according to Primitives and Derivatives, in *The Great French Dictionary*, words are organized alphabetically, "But in such a manner that, where a Derivative is remote from its Primitive, I shew its Extraction within a Parenthesis. And so, by changing that Method, I have shifted off the Trouble, without absolutely losing the Benefit of it."

Another difference between Miège's first and last dictionary is the way that phrases, idioms, and proverbs are used to illustrate the various senses of a word. Whereas in *A New Dictionary*, illustrative phrases are inserted immediately after each individual sense of a word, in *The Great French Dictionary*, all senses of a word are given together, followed by ordered phrases, and then idioms, to illustrate these. If there is more than one proverb that corresponds to a given word, these are treated separately. Otherwise, proverbs are "Intermixt" with the phrases and idioms.

Though the prefaces of both Miège's *A Dictionary of Barbarous French*, and Cotgrave's *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* do address the issue of content, neither of these texts includes a discussion on organization specifically.

6.2.2 Lexicographic Context

Interestingly, as in the previous section, there is a link between the prefaces of the bilingual dictionaries with the works of another group; within the category of lexicographic context, the issue of predecessors is that which is dwelled upon in the prefaces of both the bilingual and the monolingual English dictionaries.

6.2.2.1 Predecessors

The issue of predecessors comes up in some form in the prefaces to all of Miège's dictionaries, however it is in Boyer's *The Royal Dictionary* that this topic largely dominates the preface of the work.

In his preface, Boyer both praises and criticizes his predecessors. On the title page to *The Royal Dictionary*, he acknowledges those authors who have served as inspiration for his work, noting that the French section of the dictionary is "taken out of the Dictionaries of Richelet, Furetiere, Tachart, the Great Dictionary of the French-Academy, and the Remarks of Vaugelas, Menage, and Bouhours," and that the English section is "Collected chiefly out of the Best Dictionaries, and the Works of the Greatest Masters of the English Tongue; such as Archbishop Tillotson, Bishop Sprat, Sir Roger L'Estrange, Mr. Dryden, Sir William Temple, &c." It is to be observed that these authors are not direct predecessors of Boyer's, since their works do not consist of bilingual French-English dictionaries. In fact, Boyer is unimpressed with the existing works in this category; he writes of "how much those [dictionaries] are Defective that have been Publish'd in England, for the attaining of the French and English Tongues." Boyer does see fit to give an overview of these works, however. He claims to have made use of these dictionaries so as to avoid repeating their same mistakes in his own work.

Boyer is charitable toward Cotgrave's *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues*, observing that, considering its scope, this work was the first of its kind: "it is not one jot derogatory to the just Honour which is due to Mr. Cotgrave's Memory, (for being the first that undertook so great a Work) to take notice of its Imperfections, because, for the most part, they are to be ascribed to the vast Improvements of both Languages since his time." Boyer is much more critical of Miège, who, he concedes, "has

rais'd his Works to a far greater Perfection than Cotgrave; yet, it cannot be deny'd, but that he comes infinitely short of that to which they may be advanced."

In his criticism of Miège, Boyer focuses only on *A Great French Dictionary*, claiming that Miège himself acknowledges the shortcomings of his previous dictionaries. Boyer goes on to identify six main criticisms of Miège's third work.

i. Boyer claims that Miège's dictionary is too verbose in certain places, for example, in the case of legal terms or historical passages, but deficient in others.

ii. Entries of words that have several possible equivalents contain no indication of the context in which specific equivalents should be used. Boyer shows how his dictionary does provide the user with such guidance.

iii. Boyer claims that Miège relies too heavily on "Scripture-Phrases," noting, "as the Holy Writ is the best Guide in Matters of Religion, so I dare say, it is the least sure in point of Languages." Boyer claims that this is due to "the obsoleteness of the Stile," as well as disagreement among translators as to the original meaning of certain words. In his view, texts such as "Histories, Novels, News-books, Observators; and above all, Plays" are more appropriate sources for the content of a dictionary.

iv. There are several words in both the French and the English section of *A Great French Dictionary* with no equivalents mentioned.

v. According to Boyer, there are some instances where words are misinterpreted by Miège, and thus a mistaken equivalent is given: "Sometimes [Miège] sets down the synonymous, or parallel Signification, and omits the true and proper." In other cases, Boyer remarks, the description of a word is given, but not the word proper.[60]

vi. Boyer notes that certain elements of the entry are not included, such as the gender or part of speech of a word. Furthermore, it is Boyer's view that usage labels should be given in each entry, for example, "Proper," "Figurative," "Vulgar," or "Proverbial."[61]

Boyer goes on to discuss the "foundation" of his own dictionary, making comments first on the French to English section, and then on the English to French section. In his discussion of the first section of his dictionary, Boyer expresses his admiration for the dictionary of the Académie. In his view, this work is superior to that of Furetière, though he does acknowledge that there is disagreement about this fact. He claims "'tis Rash, if not Foolish, the very putting in the Scale the Composure of one single Person, against the joint Labours and Irreversible Decisions of the whole Society of our Masters in the French Tongue." Boyer does acknowledge Furetière's strength in the area of specialized terms, but states, "his Inaccuracy in Distinguishing the good Expressions from the bad, and his Wantonness in using many new and dubious Words, take very much from the Merit of his great Work."

