Academy Dictionaries 1600–1800

JOHN CONSIDINE

ACADEMY DICTIONARIES 1600–1800

This is the first unified history of the large, prestigious dictionaries of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, compiled in academies, which set out to glorify living European languages. The tradition began with the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* (1612) in Florence and the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1694) in Paris, and spread across Europe – to Germany, Spain, England, Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands, Portugal, and Russia – in the eighteenth century, engaging students of language as diverse as Leibniz, Samuel Johnson, and Catherine the Great. All the major academy and academy-style dictionaries of the period up to 1800, published and unpublished, are discussed in a single narrative, bridging national and linguistic boundaries, to offer a history of lexicography on a European scale. Like John Considine's *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2008), this study treats dictionaries both as physical books and as ambitious works of the human imagination.

JOHN CONSIDINE is Professor of English at the University of Alberta, Canada. He is author of *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe: Lexicography and the Making of Heritage* (Cambridge, 2008) and is co-editor, with Sylvia Brown, of *The Ladies Dictionary (1694)* (2010).

ACADEMY DICTIONARIES 1600–1800

JOHN CONSIDINE

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107071124

© John Considine 2014

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2014

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays, St Ives plc

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
Considine, John (John P.)
Academy dictionaries 1600–1800 / John Considine.
pages cm
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-107-07112-4 (hardback)
1. Lexicography–Europe–History–17th century. 2. Lexicography–Europe–History–18th century. 3. Encyclopedias and dictionaries–Europe–History and criticism. 4. Learned institutions and societies–Europe–History–17th century. 5. Learned institutions and societies–Europe–History–18th century. I. Title.
P327.45.E85C65 2014
413.094–dc23
2014004087

ISBN 978-1-107-07112-4 hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

For my mother

Contents

Acknowledgements *page* viii
Conventions x

1 Introduction 1

2 The beginnings of the academy tradition: the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* 9

3 The making of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*, and its seventeenth-century rivals 28

4 The *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* from its publication to the end of the eighteenth century 51

5 The Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft and its offshoots in Germany and Denmark from the 1640s to the mid eighteenth century 73

6 The academy tradition from the seventeenth century to 1750: England, Brandenburg/Prussia, and Spain 99

7 Samuel Johnson and Johann Christoph Adelung 121

8 The continuing academy tradition from 1751 to 1800: the United Provinces, Russia, Portugal, Denmark, and Sweden 144

9 Afterword: the year 1800 as a turning point 167

Notes 174
Bibliography 224
Index 251

Acknowledgements

The writing of this book was supported by a research grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), for which I am most grateful. The Department of English at the University of Alberta helped me to administer this grant and provided all the institutional support I needed. At an early stage in this project, Mandy Bengts helped me to read some of the Danish and Swedish sources, and Peter Midgely helped me to read some of the Dutch sources; their work was funded by SSHRC.

I owe much to the staff of the libraries of the University of Alberta (especially the Inter-Library Loans (ILL) unit – and all the corresponding units across and beyond North America which have sent books and photocopies in response to my ILL requests), and to the British Library, the Bodleian Library (especially Alan Carter, Russell Edwards, and Jean-Pierre Mialon of Duke Humfrey's Library; and William Hodges, formerly of Duke Humfrey's), the Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek in Hannover (especially Dr Friedrich Hülsmann and Frau Anke Hölzer), and the Kongelige Bibliotek in Copenhagen. John Shoesmith, Outreach Librarian of the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library of the University of Toronto, helped me to obtain the cover image.

In order to use early books day after day, I have depended heavily on the online availability of full texts in digital facsimile. I would like to acknowledge my considerable debt to Google Books, and particularly to the cooperation between Google and the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek which has made a great many pre-1800 dictionaries from Continental Europe freely available during the period in which I have been writing. I am also indebted to the Internet Archive, to the Gallica service of the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, and to many other providers of images.

Some of the work on Leibniz presented in Chapter 5 was first presented to the Third International Conference on Historical Lexicology and Lexicography (ICHLL) and to the Eleventh International Congress

on the History of the Language Sciences; these presentations were rewritten and published as my 'Leibniz and lexicography' and 'Leibniz as lexicographer?'. The material on Matthias Moth in the same chapter was first presented to the Second ICHLL; this presentation was rewritten and published as my 'Matthias Moth and the dictionary project as cultural treasury'. All six of the conferences in the ICHLL series have enriched my understanding of lexicography, and I am indebted to many of their participants (especially Michael Adams, Fredric Dolezal, Rod McConchie, and Christopher Stray) and to their organizers: Julie Coleman; Giovanni Iamartino; Marijke Mooijaart and Marijke van der Wal; Charlotte Brewer; Bettina Bock and Maria Kozianka.

Edmund Weiner trained me as a lexicographer, and he and John Simpson encouraged me to clarify some of my very earliest ideas on the history of lexicography. I have valued their friendship and support, and that of many other colleagues at the *Oxford English Dictionary*, with whom I have discussed many lexicographical problems over the years: I am particularly conscious of my debt to Philip Durkin, Anthony Esposito, Peter Gilliver, and Samantha Schad. Konrad Koerner and Toon Van Hal have helped me to see a wider context for my work in the history of the language sciences, and Ann Blair and Bill Sherman have helped me think about its context in the history of information.

I am grateful to Linda Bree of Cambridge University Press for her support, and to two anonymous readers for the Press who commented thoughtfully on the penultimate draft of the book.

Since my last book was published, two of my teachers have died: Robin Robbins, who was my supervisor at Oxford, and my father. My work on this book owes much to them, and to other teachers, particularly Tony Cockshut, the Reverend Michael Screech, and Andrew Wilson. It has taken its deepest life from the love and support of my family, especially Sylvia and Nicholas, and my mother, to whom it is dedicated with love.

Conventions

Transcriptions from pre-modern texts, including the titles of books, are as far as possible in unmodernized spelling: hence, for instance, my consistent reference to the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (the form *française* has only appeared on the title page of this dictionary since 1835). Diacritics are reproduced as in the original texts, with the exception of those in Latin. Superscript *e* in German and Swedish is normalized to umlaut; *æ* and *œ* in Latin to *ae* and *oe*; *&* in Latin and French to *et*. Square brackets in originals have been normalized to round brackets. Ellipses in quotations are my own unless otherwise indicated; italics in quotations are always in the original. Translations are my own unless otherwise indicated.

A number of quotations are from the unpaginated preliminaries of early printed books. These are given by signature, a system with which some but not all readers of this book will be familiar. If, for instance, the first gathering of four leaves in a book is unpaginated, but the second leaf has the letter A and the number 2 (or ii, or ij) printed at its foot, a quotation from the recto of that leaf will be identified as from sig. A2r, and a quotation from the verso of the last unpaginated leaf will be identified as from sig. A4v. Preliminary gatherings are sometimes identified by a typographical symbol rather than a letter, and so I give some references in forms like sig. *3r or sig.)(2v. Where preliminary gatherings are unsigned, it is sometimes possible to supply a signature: an unsigned gathering before gathering B is gathering [A]. Otherwise, the first gathering is conventionally assigned the signature π. So, when a footnote identifies a passage as, for instance, from sigs.)( )(3r–4v of a given book, this is not a typesetting error: the second gathering of the book is not paginated, but its leaves are marked with a signature of two back-to-back pairs of parentheses, and the footnote refers to a passage which begins on the recto of the third leaf of this gathering and ends on the verso of the fourth leaf.

Spellings of British proper names generally follow the forms given in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; spellings of others generally

follow those in E. F. K. Koerner's *Universal Index of Biographical Names in the Language Sciences*. Consistency in the spelling of proper names is notoriously unattainable, and I have tried to avoid pedantry: so, for instance, at one point in my text Catherine the Great (whom I was unwilling to call Ekaterina Velikaya) and Princess Ekaterina Dashkova (whom I had no intention of calling Catherine Dashkova) come into contact.

I have regularly consulted the standard biographical dictionaries and the online British Book Trade Index for personal information; the *Oxford English Dictionary* and the other standard dictionaries of European languages for lexical information; and the standard bibliographies and online library catalogues (especially the English Short Title Catalogue, COPAC, WorldCat, and the catalogues available through the Karlsruhe Virtueller Katalog) for bibliographical information. I have only indicated my use of such sources where it seemed strictly necessary.