[60] The prefatory material of Boyer's dictionary includes a separate list of examples of these faults, found in *The Great French Dictionary*.
[61] The prefatory material of both Boyer's *Royal Dictionary* and Miège's *Great French Dictionary* include a list of such indications.

In the prefaces to Miège's *A New Dictionary* and *A Dictionary of Barbarous French*, there is some mention of predecessors. In the preface to *A New Dictionary*, Miège is fairly critical of Cotgrave's dictionary; in his view, *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* is not "accommodated to our present Age." Miège claims that this work is "so far from being refined according to Cardinall Richelieu's Academy, as is pretended in the Title, that it swarms every where with Rank Words and Obsolete Phrases." He does concede, however, that Cotgrave's dictionary may be "a good Help indeed for reading of old French Books (a thing which few people mind) but very insignificant either for reading of new ones, or speaking the Court-French, which is the Design of this Work."

Interestingly, it is for the very purpose of reading older texts that Miège compiles *A Dictionary of Barbarous French*. He states on the title page that this work is compiled "For the Satisfaction of such as Read Old French." It is also noted that many of the terms included in *A Dictionary of Barbarous French* are taken from Cotgrave's *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues*.

As on the title page, Miège recognizes in his preface that this second dictionary "n'est au fond qu'un Recueil de Cotgrave, avec quêques Additions. Et c'est en quoi je l'ai trouvé d'autant plus penible & insupportable, qu'il n'est rien de plus contraire à mon genie que de copier des Volumes." It is imaginable that contributing to his dislike of this activity is the embarrassment of having to rely so heavily on the work of his competition. This copying from Cotgrave is not surprising, however, since Miège himself acknowledges the usefulness of *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* for the purpose of reading old French.

Miège does not dwell on Cotgrave's work in the preface to *The Great French Dictionary*, though he does mention in this text that "the dangerous Concurrence of Cotgrave's long-settled Reputation" contributed to a certain lack of success of *A New Dictionary*. Instead, Miège addresses his own previous works, specifically his first, drawing comparisons between *A New Dictionary*, and *The Great French Dictionary*. Despite the fact that Miège draws comparisons between his first and third dictionaries on many levels, including content and orthography, he writes in the preface to *A Great French Dictionary* that this work represents "so vast a Difference from my first Attempt, both as to Matter and Form, that I left no ground for the least Comparison."

It is not surprising that the preface to Cotgrave's work makes no mention of predecessors. Firstly, because his is among the first dictionaries of its kind, and as such, Cotgrave has only one predecessor, Claudius Holyband, whose work did not reach the scope of *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* (Anderson 1972: 38). Thus, there is little to discuss in terms of Cotgrave's direct predecessors.[62] Secondly, because the preface was not written by Cotgrave himself—reflections on the work of predecessors appear to be fairly personal in nature, thus, it is not surprising that L'Oiseau de Tourval, would not make such judgments on the author's behalf.

6.2.3 Linguistic Context

We now turn our attention to subtopics addressed within the general issue of linguistic context. As with the prefaces in the previous chapter, some discussion of orthography is

[62] Anderson (1972: 29) suggests that Cotgrave was inspired by Nicot's *Thrésor de la Langue françoyse*, however Nicot does not constitute a direct predecessor of Cotgrave's, since the former's work was not in the field of bilingual French-English lexicography.

included. Like the prefaces of both the monolingual English and French dictionaries, there is also discussion of the languages in question.

6.2.3.1 Orthography

While neither Cotgrave nor Boyer include any discussion of orthography in the prefaces to their works, Miège addresses this issue in the prefaces to all three of his dictionaries.[63]

It is noted as early as the title page of *A New Dictionary* that in this work, modern French orthography is used. This is reiterated in the preface of the work, when Miège remarks, "I have indeavoured to do it as near as I could according to the present Use and modern Orthography." Also in the preface to this work, Miège identifies one of the accomplishments of the Académie française as involving orthography: "The French Orthography, formerly stuffed with so many superfluous letters, they brought as near the Pronunciation as could in reason be allowed."[64]

Miège also addresses the subject of orthography in the preface to *A Dictionary of Barbarous French*. He mentions that *A New Dictionary* received criticism for its lack of old words; presumably, then, the author's use of modern orthography in this work may also have been criticized. It may be for this reason that in the preface to *A Dictionary of Barbarous French*, Miège claims that while he had intended to include the ancient form of certain terms, this had proved too major an undertaking, and was thus abandoned.

[63] The fact that the prefaces of neither the first nor the last bilingual French-English dictionary published during the 17th century contains a discussion of orthography may suggest that Miège's focus on this issue was linked to a preoccupation with the subject at the time of publication of his three dictionaries. Of course, there is also the possibility that this was simply due to personal interest on the part of Miège.

[64] Interestingly, this statement in some way contradicts viewpoint expressed in the preface to the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* of 1694. The Académie acknowledges that while some believe that orthography should always reflect pronunciation, there are exceptions to this rule: "cette maxime n'est pas absolument veritable." Thus, this goal should not always govern orthography. In fact, the Académie adopts ancient orthography in its dictionary, which reflects the origins of words, if not always their pronunciation.

Instead, he refers any readers interested in this ancient orthography to consult his newly published grammar.

In Miège's third work, *The Great French Dictionary*, the issue of modern versus ancient orthography is reconciled. It is mentioned on the title page that the dictionary is written "According to the Ancient and Modern Orthography." This point is reiterated in the preface, when Miège remarks, "In the first Part [of the dictionary] you have the French Words spelt after the Old and New Way; but the Old referred to the New, which has been the Occasion of so many gracefull Braces. By which means the Reader is fitted for any sort of French Books, following either the Old or Modern Orthography."

6.2.3.2 Reflections on the Languages in Question

In the prefaces of Miège's *A New Dictionary* as well as Boyer's *The Royal Dictionary*, there is a discussion of either the English or French language itself, including its history, and some of its main virtues as perceived by the author.

In the preface to Miège's *A New Dictionary*, the author places special emphasis on the Académie in his discussion of the history of the French language. It is noted in the first lines of the preface that in regard to living languages, "which sometimes are in a flourishing, and sometimes in a declining condition," change is inevitable. Miège claims that it was the "decaying condition" of French that gave rise to the Académie, whose goal it would be to "correct and improve" the language. He is especially complimentary both to the French language and to the members of the Académie when he writes, "In a word, they have so judiciously corrected, refined, and improved [the French language], that it is now become the darling Language of Europe. So sweet it is and pleasing to the ear, so

very neat and curious in its expressions, so eloquent in its own genius and nature." Miège remarks that, since French has been "brought to perfection,"[65] the goal of the Académie must now be to preserve it, and "to oppose the former rambling way and extravagant course of exploding, changing, intruding Words and Phrases."

Miège goes on to note the "Universal" status of French in Europe, and especially the popularity of the language in England, such that "(according to Mr. Howell in his Epistle upon Cotgrave) an English-man had need to study French to speak good English."

In *The Royal Dictionary*, there is less reflection on the languages than in Miège's dictionaries. Boyer does, however, allude briefly to the virtues of both French and English. Like Miège, Boyer mentions the "Universal" nature of French. In the dedication to *The Royal Dictionary*, he observes the importance of French as being "A Language which of late has obtain'd so far, as to become Universal, not only in all Courts of Europe, but also in the Armies, and amongst Men of Business."

Boyer's praise of the English language itself is veiled in criticism of the lack of what he perceives to be a comprehensive English dictionary. He remarks that despite the fact that English has been "improv'd" especially by the inclusion of its many borrowed words, "not one publick-spirited Man, did ever take the Pains to make us thoroughly acquainted with the Richness and Copiousness of the English Tongue." Furthermore, Boyer likens the language to riches, comparing users of English to "Misers, that have been raking and scraping for several Years, and know not themselves the vastness of their Treasure, by reason that they have been wholly intent, upon getting more and more, and have neglected to compute what they had already got."

[65] This sentiment is markedly similar to one expressed in the preface to the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* of 1694, in which it is noted that French has reached "sa plus grande perfection."

It is to be observed that the prefaces to Miège's *A Dictionary of Barbarous French*, and *The Great French Dictionary* do not make any notable reflections on language as such.[66] The same may be said for Cotgrave's preface to *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues*.

6.3 Conclusion

As in the previous two chapters, we have focused in this section on the content of the prefaces in question. We provided a summary of each text individually, noting the individual features of each one, such as the modest tone in the preface to *A Dictionary of the French and English Tongues*; Miège's discussion of his own methodology in his preface to *A New Dictionary*, and criticism of that of his predecessor; Miège's subsequent concession of the benefits of Cotgrave's work in the preface to *A Dictionary of Barbarous French*; and his abandonment of any discussion of predecessors in *The Great French Dictionary*. Finally, Boyer's preface is distinctive by its methodical criticism of Miège's third dictionary, as well as by its bilingual nature. Following this first section, we provided a synopsis explaining how the three prefaces relate to one another from this perspective.