In the bibliography, the alternative availability of printed sources online or in printed facsimile form has been indicated only occasionally, in the case of a few texts of which originals are particularly hard to find. I have inevitably consulted reproductions of many early books, and multiple reproductions of some, as well as handling many originals, and I have seen no value in pointing this out case by case, particularly since the availability of online reproductions changes from year to year (and even from day to day). Alphabetization in the bibliography ignores diacritics.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

'Nous nous étonnames, de voir l'Abada': a dictionary reader at work

'Nous nous étonnames, de voir l'Abada', wrote Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibniz in 1696: 'We were astonished to see the rhinoceros'. What was astonishing about this rhinoceros was its place in Thomas Corneille's *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences* of 1694, and the manner of its treatment:

> A friend being with me very recently, we looked together at the Dictionary [i.e. Corneille's], together with that of the academy [i.e. the *Dictionnaire de l'Academie françoise* of the same year]. We were astonished to see the rhinoceros and certain other exotic animals extensively described, although they are objects which are never brought into conversation. Or if they are, the person who mentions them explains directly what they are. That is how all the sciences must always be introduced.[1]

Leibniz and his friend evidently expected that even a dictionary of the arts and sciences – in other words, of relatively technical vocabulary – would leave lengthy factual accounts to specialist works: the encyclopedic entry for *abada* stands out on the first page of Corneille's *Dictionnaire*, being longer than the other eight put together. They also commented on what they perceived to be the inadequacies of the main dictionary's status marking – 'one would often be very glad to know whether a word can be used without reservation, or whether it is old, low, provincial …' – on the imprecision of definitions such as that for *canapé*, and on the calumnies to be detected in Corneille's entry *Lutheriens*.[2]

Leibniz and his friend were living in a period in which lexicography was more active than it had ever been before. Antoine Furetière, writing in 1685, remarked that 'the whole literary world agrees that there cannot be too many dictionaries'.[3] Five years later, Pierre Bayle wrote that it would be difficult to count all the dictionaries, republished and original,

which had appeared in the last fifteen to twenty years.[4] A correspondent of the *Bibliothèque germanique* wrote from Leipzig in 1720 that 'an innumerable number of dictionaries' had been appearing in Germany; a writer in The Hague observed in 1754 that 'We are in the age of dictionaries.'[5] The German lexicographer Johann Leonhard Frisch wrote in the preface to his dictionary of 1741 of 'the lexicophilia, or love of lexicon-writing of so many learned people, indeed the lexicomania … of this age'.[6] Samuel Johnson, writing to the novelist and printer Samuel Richardson in 1754, the year before the publication of his own *Dictionary of the English Language*, referred to 'this age of dictionaries'.[7] The systematization of knowledge which was such an important activity from the sixteenth century onwards had by the beginning of the eighteenth century been finding expression not only in vast encyclopedic compilations such as Johann Jacob Hofmann's *Lexicon universale* of 1677 and Louis Moréri's *Grand dictionnaire historique* of 1674, but in a profusion of lexical dictionaries of ancient and modern languages.[8] The dictionaries were perhaps on a less magnificent scale than the encyclopedic works; a few years before his reading of Corneille's dictionary, Leibniz had remarked to Daniel Georg Morhof, in a survey of the desiderata of the world of learning, that we had no comprehensive dictionary, no *dictionarium absolutum*, of any living language.[9]

In his expression of the desire for such a comprehensive dictionary, and in his surprise at finding encyclopedic information in a work which was identified as *Dictionnaire* on its title page, Leibniz can be seen working out what large dictionaries of living languages might be expected to achieve. Many other learned Europeans of the two centuries in which he lived were doing likewise. The most spectacular dictionaries of sixteenth-century Europe had been of Latin and Greek; they provided a model for seventeenth-century lexicographers to register the vocabularies of their own languages far more amply than ever before. The most important early tradition of making dictionaries of living languages to develop from this model began in Tuscany towards the end of the sixteenth century, and had offshoots across Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This may be called the academy tradition, because the dictionaries which constituted it were often the work of learned bodies called academies: the Académie française is now the best known of these bodies.

The phrase *academy tradition* does not seem to be much used by historians of lexicography, though isolated instances can be found in electronic searches. Slightly better established, especially in studies of Scandinavian lexicography, is *academy principle*. The Danish form *akademiprincip* was

used as early as 1907 by Verner Dahlerup, in an article setting out the principles for what would become the Danish national dictionary, *Ordbog over det danske sprog*. There, he wrote of the *akademiprincip* that:

> The principle is that which takes its most typical expression in the French Academy dictionary, namely that the dictionary will contain only good words: it must, so to speak, be an honour for a word to find a place in the dictionary, just as it is an honour for a work of art to find a place in the national art collections.[10]

The corresponding English form *academy principle* seems to be more recent as a term of metalexicography. The linguist Einar Haugen said of Matthias Moth's great unpublished Danish dictionary (discussed in Chapter 5 below) that it included 'words from the folk dialects, thereby violating the "Academy principle"'.[11] Likewise, a recent study of a nineteenth-century Danish lexicographer explains neatly that 'Molbech's dictionary is organized according to the normative academy principle. In other words, it includes only those forms which the editor thinks can be contained within the realm of *decorum*, that is, words which do not strike one as disagreeable in relation to a cultivated literary disposition.'[12] In practice, dictionaries made by academies might include words which disagreed at least with the cultivated literary dispositions of some readers: we shall see some examples when we look at the reception of the first edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* in Chapter 4. So, rather than starting out by taking the stable existence of an academy principle for granted, this book will tell the story of the dictionaries which were produced by academies in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and of the major learned dictionaries which responded to them.

These dictionaries constitute a tradition. All of them depended on the belief that the languages or language varieties which they treated were sufficiently unified and stable to be coherent objects of study, and some of them sought to promote the continuing coherence and stability of a language. All of them registered a wide, though not comprehensive, inventory of the vocabulary in general use among people of the middling and upper social ranks. All of them were to some extent alphabetized. All of them drew to some extent on a circumscribed body of usage, as defined either by good texts or by the good judgement of lexicographers. All of them were large books or sets of books, and those which reached print were always produced with marked typographical dignity. The reader may decide whether these common features, or a subset of them, add up to an 'academy principle'. For my own part, I have come to feel considerably

more cautious about the phrase than I was when I began to write this book, although I think that the phrase 'academy tradition' is defensible.

No previous study has examined the academy tradition of lexicography as a whole, although a number of early academy dictionaries are discussed in an excellent collection of essays published in 1985, *The Fairest Flower: The Emergence of Linguistic National Consciousness in Renaissance Europe*. As the subtitle suggests, this collection was not primarily about dictionaries, and did not attempt to cover the post-Renaissance period. A recent collection, *Große Lexika und Wörterbücher Europas*, edited by Ulrike Haß, includes articles on a number of academy dictionaries, and is chronologically deeper. Neither of these very useful books, however, offers anything like a unified narrative. So, the literary historian Paul Korshin has observed, with reference to the achievement of Samuel Johnson, 'there is no comparative study about the makings of the dictionaries of the Académie française or the Accademia della Crusca or the single-scholar enterprises like the Hebrew lexicon of Johannes Buxtorf and the Greek dictionary of Henry Estienne'.[13] I have discussed the work of Henri Estienne elsewhere, and Buxtorf is beyond my scope, but this book does offer a comparative discussion of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, and Johnson's *Dictionary*, together with the other seventeenth- and eighteenth-century dictionaries in the tradition in which those three are landmarks.

Giving a picture of the development of such a large group of dictionaries and dictionary projects over two centuries has inevitably meant leaving much material lightly sketched or altogether unexplored. It has also meant working in languages of which I do not have a native-speaker command; for Russian (but only for Russian) I have had to rely on sources in other languages. On the other hand, a view of the whole academy tradition at once is worth having. It can only really be offered in a story which is told in a single voice, and which is short enough to be read from beginning to end: hence this book.

The shape of this book

The story of the academy dictionaries has a clear beginning, namely the making of the first dictionary of a European vernacular to appear under the sponsorship of, and as the work of, an academy. Its end is nearly as clear: at the end of the eighteenth century, a new kind of lexicography, conducted on historical principles and increasingly attuned to the new science of the comparative philology of the Indo-European languages,

emerged; and although dictionaries in the eighteenth-century genres continued to be compiled, the intellectual context in which they were read had changed. Given these chronological limits, the geographical scope of the story is likewise clear: academy dictionaries or dictionaries which responded to them were made or projected in France, Italy, Spain, Germany, England, Denmark, the Netherlands, Portugal, Russia, and Sweden. They were largely a western and central European phenomenon, with Russia as an outlier, and it is therefore western and central Europe which is the heartland of this book. *Academy Dictionaries 1600–1800* is not a sequel to *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, the book in which I told the story of Henri Estienne's Greek dictionary and of some of the other learned dictionaries of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but its story does follow on from that told by its predecessor. One consequence of this is that a number of endnotes in the following chapters refer back to the earlier book rather than retelling stories which were already told there.

The second chapter of this book begins in territory which overlaps with that of *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*. It discusses the origins of the modern European concept of the academy, and the development of the first academies to go by that name, those of Renaissance Italy. It then turns briefly to the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Italian debate over language, the *questione della lingua*, which led to the resolution of the members of one academy to compile a dictionary. The academy was the Accademia della Crusca in Florence, the capital of the Grand Duchy of Tuscany; its dictionary, the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca*, was published in 1612. It registered the vocabulary of the Tuscan topolect as used in literature, with particular attention to the major Florentine authors of the fourteenth century. After telling the story of the making of the *Vocabolario* and discussing its content, the chapter concludes with an overview of the three further editions which appeared in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The third and fourth chapters turn to the foundation of the Académie française in 1635, and to the long-running project which finally led to the publication of the first edition of its dictionary in 1694. This work was undertaken with the *Vocabolario* as a model, but not one to be followed slavishly: a drastic difference between the two dictionaries was the French academicians' decision to draw on their sense of good contemporary usage rather than on evidence quoted from literary authors of the recent or even the more distant past. Chapter 3 describes the making of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* and also gives an account of the two

major dictionaries of French which preceded it, those of Pierre Richelet (1680) and Antoine Furetière (1690). Chapter 4 discusses the published dictionary, with attention both to its content and to its early reception, which was not uniformly enthusiastic. It then turns to the *Dictionnaire des arts et sciences* by Thomas Corneille which accompanied it, and then to the eighteenth-century editions of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* – the last of which took into account the changes in French vocabulary and society which were experienced immediately after the French Revolution – and to two remarkable dictionary projects discussed in the Académie française in the last quarter of the eighteenth century.

The fifth chapter turns back in time, to discuss the first learned dictionary projects which responded to the *Vocabolario* and to the work of the Académie française. These took place in Germany, where the work of the pre-eminent German language academy, the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft, which was founded in 1617, led to a series of plans for German dictionaries. These plans originated in personal contact with the Accademia della Crusca and were subsequently influenced by news from the Académie française. In 1691, a member of the Gesellschaft, Kaspar Stieler, published his *Der Teutschen Sprache Stammbaum und Fortwachs*, and although the metalanguage of this dictionary was Latin, it was the fullest and most sophisticated analysis of the vocabulary of German of the seventeenth century. By this time, the Danish ballad-collector and writer on grammar Peder Syv had begun work on a dictionary project inspired by writings from the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft, and his work is commented on, as is the much greater project for a union dictionary of Danish which was undertaken by the civil servant Matthias Moth around the end of the seventeenth century. Moth's dictionary project never resulted in a publication; nor did the last to be discussed in this chapter, which was directed by Leibniz and was intended to shed light on the origins and history of the German language. Leibniz's project was probably abandoned in the second or third decade of the eighteenth century.

The sixth chapter falls into four sections. The first discusses the plans for something like an academy dictionary which were floated in England from 1660 to 1744, by persons as diverse as the virtuosi Robert Hooke and John Evelyn, and the poets Ambrose Philips and Alexander Pope. All of these appear to have been directly or indirectly inspired by the *Vocabolario della Crusca* and the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. The second section gives a brief account of an English dictionary in the tradition of Corneille's *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*, the *Cyclopaedia; or, An universal dictionary of arts and sciences* of Ephraim Chambers, published in

1728. The third turns, again briefly, to Brandenburg, where the Societät der Wissenschaften, founded in Berlin in 1700 under the inspiration of Leibniz, promoted more than one abortive dictionary project in the first two decades of the century. The last section of the chapter discusses a project which was actually realized, turning to Spain, where the Real Academia Española was founded in 1713 and produced a major dictionary between 1726 and 1739, rich in quotations from canonical authors. This was the third academy dictionary to see the light of day. The chapter ends by taking stock of the academy tradition at mid-century.

The seventh turns to two single-authored dictionaries in the academy tradition. The first of these is the *Dictionary of the English Language* of Samuel Johnson, published in 1755. A specimen entry from the dictionary is presented and commented on, after which Johnson's preliminary statements of lexicographical principles are discussed, followed by the making, structure, and reception of the dictionary itself. The emphasis throughout is on Johnson's relationship with the *Vocabolario della Crusca* and the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. Two German dictionaries, those of Matthias Kramer and Johann Leonhard Frisch, are then discussed as predecessors to the second single-authored dictionary in the academy tradition, that of J. C. Adelung. The chapter ends by turning full circle, with an overview of Adelung's criticisms of Johnson's *Dictionary*.

The eighth chapter takes up the story of the eighteenth-century academy dictionaries, beginning with the Netherlands, where abortive dictionary projects associated with the Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde, on which work took place between the 1760s and the 1790s, were succeeded at the very end of the century by a single-authored dictionary like those of Johnson and Adelung. It proceeds to Russia, where a grand polyglot dictionary project of the 1780s took place against the background of the founding of the Russian Academy in 1783 and its production of a dictionary between 1789 and 1794; to Portugal, where the Academia Real das Ciências was founded in 1779 and produced the first volume of a dictionary in 1793; to Denmark, where an academy was founded in 1742 and likewise produced the first volume of a dictionary in 1793; and to Sweden, where the Swedish Academy was founded in 1786 and immediately undertook a dictionary project, which soon lapsed. The chapter concludes with an overview of the academy tradition as it stood at the end of the eighteenth century.

The ninth and final chapter gives a brief sketch of the later fortunes of the main dictionary projects surveyed in this book, and explains why the book ends where it does.

Broken down like this, this book inevitably looks rather bibliographical. So it must: dictionaries are books, and a story about dictionaries is a story about books. The ones discussed here were often big, heavy, and expensive, and an account which treated them as weightless texts rather than as weighty things would be impoverished. Not the least notable of the tensions in Johnson's *Dictionary* was that between its own weight as paper and its integrity as a book: 'few copies', Johnson's bibliographer remarks, 'survive in booksellers' boards, and all such have restored spines, for when standing upright, the contents are too heavy for the binding cords'.[14] Thinking about dictionaries as books is part of thinking about their place in the human hands of their readers and their makers. And thinking of them in human hands is part of thinking of them in human lives. The dictionaries which I discuss expressed the ideas of their sponsors and their makers, and although some of them were presented as impersonal authorities, the works of academies rather than of people, they were all personal documents. If we hold the handsome pages of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* up to the light, we can see people moving behind them, the makers of the dictionary, perhaps in one of the unpleasant meetings of the early 1680s:

> He who shouts the loudest is right; each makes a long speech over the smallest trifle. One man repeats like an echo what the last speaker has said, and most often, three or four of them talk together. When a subcommittee is made up of five or six people, one of them reads the entry out, one gives his opinion, two converse, one sleeps, and one passes the time by reading some dictionary which is on the table …[15]

A story about dictionaries is a story about books, but it is also, most importantly, a story about people.

CHAPTER 2

The beginnings of the academy tradition
The Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca

A remarkable dictionary entry

In 1612, the members of a Florentine society called the Accademia della Crusca undertook a risky publication. This was a dictionary on a very large scale, normative in tone, and richly illustrated with quotations from canonical literary authors of the past, pre-eminent among whom were the so-called *Tre corone*: Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio. The dictionary was not therefore a dictionary of all Italian, but of the Tuscan topolect as used in Florentine literature of the fourteenth century. Its title was *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca*. A sample entry gives a sense of what its makers achieved; this one stands at the mid-point of the dictionary, at the end of page 480 of the 960 pages of entries:

> LENTO. Tardo, agiato, pigro. Lat. *lentus*, *tardus*. Bocc. n. 27. 43. La donna, che altro non desideraua, non fu lenta, in questo, ad ubbidire il marito. E introd. n. 36. Perchè più pigre, e lente alla nostra salute, ec. E g. 6. p.1. Alquanto, con lento passo, dal bel poggio, su per la rugiada spaziandosi. Dan. Par. c. 13. Per farsi muouer lento, com' huom lasso. E Inf. 17. Ella sen ua notando lenta lenta. Petr. Son. 178. Caccio con un bue zoppo, infermo, e lento. E canz. 16. Quando cade dal Ciel più lenta pioggia (cioè piccola, e leggieri) ¶ Per metaf. Cr. 9. 104. 4. Si ponga a fuoco lento, in un paiulo, e, senza bollire, si scaldi. E LENTO contrario di TIRATO.

The headword of this entry is set off typographically, in small capitals. Three vernacular equivalents follow: *lento* 'slow' may be equivalent to *tardo* 'slow', *agiato* 'at ease', or *pigro* 'slow, unwilling'. Next come two Latin equivalents, *lentus* and *tardus*. A series of quotations from the *Tre corone* and others follows.[1] Three are from Boccaccio's *Decameron*: 'The lady, who desired nothing better, was in this not slow to obey her husband' (Day Three, Story Seven); 'why are we more sluggish, and slow to provide for our own safety?' (Day One, Introduction); 'gently sauntering, across the dewy mead some distance from the beautiful hill' (Day

Six, Introduction). Then comes one from Dante's *Paradiso* 13.113, 'to make thee slow in motion, as a weary man', and one from the *Inferno* 17.115, 'onward he goeth, swimming slowly, slowly'. Then there are two quotations from Petrarch: *Rime* 212.8, 'I pursue with a lame, sick, slow ox' and 66.12, 'When there falls from the sky the gentlest rain'. A quotation from the agricultural writer Piero de' Crescenzi illustrates a metaphorical sense: a *fuoco lento* is a slow fire, on which one can warm something without boiling it. Finally, the antonym *tirato* is given.

The richness of this entry in the *Vocabolario* can be appreciated by comparing it with the entry closest to it in the alphabetical sequence of the only monolingual general-purpose dictionary of English to have been published by 1612, Robert Cawdrey's *Table alphabeticall* of 1604: '*lenitie*, gentlenes, mildnes'. More elaborate than Cawdrey's *Table* was the Dutch–Latin *Etymologicum* of Cornelis Kiliaan, of which the third edition was published in 1599. Its first entry in the range *len-* was '*Lende*. Lumbus. *ger, lende: ang. loyne*'. Likewise, in the leading French dictionary of the day, Jean Nicot's *Thresor de la langue francoyse* of 1606, the entry for the French cognate of *lento* is '*Qui est* Lent *de nature,* Cunctans, Lentus'. The leading Spanish dictionary, the *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española* of Sebastián de Covarrubias Horozco, published in 1611, did not register Spanish *lenta*, the cognate of Italian *lento* and French *lent*: the nearest entry in its alphabetical sequence was:

> LENTEJA, legumbre conocida del nombre latino lens, tis. En su pasto y comida se figura la virtud de la templança, por quanto los pobres se contentauan antiguamente con el puchero delas lentejas. Delas calidades desta legumbre, veras a Dioscorides, libr. 2. cap. 98, y alli a Laguna. Huuo en Roma vn linage de los Lentulos, dichos assi porque los antiguos criauan en sus campos las lentejas.