We then presented a thematic analysis of the texts within this group as a whole. It is to be remarked that one author, Miège, was responsible for three of the five texts studied in this section. We were thus aware that this would likely account for certain thematic similarities among his prefaces, however as was observed in the overview section as the

[66] It is interesting to note, however, that the preface to Miège's English Grammar, included along with its French counterpart in *The Great French Dictionary*, does include a lengthy discussion of this topic, focusing on the English language.

beginning of this chapter, this one author produced quite different prefaces according to the context surrounding the publication of his individual works.

The common themes observed among the prefaces within this category of dictionary included a discussion of target audience as well as content and organization of the work, within the broader subject of dictionary content and scope; within the topic of lexicographic context, the issue of predecessors was commonly addressed; and the linguistic context of the works was illustrated through discussions on orthography, as well as reflections on the languages in question. In noting the thematic similarities among the prefaces of the bilingual French-English dictionaries published during the 17th century, we can see that the parallels among the three groups of prefaces studied extend not only to the treatment of dictionary content and scope, lexicographic context, and linguistic context, but also to the subtopics within these broader headings.

Conclusion to PART II.

In noting the prominent themes in the prefaces of each of the three categories of dictionary published during the 17th century, we were in fact able to observe the similarities among them. Each group of prefaces deals with the three broader thematic categories: dictionary content and scope, lexicographic context, and linguistic context. But even within these categories, the specific topics treated are in some cases common to more than one type of dictionary; within the category of dictionary content and scope, the issue of target audience is treated in all three groups of preface. Similarly, all three groups contain reflection on language in some capacity within the broader category of linguistic context, such as history of English in the English works, modern vs. classical languages and praise of the French language in the French works, and reflections on either of the languages in question in the bilingual works.

It is also to be observed that the prefaces of the bilingual dictionaries studied serve as a kind of link between the prefaces of the monolingual English and French dictionaries. Though the issue of predecessors is not a prominent theme in the monolingual French texts, both the monolingual English and bilingual French-English prefaces treat this topic. Conversely, the prefaces of the bilingual dictionaries also address the topics of content and organization, as well as orthography, subjects that are dealt with in the monolingual French texts, but not in any significant way in their monolingual English counterparts.

Overall, we can see despite certain individual traits of each group of preface, and indeed of each preface itself, there are definite similarities in terms of the main issues addressed in the texts, and the overall type of information that they provide.

General Conclusion

In the first section of this work, we saw that the monolingual English, monolingual French, and bilingual French-English dictionaries of the 17th century emerged from significantly different contexts of publication. The monolingual English dictionaries, the first of which was published in 1604 by Cawdrey, were not only the first of their kind, but also helped to establish the specific 'hard word' tradition, and as such, strove toward a different goal than later dictionaries that focused on general language. The first two monolingual French dictionaries, published in 1680 and 1690, operated under the oppression of the Académie française, and would ultimately have to be published outside of France, while the dictionary of the Académie itself would struggle against opposing forces, not the least of which was the attitude of its own members, that would delay the duration of the project to sixty years. The bilingual works studied were not the first of their kind, this particular lexicographic tradition having already been initiated by Claudius Holyband in the 16th century. This is evidenced by the fact that Cotgrave's work, published in 1611 and thus the first French-English compilation to appear in the 17th century, drew inspiration from Holyband. It is also to be observed that of the three categories of dictionary studied, the French-English works were the most closely related to the bilingual dictionaries involving Latin published during the Renaissance. Thus, innovations in 17th century French-English lexicography, such as the bidirectional model put into practice by Miège, affected the course of a long-standing lexicographic tradition, rather than serving to establish a new one. As we can see, monolingual English, monolingual French, and bilingual French-English dictionaries emerged from very different and unique lexicographic environments.

The main goal of this thesis was to see whether the prefatory discourse of dictionaries is different from one lexicographic tradition to another. Our hypothesis was that dictionary prefaces convey essentially the same type of message to the reader, and that this message revolves around the same broad issues. As we have seen, three principle topics emerged from our analysis: 1) dictionary content and scope, that is, who the dictionary is intended for, the purpose of the dictionary, the choice of words included in the work, and how it is organized; 2) lexicographic context, including comments on the work of predecessors, time taken to complete the work, and in the case of the French dictionaries, praise of the Académie; 3) linguistic context, consisting of reflections on the history of the languages in question, the debate on new or borrowed words in the case of the English dictionaries, choices made in regards to orthography, the issue of modern vs. classical languages in the French dictionaries, and overall considerations of the French and English languages, and of language in general.

While all three groups of prefaces contain some discussion on each of these broad issues, there are also similarities on the level of the subtopics considered. Each of the three categories of preface as a whole addresses the issue of target audience, and contains some reflections on either the French or English language, whether on the level of history, as in the case of the English dictionaries, praise, as in the case of the French dictionaries, or both, as in the case of the bilingual dictionaries. Furthermore, it is interesting to observe that the prefaces of the bilingual dictionaries share certain features with each of the other two types of compilation studied, and in this way, serve to establish a kind of connection between them. The texts in this group as well as the prefaces of the French dictionaries share the same subtopics within the broader subject of

dictionary content and scope, namely, a focus on the content and the organization of the work in question. Similarly, in the area of linguistic context, a certain consideration of orthography is also shared between these two groups of prefaces. Conversely, in the area of lexicographic context, it is the English dictionaries with which the bilingual works find common ground: these two groups of prefaces are both limited, within this issue, to a discussion of predecessors.

We can also see that there is inevitable overlap among certain subtopics. For example, though neither the French nor the bilingual prefaces make direct mention of *purpose of the dictionary*, this purpose may in some cases be inferred from explanations of target audience. In some cases, there is also overlap among the broader issues; within the topic of linguistic context, the discussion of borrowed words in the prefaces of the English compilations often leads to some mention, albeit brief or implied, of what has been included in the dictionary in question. Thus, despite the fact that there is no *content* section in the case of the monolingual English prefaces due to lack of prominence, we can see that this issue is alluded to in some of these prefaces.

Overall, our research tends to demonstrate that, even in the early days of monolingual English, monolingual French, and bilingual French-English lexicography, there was a general pattern applied to dictionary prefaces, and this pattern was largely independent of the lexicographic milieu of the dictionaries in question.

Recommendations for Further Research

We can see that, beyond similarities among the prefaces of these works, the comparison of the texts with the prefaces of dictionaries involving other languages may present a

promising opportunity for broader research in the field of 17th century lexicography. Such a study would require a more in-depth lexicographic analysis of the time period in question, focusing not only on the history of lexicography, but on a more general history of Europe.

Other prospective research might involve an equivalent study conducted using the prefaces of major dictionaries published in these three categories in the present day. One might also consider a diachronic study of this nature, comparing the prefaces of contemporary monolingual English, monolingual French, and bilingual French-English dictionaries not only to one another, but also to their 17th century counterparts. Such research would involve noting whether changes in the structure of these prefaces over time, though undoubtedly radical in all three categories, may be more or less apparent in one of the categories in particular.

Prefaces provide a resource for understanding the views on language of the first monolingual dictionary compilers, a resource that has, as yet, been largely untapped. Understanding the ideas on language of these lexicographers provides insight into how the field of lexicography has changed and developed from their time to ours.

Bibliography

Sources on Monolingual English Lexicography

BENSON, Morton, Evelyn BENSON, and Robert ILSON (1986): *Lexicographic Description of English*, Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

BENSON, Phil (2001): *Ethnocentrism and the English Dictionary*, London and New York, Routledge.

BURCHFIELD, Robert (1985): *The English Language*, Oxford; New York, Oxford University Press.

GNEUSS, Helmut (1996): *English Language Scholarship: A Survey and Bibliography from the Beginnings to the End of the Nineteenth Century*, Binghamton, Medieval and Renaissance Texts & Studies.

HAYASHI, Tetsuro (1978): *The Theory of English Lexicography 1530-1791*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

HULBERT, James Root (1968): *Dictionaries: British and American*, London, Andre Deutsch Limited.

JACKSON, Howard (2002): *Lexicography. An Introduction*, London and New York, Routledge.

JONES, Richard Foster (1953): *The Triumph of the English Language*, London, Oxford University Press.

McARTHUR, Tom (1986): *Worlds of Reference. Lexicography, Learning and Language from the Clay Tablet to the Computer*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

MATHEWS, M. M (1966): *A Survey of English Dictionaries*, New York, Russell & Russell.

NEVALAINEN, T. (1999): 'Early Modern English Lexis and Semantics', in R. Lass (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Volume III, 1476-1776*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

OSSELTON, Noel Edward (1990): "English Lexicography from the Beginning up to and Including Johnson", *Wörterbücher. Dictionaries. Dictionnaires. Ein Internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie*, F.J. Hausmann et al. (ed), Berlin, De Gruyter, p. 1943-1953.

OSSELTON, Noel Edward (1983): "On the History of Dictionaries: The History of English Language Dictionaries", *Lexicography: Principles and Practice*, R. R. K. Hartmann (ed), London, Academic Press, p. 13-21.

PETERS, Robert A. (1966): Introduction to *A Table Alphabeticall of Hard Usual English Words (1604); the First English Dictionary* by Robert Cawdrey, Gainesville, FL, Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints.

STARNES, De Witt T., and Gertrude E. NOYES (1991): *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson 1604-1755*, Amsterdam; Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company.

WARREN, Jonathan (1997): "Reflections of an Electronic Scribe: Two Renaissance Dictionaries and Their Implicit Philosophies of Language", *Early Modern Literary Studies*, Special Issue 1 <http://purl.oclc.org/emls/si-01/si-01warren.html> accessed December 22, 2004.