This is an encyclopedic entry, giving us the Latin name for the lentil, its connection with temperance (it was food for the poor), a reference to Dioscorides' treatment of its qualities, and the remark that the Roman family of the Lentuli took their name from the growing of lentils.

The *Vocabolario della Crusca* seems almost to come from another world than the encyclopedic work of Covarrubias, focussed away from vernacular usage as the latter is, let alone from the style of its terse French and Germanic contemporaries. Why was Italian monolingual lexicography so much further advanced in the first quarter of the seventeenth century than that of English, Dutch, French, or Spanish, and why, in particular, was the *Vocabolario* such a sophisticated dictionary? An answer to the first question is that the study of the vernacular in sixteenth-century Italy had

been carried out in ways which encouraged the making of good dictionaries. An answer to the second is that the Accademia della Crusca turned out to be very well suited to the making of dictionaries, both on account of its collective qualities as an institution and on account of the personal qualities of a couple of its leading members. In order to understand the *Vocabolario*, we must now turn to the history of the study of the Italian language, and to the history of academies, before returning to the dictionary itself.

The study of the Italian language in the sixteenth century

The story of the study of Italian in Italy begins with the famous *questione della lingua*. As other vernaculars developed high-prestige varieties, which could be measured against classical Latin in bilingual dictionaries and translations, and were used in government as well as in literature, a number of users of the vernaculars of the Italian peninsula sought to assert the status of their own language. This called for the development of a standard; so did the extensive printing of vernacular texts, which could readily be disseminated across the Italian peninsula in their printed form, and needed therefore to be intelligible to readers throughout the area.[2] In other countries, there was relatively little doubt as to the most prestigious variety: in France, that of Paris, which was the seat of government; in Spain, the Castilian of the royal court at Toledo (the capital was only moved to Madrid in 1561); in England, the language of the London chancery, reinforced by the concentration of printing in London and nearby Westminster and the importance of Bible translations reflecting the usage of London and its environs; in Germany, the usage of chancelleries in the High German dialect area, and of Luther's Bible translation; in Denmark and in Sweden, similar situations.[3] There would, therefore, be no serious debate in these countries as to which variety of the national language should be the basis of the standard language. But in sixteenth-century Italy, although there was a sense of Italian national identity, there was neither a single administrative centre nor – as in Germany – a widely distributed Bible translation to provide a standard.[4] Latin had even more extensive high-status functions in Italy than in other countries, and Italian Latinists had good reason to feel proprietorial about it; so it was that in the course of the century, 'the vernacular made progress in all fields' but 'in bulk what was written in Italian still amounted to less than what was written in Latin'.[5] The development of a prestige variety of the vernacular therefore took place under the shadow of Latin.

There were three basic models for the development of such a variety.[6] The first, whose best-known proponent was the Venetian poet and literary theorist Pietro Bembo, called for an archaizing return to the usage of the fourteenth-century Florentine classics, especially the *Tre corone*. (Tuscan had changed slowly enough over time for this to be a reasonable proposition; nobody could realistically have proposed that sixteenth-century English or French should draw on fourteenth-century models.) The second called for the eclectic adoption of courtly usage from contemporary Italy: *lingua cortigiana*, or *lingua commune italiana*. The third called for the adoption of contemporary Florentine usage. The debate as to which of these would provide the best standard for the Italian language was conducted with considerable learning. One necessary contribution to the debate was the codification of grammar, undertaken in a number of works, including Bembo's influential *Prose della volgar lingua* (begun before 1512 and published in 1525), and another was the codification of vocabulary: the making of Italian dictionaries.[7] These, if they were to register the whole of the vocabulary of the preferred variety of the language with attention to the senses and contexts in which a word had been used by preferred writers, needed to be wide-ranging and sophisticated. One reason, then, why vernacular lexicography in Italy was more advanced than in England, the Low Countries, or France is that the particular circumstance of the *questione della lingua* led to a perceived need for the codification of vocabulary which was not closely paralleled outside Italy.

The makers of the Italian dictionaries of the sixteenth century had to draw on the work of predecessors: elaborate dictionaries are always the products of tradition as well as of innovation. In this case, the obvious tradition to which to turn was that of the lexicography of classical Latin. Dictionaries of Latin provided a model for the (ideally) exhaustive documentation of the vocabulary of a literary language, in which each word would be defined and each phrase or idiom would be illustrated by a precisely documented quotation from a canonical text – in the case of a dictionary of classical Latin, all the texts would be many centuries old, and in the case of a sixteenth- or seventeenth-century dictionary of Tuscan, the most prestigious texts would be about three centuries old.[8] A new generation of Latin dictionaries had evolved in the first half of the sixteenth century, one key figure in their development being the French printer and scholar Robert Estienne, to whom we shall return at the beginning of the next chapter.[9] His work, achieved in the first half of the century in the form of the successive editions of his *Dictionarium, seu Latinae linguae thesaurus* and a number of offshoots, had been widely disseminated, not

least in an Italian printing of the *Dictionarium* edited by the humanist Mario Nizzoli.[10] Nizzoli's own often-reprinted dictionary of the vocabulary of Cicero, which was independent from Estienne's dictionaries, was, like the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, a normative work based on a selective body of good usage.[11] The entry *lentus* from the *Nizolius, sive Thesaurus Ciceronianus* of 1576 reads as follows:

> LENTVS, a, um. *tardus*, *frigidus*, *remissus*. I. C. 109 a, Hos ego non tam milites acres, quam inficiatores lentos esse arbitror. de Cl. 180 b, Lentus in dicendo, ac pene frigidus.
>
> ¶ *Simplex*. de Orat. 134b, Vir patiens ac lentus.
>
> ¶ *Productus*. Att. 8b, Teneri Syllani lentum negocium.

Here, after the feminine and neuter endings of the adjective, three synonyms are offered, and the word is illustrated from four passages in Cicero, the latter two making the contrast, which does not translate well into English, between its use after the noun (*vir lentus*, 'a slow man') and before it (*lentum negocium*, 'slow business').

Latin dictionaries such as Nizzoli's provided the model for a largely monolingual Italian tradition of dictionaries prior to the *Vocabolario della Crusca*.[12] This reached its climax in the *Memoriale della lingua* of Giacomo Pergamino, first published in 1602, and here cited from the second edition, of 1617. The debt of the structure of the entry, and its typographical expression, to the Latin tradition is clear:

> LENTO. Pigro, Tardo, Negligente. *Lentus*, *Tardus*. Non fù LENTA in questo d'vbbidire al Marito. 27. 6. in fi. Non fù LENTO, à tirar fuori la spada. Filoc. 85. Questi non fù LENTO: accostossi. N. A. 99. Con LENTO passo si misero per vn Giardino. P. 2. 7. 1. Con LENTO passo sen'andauiono. 10.2.2.11. in p. P. della 21.
>
> LENTO, LENTO, Pian piano, Passo Passo.

Here, Italian and Latin glosses similar to those which would be provided in the *Vocabolario della Crusca* are followed by a shorter version of what would appear as the *Vocabolario*'s first quotation from the *Decameron*; then one from Boccaccio's *Filocalo*; and then one from a thirteenth-century text in the collection *Novelle antiche*, all three illustrating exactly the same idiom (*non fù lenta/lento*, 'she/he was not slow'); then two from the *Decameron*, both illustrating the phrase *con lento passo* 'with a slow pace'. The idiom *lento, lento* 'slowly, slowly' is recorded, but without an authority. The use of *lento* in *lento fuoco* 'slow/gentle fire' is noted under *fuoco*, and is not cross-referenced here. Pergamino's reliance upon classical Florentine texts rather than examples of more recent usage is evident.

He had, as can readily be seen, taught the makers of the *Vocabolario della Crusca* much, but his *Memoriale* is, in this entry, inferior to the *Vocabolario* in its choice and referencing of quotations.[13] It is also much less ample: the second edition of the *Memoriale* runs to 609 numbered pages (and an extensive index, since its headwords are arranged in a semi-etymological order rather than an alphabetical one, a point to which we will return below), with fewer entries per page than the *Vocabolario*. Having said that, the prestige of the *Vocabolario* should not obscure the achievement of Pergamino's *Memoriale*, which is rightly identified in the opening essay of the standard survey of world lexicography as 'the first alphabetical defining dictionary [of a living language] in Europe compiled on the basis of an exhaustive coverage of the vocabulary'.[14]

Italian academies

Turning from linguistic ideas to the institutions best suited to putting them into lexicographical shape means turning to the story of the Italian academies. These were numerous: more than 2,200 of them are documented in the standard source, Michele Maylender's *Storia delle accademie d'Italia*, though some of his entries are for short-lived or informally constituted groups. They were also diverse: some academies had as their objects the making of pageants, or feasting, or the playing of card-games, while others concerned themselves with Latin and Greek, or archaeology, or natural history.[15] Similar kinds of society developed in a number of different urban cultures in later medieval Europe.[16] However, the use of the word *academy*/*académie*/*academia*/*accademia* reflects a specifically Italian kind of development, which was to be widely influential, and it was in academies in the Italian tradition that lexicography was to be cultivated. The original Academia had been the gymnasium outside Athens where Plato taught; its name was taken by Cicero as a name for the estate where he wrote his *Academica*, and as a name for his Tusculan villa. At least seven senses of *academia*, springing from these classical origins, are said to be distinguishable in Quattrocento Florentine sources alone, although they tend to merge into each other.[17] For instance, *academia* could in the fifteenth century refer to a university, or a private humanist school. Moreover, and importantly, it 'was becoming a favoured word to describe a coterie dominated by one or two charismatic individuals, mainly interested in the literature and ideas of the ancient world'.[18]

The household which the Byzantine émigré Cardinal Bessarion maintained in Rome from 1443 onwards became, in the words of the historian of

the Italian Renaissance David Chambers, 'the earliest prototype of a semi-institutionalized private "academy"'.[19] Bessarion was particularly interested in collecting and editing Greek manuscripts, and Chambers adds that 'his scriptorium may perhaps have anticipated in some respects the publishing programmes of later academies'.[20] The use of the word *academia* in the circle of Bessarion to refer to an informally or semi-formally constituted group of people with an interest in the recovery of the past and in book production suggests that one line of ancestry of the fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century coteries known as academies – and hence, ultimately, of the whole academy dictionary tradition – leads back through him to the learned culture of the last Byzantine renaissance.[21] To look forward in time from the 1440s rather than back, the use of *academia* in the Bessarion circle anticipates its use, however light-hearted and however wishful, by Aldus Manutius of the intellectual circle associated with his editing and publishing workshop, his *officina*.[22] The first group of learned persons in northern Europe to be called an academy appears, like the so-called Aldine academy and perhaps in imitation of it, to have been centred on a publishing house, that of Anshelm in Hagenau; Melanchthon belonged to it.[23]

The development from informal literary circle to formally constituted academy was first fully realized with the foundation of the Academy of the Intronati in Siena in 1525. Their name means 'the stunned ones', and they affected an imperviousness to the disturbances of the time: after an earlier existence as an informal circle, the academy was formally founded in the year of the Battle of Pavia, a critical moment in the contest between Spain and France for power in Italy.[24] As well as an allusive corporate name, the Intronati had an allegorical emblem or *impresa* and a set of formal statutes, and each member had a formally assigned nickname, an academic name, by which he was identified at meetings of the academy. An interest in the Italian language, especially as a medium for poetry, is already to be observed in the Academy of Naples in the fifteenth century, and the Intronati likewise saw one of their aims as 'literary undertakings, in the vernacular as well as Greek and Latin'.[25] Fifteen years later, upon the foundation of the academy of the Infiammati in Padua, such an interest was taken further.[26] They sponsored lectures in which the use of Italian was emphasized, and one of their purposes was to edit and publish the works of members of the academy.[27] Their emblem was the body of Hercules on the funeral pyre, symbolizing 'their heroic and burning desire to purge away their mortal dross by intellectual and moral efforts and fit themselves for eternal life'.[28] The first philologically oriented academy in Florence, the

city which would be the home of the Accademia della Crusca, was formed when, in 1541, Cosimo de' Medici, the duke of Tuscany, reconstituted the recently founded Accademia degli Umidi as the Accademia Fiorentina, with the cultivation of the Italian language as one of its explicitly stated aims.[29] (The interests of the Accademia were, however, wide-ranging: in the words of the historian Eric Cochrane, it 'sponsored lectures on genetics, geometry, the nature of heat, and the origins of the Tuscan language', just as, in the third quarter of the seventeenth century, Leibniz's projected Societas Confessionum Conciliatrix would have promoted 'good letters, fine arts, surgery, medicine, manufacturing, and commerce' and the Royal Society of London would sponsor work on the English language as well as on physics, meteorology, and population studies.)[30]

The Accademia della Crusca and the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* (1612, 1628)

Despite their interest in the vernacular, the Infiammati did not turn their efforts towards vernacular lexicography. That turn in Italian academy life was taken in Florence, partly as a result of the work of two Florentines, acquainted with each other: Vincenzio Borghini and Lionardo Salviati.[31]

Borghini was a Benedictine monk, prior of the Ospedale degli Innocenti, a position which gave him a respectable social status and put money and leisure at his disposal. His interests, like those of many sixteenth- and seventeenth-century students of the vernaculars, included natural history, archaeology, and philology. They also extended to the study and promotion of the Tuscan language. As a leisured independent scholar, he was able to build on his native-speaker knowledge through an extensive programme of reading and editing:

> Borghini's linguistic ideas and his views on textual criticism were indivisible. He read every fourteenth-century text he could find, including private letters, diaries and family account books, which might demonstrate the high quality of language used by contemporaries of Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio. His vast knowledge and familiarity with fourteenth-century usage meant that he was unrivalled in correcting textual readings. That research also gave Borghini profound insights into the development and present state of his contemporary Tuscan.[32]

In 1573, Borghini and the other members of a commission of *deputati* appointed by Cosimo de' Medici completed a censored edition of Boccaccio's *Decameron* which was published in Florence, followed the next year by a volume of *Annotationi et discorsi sopra alcuni luoghi del*

'Decameron', in which some eight hundred words and phrases are discussed, in the order in which they appear in the text.[33] In it, philological work on the language of a canonical text was carried out with an awareness of the living tradition of the language. So, for instance, Borghini found to his pleasure that the word *scretio*, which is a possible reading at one disputed point in the *Decameron*, was still in use, as he recorded in a handwritten note added to his personal copy of the printed book:

> While these *Annotations* were being written a lovely little incident took place: a doctor had refurbished the façade of his house and had incised on it certain friezes and stripes in black and white. And as we were walking along a little old lady was sending someone to the doctor's house. 'I don't know the house', he said. 'Away with you', said the old lady, 'It's that stripey one (*screziata*).'[34]

Borghini's *Annotationi* has been described as 'in effect a select and deep-probing dictionary of Tuscan usage'.[35] The book's alphabetical index certainly makes it possible to use it as a dictionary, albeit a very select one. But its real importance in the history of lexicography is as a forerunner of the *Vocabolario* of the Accademia della Crusca – into the possession of which the annotated copy of the *Annotationi* which has just been quoted was, appropriately, to pass.

Salviati was, like Borghini, a privileged person, a cadet of one of the grandest Florentine families. His progress as a man of letters started with a publication 'of which the central, obsessive theme throughout is servile adulation of the Medici'.[36] On 18 March 1564 he became a member of the Accademia Fiorentina, and in April he gave a lecture before it, an 'Oration in which it is shown that the Florentine speech and the Florentine authors are superior to all other languages, ancient and modern, and to all other authors'.[37] In it, he insisted on 'the identity of the old and modern languages, of the language of Boccaccio and the present spoken tongue of Florence'.[38] The nationalist implications of this argument are obvious, and connect it with Salviati's early flattery of the Medici. As the years went by, Salviati's approach to the language of Florentine high culture developed: 'By 1576 he had come round to Borghini's way of looking at the language as a whole, as an organic vehicle, rather than as … a contemporary *favella* which could ignore antiquity.'[39] In 1582 he produced his own edition of the *Decameron*, 'using the template of Borghini's edition', and in 1584 and 1586 he published his two-volume *Avvertimenti* on it.[40] Like Borghini's *Annotationi*, this work shows the application of great learning and accuracy to the understanding of the development of the Tuscan topolect: 'the school of historical philology initiated by Borghini and developed by his

pupil placed Italy in the vanguard of European vernacular philology'.[41] This provides us with a context for the excellence of Pergamino's *Memoriale*. It even suggests that Florentine philologists of Salviati's generation or the next might in theory have undertaken a historical lexicography in which the texts cited in each entry could be arranged chronologically, for the *Avvertimenti* begins with a bibliography of fourteenth-century 'scrittori Toscani' grouped by decade – but this step was not taken, and the beginnings of this sort of historical lexicography belong, as we shall see, to a later period.[42]

Like Borghini's work again, Salviati's *Avvertimenti* made a case for the organic relationship between the contemporary spoken language of Florence and that of the fourteenth century. Indeed, Salviati urged, the language had deteriorated since the death of Boccaccio, in large part because it had been polluted by an influx of Latinisms. The fourteenth century represented the golden age of a living national language. In the *Avvertimenti*, Salviati announced that he was compiling a 'vocabolario della toscana lingua' in which all of the words and idioms used in good authors of the period before 1400 would be gathered and explained.[43] He worked on this dictionary for many years, and it appears, despite the difficulties which his deteriorating eyesight must have caused him, to have been well advanced by the time of his death in 1589; as early as 1584, he was looking forward to its publication in the fairly near future.[44]