WELLS, Ronald A. (1973): *Dictionaries and the Authoritarian Tradition*, The Hague, Mouton & Co.

Sources on Monolingual French Lexicography

"Bayle, Pierre", *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1979 ed., Micropædia I, p. 892.

BEAULIEUX, Charles (1967): "Histoire de la gestation de la 1re édition du Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise (1639-1694)", *Observations sur l'orthographe de la langue françoise*, Paris, Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, p. 11-89.

BENHAMOU, Simone et Eugénia ROUCHER (with the help of Jean BUFFIN) (1997): "Première édition. 1694. Épître, Préface, Privilège, Pièces annexes. Introduction et Notes", Bernard Quemada (ed.), *Les préfaces du Dictionnaire de l'Académie française: 1694-1992*, Paris, Honoré Champion, p. 7-104.

BRAY, Laurent (1990): "La lexicographie française des origines à Littré" in *Wörterbücher. Dictionaries. Dictionnaires. Ein Internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie*, F.J. Hausmann et al. (ed), Berlin, De Gruyter, p. 1788-1818.

"Chapelain, Jean", *Encyclopædia Britannica*. 1979 ed., Micropædia II, p. 744-745.

CHAURAND, Jacques (ed.) (1999): *Nouvelle histoire de la langue française*, Paris, Seuil.

CHRÉTIEN, Annie et al. (2001): "Le Projet de l'Académie française à travers les préfaces de deux éditions de son dictionnaire: 1694 et 1798", *International Journal of Lexicography*, Vol 14, no 2, p. 85-95.

COLLINOT, André (1985): "L'ouverture des dictionnaires: Remarques sur les titres et préfaces des dictionnaires français du XVII^{e} siècle" in *Lexique*, n^{o} 3, p. 11-29.

FRANCOEUR, Aline (2003): "Les discours de présentation du *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*. Échos d'une longue tradition institutionnelle", *Cahiers de lexicologie*, n^{o} 83-2, p. 57-84.

MATORÉ, Georges (1968): *Histoire des dictionnaires français*, Paris, Larousse.

QUEMADA, Bernard (1967): *Les dictionnaires du français moderne 1539-1863. Étude sur leur histoire, leurs types et leurs méthodes*, Paris, Didier.

QUEMADA, Bernard (ed.) (1997): *Les préfaces du Dictionnaire de l'Académie française: 1694-1992*, Paris, Honoré Champion.

REY, Alain (1978): *Dictionnaire d'Antoine Furetière*, Paris, SNL - Le Robert.

REY-DEBOVE, Josette (1971) : *Étude linguistique et sémiotique des dictionnaires français contemporains*, The Hague, Mouton.

SEGUIN, Jean-Pierre (1999): "La langue française aux XVII^{e} et XVIII^{e} siècles" in *Nouvelle histoire de la langue française*, Jacques Chaurand (ed), Paris, Seuil, p. 225-344.

Sources on Bilingual French-English Lexicography

ANDERSON, James David (1972): *The Development of the English-French, French-English Bilingual Dictionary: A Study in Comparative Lexicography*, Supplement to Word, Vol 28, n^{o} 3, p. 23-56.

CORMIER, Monique, C. and Aline FRANCŒUR (2002): "The Huguenot Contribution to the Rise of Bilingual (French-English) Lexicography in Europe", *Proceedings of the 3rd International Huguenot Conference*, Franschhoek, Huguenot Society of South Africa, p. 240-256.

HAUSMANN, Franz Josef (1990): "La lexicographie bilingue anglais-français, français-angalis", *Wörterbücher. Dictionaries. Dictionnaires. Ein Internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie*, F.J. Hausmann et al. (ed), Berlin, De Gruyter, p. 2956-2960.

SMALLEY, Vera (1948): *The Sources of A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues*, Baltimore, John Hopkins Press.

Other

HARTMANN, R. R. K. AND G. JAMES (1998): *Dictionary of Lexicography*, London and New York, Routledge.

HARTMANN, R. R. K. (2001): *Teaching and Researching Lexicography*, Harlow, Pearson Education.

HAUSMANN, Franz Josef (1989): "Pour une histoire de la métalexicographie", Franz Josef Hausmann et al. (ed.), *Dictionnaires. Encyclopédie internationale de lexicographie*, Part 1, Berlin/New York, Walter de Gruyter, p. 216-224.

ZGUSTA, Ladislav (1971): *Manual of Lexicography*, The Hague; Paris, Mouton.

ZGUSTA, Ladislav (1988): *Lexicography Today. An Annotated Bibliography of the Theory of Lexicography*, Tübingen, Max Niemeyer.