When lexicographers die, their unfinished dictionary projects often die with them. We will see this in Chapter 5 below, in the cases of the dictionary projects supervised by Leibniz in Germany and by Matthias Moth in Denmark. But the study of the vocabulary of Tuscan which had been undertaken by Salviati and, before him, by Borghini bore fruit after both men were dead, and this was because Salviati's project was taken over by an academy. (We may compare the dictionary project which became the *Oxford English Dictionary*: on the premature death of its first editor, Herbert Coleridge, the project survived because it was not the undertaking of Coleridge alone – nor of Coleridge's preferred successor, Frederick Furnivall, who was temperamentally unsuited to prolonged, meticulous work on a single project – but of an academic body, the Philological Society.)[45] From the early 1570s onwards a group had been gathering in the spirit of the Umidi, avoiding what Nikolaus Pevsner called the 'solemnity and pedantry' of the Accademia Fiorentina.[46] They called themselves the *brigata dei crusconi*, 'the squadron of coarse bran', by way of a pun on the name of the Accademia Fiorentina: *fiore* means 'flower' and 'flour'. Salviati joined its meetings in 1582 or 1583, and soon persuaded the other

members to found a formally constituted body, an academy. In February 1584 – the month, as it happened, in which the first volume of Salviati's *Avvertimenti* was published – the Accademia della Crusca came into being. Its name was a witty adaptation of *brigata dei crusconi*, now emphasizing purification rather than coarseness: its emblem was a *frullone*, or bolting-hutch, the device which separates good flour from bran (*crusca*). Bastiano de' Rossi, who worked closely with Salviati on the latter's 'vocabolario', was its secretary.

The codification of the vernacular soon came to interest the Accademici, no doubt as a result of the influence of Salviati, even after his departure from Florence and his death. For instance, questions of its relationship with Greek and Latin, its capacities for learned use, and the possibility of its codification were all raised in a set of propositions for discussion in 1589.[47] On 6 March 1591, the Accademici discussed the making of a dictionary, to be undertaken collaboratively and based on words extracted from the *Decameron* and the works of Dante and Petrarch.[48] The form of words in the record of this discussion is 'del modo del fare il vocabolario': *the* dictionary, not *a* dictionary. The project must therefore have been the subject of an earlier, unrecorded discussion.[49] The proceedings of its undertakers after the famous 6th of March, however, are better documented than those of most lexicographers of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, because many of their working papers are preserved in a sixteen-volume collection of materials collected in the making of the third edition of the *Vocabolario della Crusca* in 1692, and still in the keeping of the Accademia della Crusca.[50]

It is from these papers, for instance, that we know how material was divided between individual collaborators: a document of 19 February 1592 records the assignment of the 105-word range *acceffa–acquisto* to Il Rimenato (Giuliano Giraldi), the 108-word range *acquisto–adottivo* to Il Arido (Filippo de' Bardi), and so on.[51] Their early reports on their assigned ranges also survive.[52] There are small discrepancies between the ranges assigned and those reported on, but the fact that alphabetical ranges could be assigned with any degree of confidence shows, as one might have guessed, that the Accademici were working from the wordlist of a previous dictionary. The reports show that at this early stage in their proceedings, they were particularly interested in establishing the precise sense of a given word rather than illustrating it from the authorities. The gathering of illustrative material took place simultaneously with early work on definition, apparently on uniform citation slips. This was a most interesting early use of this procedure, but it was not tied to the process of the

induction of sense from quotations manipulated on slips which would be characteristic of the best nineteenth-century lexicography.[53]

In fact, a problem with one of the authorities for the dictionary became apparent at an early stage. Perceiving that the standard printed text of Dante's *Commedia* was too corrupt to be the basis for their work, the Accademici edited a new one, working from about a hundred manuscripts (forty of them in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, a library whose name is a reminder of the closeness of big Florentine cultural projects to the Medici ducal regime), and publishing their edition with impressive speed, in 1595.[54] The work of lexicography turned out, however, to be harder to undertake collaboratively than that of collation, and as work on the dictionary proceeded, there were inconsistencies among different academicians' treatments of different words. At least they had the advantage of being a coherent social group: as the American lexicographer Sidney Landau has remarked, 'dictionaries composed entirely by strangers will not be as good as dictionaries composed by people who work together and know each other'. But despite this advantage, the Accademici had different degrees of familiarity with the vernacular philology which Borghini and Salviati had developed, and no doubt different degrees of sheer talent: to quote Landau again, 'Really top-flight dictionary editors are about as rare as good poets.'[55]

At the beginning of March 1597, a small group of academicians – an inner circle of six *deputati* and an outer one of fifteen *arroti* – undertook the principal work on the dictionary, and this must have helped work to move forward purposefully and efficiently.[56] Editorial principles were developed carefully: documents of March and April 1597 show discussion of the treatment of terms of art and science, of etymologies, of proper names, and of more.[57] What is then striking is the uneven progress of work between 1597 and the completion of the dictionary in 1610–11. Specimen entries in *D*, much better documented than the first drafts in *A*, were discussed as late as June 1603.[58] After that, there are no records of sets of specimen entries being submitted for discussion, no doubt because a satisfactory methodology and format had been established, and the next seven and a half years could be spent making any necessary revisions to entries in *A–D* and editing those in *E–Z*: ranges respectively corresponding to 310 and 650 folio pages in the published *Vocabolario*. The availability of Pergamino's *Memoriale* after 1602 must have been helpful.

The dictionary was published in 1612 as the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca*. Its first readers will have been struck, as soon as they took the volume in their hands, by its physical grandeur: this was a big, handsome

folio, with the badge of the Accademia proudly displayed on its title page. A glance at its main text showed entries in double columns, lemmata set off in small capitals and Latin picked out in italic type, each page structured by double box rules around the edge of the text-block and between the columns. This was a very long way, in typographical terms, from the workmanlike pages of Kiliaan or the more elegant but unimposing ones of Nicot. Any dictionary-maker who sought to emulate the *Vocabolario* over the next two hundred years – and this meant any dictionary-maker in what would become the academy tradition – would need to take its physical presentation into account.

The 960 folio pages of its main sequence of entries registered 24,595 lemmata.[59] They were presented in a single alphabetical sequence, with only trivial exceptions: for instance, the entry for the usual diminutive of *orfano* 'orphan', namely *orfanino*, is followed by the undefined synonym *orfanello*, which would precede it in strict alphabetical order. This was not the only way in which a major dictionary could have been arranged. As we have seen, Pergamino's *Memoriale* was arranged in a semi-etymological sequence, in which roots were alphabetized, but derivatives and compounds were placed immediately after their respective roots.[60] This had been the arrangement of two extremely prestigious classical dictionaries: the *Latinae linguae thesaurus* of Robert Estienne, of which the definitive edition had been published in 1543, and the *Thesaurus graecae linguae* of Henri Estienne, published in 1572.[61] It had significant advantages, among them its abilities to give some historical sense of the development of groups of words and to show off the productivity of the language being documented. These were balanced by the difficulty of using the dictionary: a reader of the *Memoriale* in search of *allentare* 'slacken, relent' would find it treated under *lento* 'slow', either by following a cross-reference from its place in the main alphabetical sequence or by going straight to the alphabetical index – either way, the word would be found, but only by looking in two places in the dictionary rather than one. Nor could a reader always be confident of finding a word by guessing its root: *allenire* 'assuage, relent' was treated at *all-* rather than at *len-*. The full alphabetization approached by the *Vocabolario della Crusca* turned out to be the most efficient model for large printed dictionaries, but, as we shall see, the desirability of this model was debated by academicians from France to Russia, and it took nearly two hundred years to be universally adopted.

After its preface, the *Vocabolario della Crusca* had a bibliography of works cited; there was an alphabetical table of the Latin glosses at the end of the volume. Lemmata were explained with definitions rather than simple

equivalents. Etymologies were not systematically provided, although in many cases the Latin gloss was the etymon anyway; the decision of 1597 had been that the criteria for including etymological information should be attractiveness and importance, and these criteria are too vague and subjective for practical use.[62] Technical terms were sparsely represented, and encyclopedic material was generally avoided. The rhinoceros, for instance, which as we have seen surprised Leibniz and his friend by its appearance in Thomas Corneille's *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*, is not to be found, although Italian *rinoceronte* is attested as early as the fifteenth century. As for the elephant, it is dismissed as 'ELEFANTE. animal noto', with a note of its Latin and Greek etyma and a short quotation from Dante in which the gigantic but inoffensive elephant is contrasted with the evil giants to be found in hell.[63] The preferred authorities were Florentine – with particular weight given to the *Tre corone* – or wrote Italian which conformed to Florentine literary norms, as did Bembo and Ariosto. Some authors were notably under-represented, for instance Tasso.[64] Although the writings of some recent authors such as Giovanni della Casa, Lorenzo de' Medici, and Salviati himself did appear (especially when early evidence for a given item was lacking), very little explicit attention was paid to the contemporary spoken language.[65] Registering the terminology of the mechanical arts was therefore not a priority.

The dictionary thus, in the words of the twentieth-century academician Giovanni Nencioni, 'furnished the new authors who consulted it and took it as their guide with a carefully chosen language which was not entirely current, in other words a language that was already "classical"'.[66] It borrows on a number of occasions from Borghini's manuscripts.[67] However, it was first and foremost the product of Salviati's thought. His biographer Peter Brown calls the *Vocabolario della Crusca* the 'natural corollary' of the *Avvertimenti*, and observes that:

> in its Florentine purist inspiration, in its use of the 'good' authors for the development and enrichment of the language, in its whole conception and execution in short, it was a monument to Salviati's principles. It is almost more than probable, though there is no proof, that his own work over the preceding years provided its material nucleus.[68]

The dictionary was printed in Venice, by Giovanni Alberti, whose modest output since 1589 had included a work by Sperone Speroni and the letters of Annibale Caro, both of whom were of the circle of Salviati. Alberti had not previously printed works by members of the Accademia della Crusca, and he had not previously printed a dictionary: it has been suggested that

the *Vocabolario* was printed in Venice because paper was cheaper there, and perhaps Alberti offered the Crusconi good financial terms. The number of copies printed is uncertain, but since, in contrast to earlier Cruscan publications, very few were given away, the print run may have been comparatively small, suggesting that the members of the Accademia della Crusca were uncertain as to the reception their dictionary would have; the printing was financed by members' own contributions.[69] The *Vocabolario* turned out to be a great success, and greatly influential.

There were, to be sure, dictionaries with greater entry counts than that of the *Vocabolario della Crusca* in the early seventeenth century. For instance, John Florio's Italian–English dictionary of 1611, *Queen Anna's new world of words*, had about 70,000 entries in its seven hundred folio pages.[70] However, the *Vocabolario* was concerned to document a normative selection of the vocabulary of Italian; Florio's dictionary, by contrast, was deliberately inclusive.[71] The *Vocabolario* was physically a bigger dictionary than *Queen Anna's new world of words*, despite its smaller entry count, because each entry was fuller – and in particular, because each entry was so well documented. Florio's treatment of *lento* simply comprises a short string of possible translation equivalents, 'slow, slacke, lazie, lingring'. He and the makers of the *Vocabolario* had completely different aims.

Responses to the *Vocabolario della Crusca* did not complain that it was too small. They might be directed at its Florentine orientation: so, for instance, the Sienese translator Adriano Politi published a *Dittionario Toscane, compendio del Vocabolario della Crusca* in 1614, which abridged the *Vocabolario* and offered 'la nota di tutte le differenze di lingua che sono trà questi due Populi Fiorentino, e Senese': in effect, it added Sienese equivalents to some of the *Vocabolario*'s distinctively Florentine lexical items. The Accademia della Crusca protested at its subtitle, which was dropped from subsequent editions.[72] The archaic character of the *Vocabolario* was also criticized. So, for instance, Paolo Beni of Padua published *L'Anticrusca overo il Paragone dell'italiana lingua, nel qualsi mostra chiaramente che l'Antica sia inculta e rozza, e la Moderna regolata e gentile* in 1612, within a year of the appearance of the *Vocabolario*, objecting to its archaisms – the rusticity of past authors and the refinement of more recent ones are pointed out in the title of his work – its Florentine bias, and its undervaluation of Tasso.[73] The controversy which ensued was remembered across Europe for many years, being evoked by Pierre Bayle in his preface to Furetière's *Dictionaire universel* in 1690, and by Samuel Johnson in his preface to his own dictionary in 1755.[74] But when a second edition of the *Vocabolario* appeared in 1623, with more than 2,000 new entries,

very little revision had taken place: even the emendations and additions offered by Alessandro Tassoni, a member of the Accademia della Crusca, had been ignored.[75] A few more recent authors were now laid under contribution: for instance, the *Rime* of Michelangelo and the *Rime in burla* of Luca Martini were mentioned for the first time in the *index fontium*.[76] However, the general stability of the dictionary suggests self-confidence, if not complacency. It may also suggest that the first edition had sold out as a result of its short print run, and was in active demand, so that it had to be replaced in the market without delay.

The third and fourth editions of the *Vocabolario* (1691, 1729–1738)

In 1691, the Accademia della Crusca produced a third edition of the *Vocabolario*, in three volumes, with a dedication to Grand Duke Cosimo III displayed with the utmost prominence on the title page. The entry count of the new edition was 36,284, a considerable advance on the first two.[77] It had been compiled laboriously over more than four decades: plans for its correction were being made as early as 1640, and a third of it had been completed by 1665.[78] Although it was certainly not comprehensive in its treatment of technical words, it was richer than its predecessors in scientific vocabulary, not least that of Galileo.[79] So, to give a non-Galilean example, it registered the word *rinoceronte* at last:

> RINOCERONTE. Animal di grandezza simile all'elefante, che ha un corno sopra il naso. Lat. *Rhinoceros*. Ricett. Fior. Nell'infusioni, ec. di corno di rinoceronte fatte in acqua. Serd. Stor. 5. Fu inviato anche a Roma un rinoceronte, animale non veduto più in Italia da molti secoli in qua, acciocchè messo a fronte coll'elefante, ec. rappresentasse, ec. lo spettacolo dell'antica magnificenza.

The quotations here are from two sixteenth-century sources: a pharmacopoeia, the *Ricettario Fiorentino* of 1567, and a narrative of the New World, Francesco Serdonati's translation of Giovanni Pietro Maffei's *Historiarum Indicarum libri XVI* of 1589. As exemplified by this entry, the third edition represented modern authors much more fully than its predecessors: Tasso was recognized at last, as were, for instance, Castiglione, Machiavelli, and Guicciardini. Words were included even if attestations for them could not be found. Overall, then, the third edition of the *Vocabolario* was less puristic than its predecessors, as Leibniz noted sardonically: the Accademici had decided 'to let many words in through the back door which were

hitherto shut out'.[80] It had more to offer than an increased wordlist: for instance, archaic words were labelled 'V. A.' (*voce antiqua*) much more systematically than before. The preliminaries included an impressive list of sources (four pages of the names of early and modern authors and anonymous texts, and twenty-nine pages of the abbreviations by which individual works were designated in the citations), a forty-page index of the Greek words cited in the *Vocabolario*, and a two hundred-page index of the Latin words. So, by the end of the seventeenth century, large-scale Italian vernacular lexicography had advanced even beyond the remarkable achievement of 1612.

One feature which had been rejected in the plans for the first edition of the *Vocabolario della Crusca* was the systematic provision of etymologies. While the third edition was in progress, the academician Carlo Dati began work on an 'Etimologico Toscano' which was meant to accompany it. His plans were frustrated by the news, received at the beginning of 1666, that the French scholar Gilles Ménage, whom we shall meet again in Chapter 3, had completed an *Origini della lingua Italiana*, which he was sending to the press.[81] Printing took longer than might have been expected, but the appearance of Ménage's volume in 1669, with a dedication to the Accademici della Crusca (he was one of the first foreign members of the academy) gave the *Vocabolario* an etymological counterpart.[82] This opened up the interesting possibility that even a dictionary as comprehensive as the *Vocabolario* might, rather than attempting to provide every fact about the vocabulary of a given language in a single volume, be the central member of a suite of complementary dictionaries.

In 1717, a member of the Accademia della Crusca, Girolamo Gigli, who had been born in Siena, produced a highly discursive dictionary based on the usage of Saint Catherine of Siena, the fourteenth-century author (or supposed author) of a substantial body of letters. Gigli's personal devotion to Saint Catherine was real, but on this occasion it was pressed into the service of polemic: the *Vocabolario cateriniano* was, like Politi's dictionary a century earlier, a Sienese counter to Florentine claims to linguistic supremacy. It included forms coined by Gigli himself, and indeed testimonials written by Gigli himself, as well as 'acrimonious attacks on Florentines in general and on the Crusca in particular'. The work was suppressed before printing was complete, and a copy was ceremonially burnt at the hands of a public executioner; when a second impression appeared, it was with the fictitious imprint 'A Manilla, nelle Isole Filippine'.[83] The *Vocabolario della Crusca* would have been the pre-eminent dictionary of Italian on its own merits, but it also had the backing of powerful friends.