Dictionaries (In order of publication)

Monolingual English Dictionaries

CAWDREY, Robert (1604): *A Table Alphabeticall, conteyning and teaching the true writing, and understanding of hard usuall English wordes, borrowed from the Hebrew, Greeke, Latine, or French. &. With the interpretation thereof by plaine English words, gathered for the benefit & helpe of Ladies, Gentlewomen, or any other unskillful persons. Whereby they may the more easilie and better understand many hard English wordes, which they shall heare or read in Scriptures, Sermons, or elsewhere, and also be made able to use the same aptly themselves*, At London, Printed by I.R. for Edmund Weaver, & are to be sold at his shop at the great North doore of Paules Church.

BULLOKAR, John (1616): *An English Expositor: Teaching the interpretation of the hardest words used in our Language. With sundry explications, Descriptions, and Discourses*, London, Printed by Iohn Legatt.

COCKERAM, Henry (1637): *The English Dictionarie: or, An Interpreter of hard English Words. Enabling as well Ladies and Gentlewomen, young Schollers, Clerkes, Merchants; as also strangers of any Nation, to the understanding of the more difficult Authors already printed in our Language, and the more speedie attaining of an elegant perfection of the English tongue, both in reading, speaking, and writing*, London, Printed by I.H. for Edmund Weaver, and are to be sold at the Greyhound in S. Pauls Church-yard.

BLOUNT, Thomas (1656): *Glossographia, or a Dictionary, Interpreting all such Hard Words, Whether Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, French, Teutonick, Belgick, British or Saxon; as are now used in our refined English Tongue. Also the Terms of*

Divinity, Law, Physick, Mathematicks, Heraldry, Anatomy, War, Musick, Architecture; and of several other Arts and Sciences Explicated. With Etymologies, Definitions, and Historical Observations on the same. Very useful for all such as desire to understand what they read, London, Printed by Tho. Newcomb, and are to be sold by Humphrey Moseley, at the Prince's Arms in St. Pauls Church-yard, and George Sawbridge at the Bible on Ludgate-hil.

PHILLIPS, Edward (1658): *The New World of English Words: or, a General Dictionary: Containing the Interpretations of such hard words as are derived from other Languages; whether Hebrew, Arabick, Syriack, Greek, Latin, Italian, French, Spanish, British, Dutch, Saxon, &c. their Etymologies and perfect Definitions: Together with All those Terms that relate to the Arts and Sciences; whether Theologie, Philosophy, Logick, Rhetorick, Grammer, Ethicks, Law, Natural History, Magick, Physick, Chirurgery, Anatomy, Chimistry, Botanicks, Mathematicks, Arithmetick, Geometry, Astronomy, Astrology, Chiromancy, Physiognomy, Navigation, Fortification, Dialling, Surveying, Musick, Perspective, Architecture, Heraldry, Curiosities, Mechanicks, Statisticks, Merchandize, Jewelling, Painting, Graving, Husbandry, Horsemanship, Hawking, Hunting, Fishing, &c. To which are added The significations of Proper Names, Mythology, and Poetical Fictions, Historical Relations, Geographical Descriptions of most Countries and Cities of the World; especially of these three Nations wherein their cheifest Antiquities, Battles, and other most Memorable Passages are mentioned; as also all other Subjects that are useful, and appertain to our English Language. A Work very necessary for Strangers, as well as our own Countrymen, for all Persons that would rightly understand what they discourse, write, or read*, London, Printed by E. Tyler, for Nath. Brooke at the Sign of the Angel in Cornhill.

COLES, Elisha (1676): *An English Dictionary: Explaining The difficult Terms that are used in Divinity, Husbandry, Physick, Phylosophy, Law, Navigation, Mathematicks, and other Arts and Sciences. Containing many Thousands of Hard Words (and many proper names of Places) more than are in any other English Dictinary or Expositor. Together with The Etymological Derivation of them from their proper Fountains, whether Hebrewm Greek, Laitn, French, or any other Language. In a Method more comprehensive, than any that is extant*, London, Printed for Samuel Crouch, at the Corner Shop of Popes-bend Aly, on the right hand next Cornhill.

Monolingual French Dictionaries

RICHELET, Pierre (1680): *Dictionnaire Francois, contenant les mots et les choses, plusieurs nouvelles remarques sur la langue francoise: Ses Expressions Propres, Figurées et Burlesques, la Prononciation des Mots les plus difficiles, le Genre des Noms, le Regime des Verbes: Avec Les Termes les plus connus des Arts & des Sciences. Le tout tiré de l'usage et des bons auteurs de la langue francoise*, A Geneve, Chez Jean Herman Widerhold.

FURETIÈRE, Antoine (1690): *Dictionaire Universel, Contenant generalement les Mots François tant vieux que modernes, & les Termes de toutes les Sciences et des Arts, Sçavoir La Philosophie, Logique, et Physique; la Medecine, ou Anatomie; Pathologie, Terapeutique, Chirurgie, Pharmacopée, Chymie, Botanique, ou l'Histoire naturelle des Plantes, & celle des Animaux, Mineraux, Metaux & Pierreries, & les noms des Drogues artificielles:La Jurisprudence Civile & Canonique, Feodale & Municipale, & sur tout celle des Ordonnances: Les Mathematiques, la Geometrie, l'Arithmetique, & l'Algebre; la Trigonometrie, Geodesie, ou l'Arpentage, & les Sections coniques; l'Astronomie, l'Astrologie, la Gnomonique, la Geographie; la Musique, tant en theorie qu'en pratique, les Instrumens à vent & à cordes; l'Optique, Catoptrique, Dioptrique, & Perspective; l'Architecture civile et militaire, la Pyrothechnie, Tactique, & Statique: Les Arts, la Rhetorique, la Poësie, la Grammaire, la Peinture, Sculpture, &c. la Marine, le Manege, l'Art de faire des armes, le Blason, la Venerie, Fauconnerie, la Pesche, l'Agriculture, ou Maison Rustique, & la plus-part des Arts mechaniques: Plusieurs termes de Relations d'Orient & d'Occident, la qualité des Poids, Mesures & Monnoyes; les Etymologies des mots, l'invention des choses, & l'Origine de plusieurs Proverbes, & leur relation à ceux des autres Langues: Et enfin les noms des Auteurs qui ont traitté des matieres qui regardent les mots, expliquez avec quelques Histoires, Curiositez naturelles, & Sentences morales, qui seront rapportées pour donner des exemples de phrases & de constructions. Le tout extrait des plus excellens Auteurs anciens et modernes*, A La Haye, et a Rotterdam, Chez Arnout & Reinier Leers.

ACADÉMIE FRANÇAISE (1694): *Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie Françoise, Dedié au Roy*. A Paris, Chez la Veuve de Jean Baptiste Coignard, Imprimeur ordinaire du Roy, & de l'Académie Françoise, ruë S. Jacques, à la Bible d'Or: et Chez Jean Baptiste Coignard, Imprimeur & Libraire ordinaire du Roy, & de l'Académie Françoise, ruë S. Jacques, prés S. Severin, au Livre d'Or.

Bilingual French-English Dictionaries

COTGRAVE, Randle (1611): *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues*, London, Printed by Adam Islip.

MIÈGE, Guy (1677): *A New Dictionary French and English, With Another English and French; According to the Present Use, and Modern Orthography of the French. Inrich'd With New Words, Choice Phrases, and Apposite Proverbs; Digested Into a most Accurate Method; And Contrived For the Use both of English and Foreiners*, London, Printed by Tho. Dawks, for Thomas Basset, at the George, near Clifforss-Inn, in Fleetstreet.

MIÈGE, Guy (1679): *A Dictionary of Barbarous French. Or, A Collection, By way of Alphabet, of Obsolete, Provincial, Mis-spelt, and Made Words in French. Taken out of Cotgrave's Dictionary, With some Additions. A Work much desired, and now performed, For the Satisfaction of such as Read Old French*, London, Printed by J.C. for Thomas Basset, at the Sign of the George near Clifford's-Inne, in Fleetstreet.

MIÈGE, Guy (1688): *The Great French Dictionary. In Two Parts. The First, French and English; According to the Ancient and Modern Orthography. Wherein Each Language is Set forth in its Greatest Latitude: The Various Senses of Words, both Proper and Figurative, Are Orderly Digested; And Illustrated with Apposite Phrases, and Proverbs: The Hard Words Explained; And the Proprieties Adjusted. To Which are Prefixed The Grounds of Both Languages, in Two Grammatical Discourses; The One English, and the Other French*, London, Printed by J. Redmayne, for Tho. Basset, at the George near St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet-Street.

BOYER, Abel (1699): The Royal Dictionary. In Two Parts. First, French and English. Secondly, English and French. The French taken out of the Dictionaries of Richelet, Furetiere, Tachart, the Great Dictionary of the French-Academy, and the Remarks of Vaugelas, Menage, and Bouhours. And, The English Collected chiefly out of the Best Dicitonaries, and the Works of the Greatest Masters of the English Tongue; such as Archbishop Tillotson, Bishop Sprat, Sir Roger L'Estrange, Mr. Dryden, Sir William Temple, &c. For the Use of His Highness the Duke of Glocester, London, Printed for R. Clavel, H. Mortlock, S. Lowndes, J. Robinson, D. Brown, W. Hensman, S. Crouch, E. Evets, j. Laurence, R. Sare, A. Churchill, S. Smith, L. Meredith, J. Taylor, F. Saunders, T. Bennet, J. Knapton, J. Wyat, E. Castle, D. Midwinter.