Soon after the publication of the third edition of the *Vocabolario*, work began on the fourth. By the time of the publication of this edition, the Accademia della Crusca was coming to be thought of by some as a body which had had its best days. 'It is truly pitiful', wrote the historian Pietro Giannone, 'to see the minds of Florentines, once eager to speculate with such acumen and solidity upon high and hidden matters … fallen into such boring puerilities' as were to be observed at its meetings.[84] But the lasting value of the dictionary which had been created by the academicians of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries and was continuing to be sponsored by those of the early eighteenth could hardly be doubted. The fourth edition was published in six volumes, between 1729 and 1738, dedicated to Cosimo III's son and heir, Gian Gastone, the last grand duke of Florence of the Medici line. The entry count was again significantly increased, to 47,453.[85] The *mise-en-page* was modernized somewhat (for instance, the columns of text were no longer surrounded by box rules), and the typography was improved, not least by the introduction of a distinction between editorial material in italics and quotations in roman type. New textual work went into it, some of it very meticulous, and since its editor, Domenico Maria Manni, owned a printing house, he and his colleagues were able to produce a number of editions of early texts to support the work of the dictionary, just as the Early English Text Society would publish materials for the dictionary of the Philological Society in nineteenth-century England.[86] However, 'compared to the more liberal spirit of the third edition', it 'showed a certain rigidity as to scientific terms, which were treated once more with circumspection' – though the entry at which we have just looked, for *rinoceronte*, was not altered verbally.[87]

The Florentine art historian Filippo Baldinucci had published a dictionary of the fine and decorative arts, *Vocabolario toscano dell'arte del disegno*, in 1681, with a title-page dedication to the Accademici della Crusca.[88] In 1698, the possibility of making a wider-ranging 'Vocabolario delle arti' was suggested within the academy, perhaps in response to the double publication of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* and Thomas Corneille's *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences* in 1694.[89] The idea of such a dictionary of Italian had already occurred to Leibniz, who mentioned it in a letter of 1696.[90] It was, however, only in 1745 that such a work was published as a companion to the *Vocabolario*, namely Giovan Pietro Bergantini's *Voci italiane d'autori approvati dalla Crusca nel Vocabolario d'essa non registrate*, a dictionary of Italian words from canonical authors which had been excluded from the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, and of words belonging to the arts and sciences.[91] By contrast with Corneille's dictionary, Bergantini's was

not on the same physical scale as the general dictionary which it accompanied, running to 470 pages in quarto. The genre of the dictionary of the arts and sciences was, by the 1740s, starting to be challenged by that of the alphabetized encyclopedia, and the first volume of the first complete, alphabetized Italian encyclopedia, Gianfrancesco Pivati's *Nuovo dizionario scientifico e curioso*, was published in 1746.[92] The French *Encyclopédie* would have a significant circulation in Italy, and would be re-edited (still in French) in Lucca and Livorno in the latter half of the eighteenth century, both editions in print runs of 1500.[93] Bergantini's work was of course cheaper and more portable than the multi-volume encyclopedias, but the genre to which it belonged was to be eclipsed by the genre of the encyclopedia, and it was not republished.

By the later eighteenth century, the 'Cruscan ethic' was perceived by critics as unduly literary and archaizing; an alternative was provided by the *Dizionario universale critico enciclopedico della lingua italiana* of Francesco D'Alberti di Villanuova, published from 1797 to 1805, which drew on spoken as well as literary language, including, at last, 'words used by craftsmen, for which no written authority existed'.[94]

The achievement of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*

A twentieth-century history of the Italian language has observed that 'no other modern language possessed at the end of the seventeenth century a dictionary that could worthily compete with the Crusca's', and just this claim had already been made by an impartial and learned contemporary, Daniel Georg Morhof, whose *Polyhistor* judges of the *Vocabolario della Crusca* that 'to the present day, none of the vernacular languages has its like'.[95] The *Vocabolario* had demonstrated the effectiveness of academies as bodies for the sponsorship and production of learned texts: hence Diderot's evocation of 'the numerous and erudite society of the academicians of La Crusca' in the article 'Encyclopédie' in which he reflected on the *Encyclopédie* itself. Its continuing prestige was likewise recognized by Samuel Johnson in his presentation of a copy of his *Dictionary* to the Accademia. Morhof, Diderot, and Johnson all, in their different ways, bore witness to the outstanding achievement of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*. This dictionary, more than any other, was the foundation of the scholarly lexicography of the living languages of Europe.

CHAPTER 3

The making of the Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise, *and its seventeenth-century rivals*

The story of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* is told over the next two chapters. It is a long one for three reasons. First, the making of the dictionary extended over seven well-documented decades. Second, the two-volume dictionary published by the Académie française in 1694 cannot be considered in isolation, because it was accompanied by another two-volume dictionary, the *Dictionnaire des arts et sciences* of Thomas Corneille; moreover, while it was still being compiled, it inspired two other major dictionaries, those of Richelet and Furetière; and moreover, between 1694 and the end of the eighteenth century, it ran to four revised editions, all of which call for notice here. Third, the dictionary itself was a very important landmark in European lexicography.

Early modern French lexicography and the founding of the Académie françoise

There had been an active tradition of Latin–French lexicography in the Middle Ages.[1] A milestone in the development of a post-medieval tradition of French lexicography is the year 1539. This is the date of the ordinance of Villers-Cotterêts, which ruled that legal documents must henceforth be drawn up 'en langage maternel françois et non aultrement': in French, rather than Latin or any vernacular other than French (such as Breton).[2] It is also the date on the title page of the first substantial printed dictionary with French headwords, Robert Estienne's *Dictionaire francoislatin, contenants les motz et manieres de parler François, tournez en Latin*.[3] The emphasis of the title is clear: this was a French dictionary with Latin as a defining language. Its order was semi-etymological: the 8,811 words which the first edition listed were grouped under 4,882 centred headings of one, two, or more words: for instance 'Lent. Lentement' or 'Lire. Lecteur. Lecture. Liseur.'[4] Later editions lost the centred headings and distinguished alphabetized headwords from the derivatives which followed them by size of

type alone, so that, in the 1549 edition, *Lire* in large type was followed by 'Legible, ou Lisible … Lecteur … Lecture … Liseur' in small type. This structure, designed to reveal the derivational processes of the French language, confirms the statement of the title page that this was not simply a dictionary which would enable readers of French to find Latin words. As Estienne's brother-in-law Jacques Dupuys put it in the dedicatory epistle to an edition of 1564 – the title page of which offered 'the words of the French language, and the ways in which they are used' – it was of 'great utility to all who wish to learn how the French language works'.[5] The *Dictionaire francoislatin* was derived from Estienne's *Dictionarium latinogallicum* of the previous year, itself a bilingualized derivative of Estienne's *Latinae linguae thesaurus*, of which the second edition had appeared in 1536.[6] Two dictionary traditions descending from the *Dictionnaire francoislatin* flourished in France in the first three decades of the seventeenth century, one represented by the two editions of Jean Nicot's *Thresor de la langue francoyse* (1606 and 1621), and the other by about twenty editions, by various persons, of a redaction of Estienne's dictionary published in 1593 by Jacob Stoer of Geneva, under the title *Grand dictionaire françois–latin*.[7] These dictionaries continued to provide some Latin equivalents in a largely French defining text.[8] They were substantial: Nicot's *Thresor* registered about 18,000 headwords.[9] But as we saw in the previous chapter, their entry structure was by no means on the same scale of elaboration as that of the best of their Italian contemporaries.

Although early modern French was not the subject of a *questione della lingua* as Italian was, the codification of French was nevertheless anxiously desired by the beginning of the seventeenth century. After the establishment of Henri of Navarre as king of France in Paris in 1594, which brought an end to the Wars of Religion, the power of the Crown began to be consolidated, a process which continued over a number of decades. The establishment of a well codified standard language variety was a matter of royal policy, allied to the consolidation of royal power. At the same time, members of a social elite sought to establish the status of their class, which was not necessarily defined by subordination to royal power, and this status was defined in part by the mastery of a linguistic code.[10] These potentially conflicting impulses towards codification help to explain both the official founding of a French language academy and the form which its dictionary eventually took.

Like the Accademia della Crusca, the Académie française had a prehistory as an informal society, namely a group of 'gens de lettres' who had been meeting informally at the house of the civil servant Valentin Conrart

in Paris from the 1620s onwards. But unlike the case of the Accademia, the impulse which moved this group towards formal establishment did not come from one of its members, but from an external authority. As the early history of the academy by Paul Pellisson relates, the group came to the attention of Cardinal Richelieu, who had by then been a leading counsellor of the king for more than a decade, and had been working with great talent and energy to foster the power and prestige of France. He saw in the meetings of this informal society – in which they had discussed 'all sorts of things: business, news, *belles lettres*' – the possibility of establishing a French language academy, which would meet regularly, 'under a public authority'. Early in 1634, he communicated to the group his wish that they should be formally constituted as an academy.[11] In conscious distinction to the wittily named Italian academies, it was to be called simply the Académie françoise (the present narrative will use the modern form *française* except in direct quotations). Likewise, whereas the members of Italian academies each had an academic name – we noticed Il Rimenato and Il Arido among the Crusconi in the previous chapter and we will meet L'Acceso in Chapter 5 – the members of the French academy were not to use such names: they were not free spirits gathering to enjoy themselves, but members of a body supported and observed by the monarchy.[12] The first members of the academy included Conrart, who became its secretary; Claude Favre, seigneur de Vaugelas, whose *Remarques sur la langue françoise* of 1647 was to become one of the classics of linguistic prescriptivism; the prose stylist Jean-Louis Guez de Balzac; and the poet Jean Chapelain. All four belonged to the salon which gathered at the Hôtel de Rambouillet, which was strongly associated with the development of the social and discursive ideal of *honnêteté*. This ideal 'emphasized restraint and decorum' and 'could not be taught or learned outside the closed circles in which it was practiced'.[13] It would, as we shall see, be prominent in the preface of the dictionary which the academy would eventually publish after Conrart, Vaugelas, Balzac, and Chapelain had all died.

The dictionary project of the Académie from 1634 to 1672

On 22 March 1634, the academicians-to-be wrote to Richelieu announcing their intention to perform the patriotic duty of devoting themselves to the elevation of the status of the language of France – which was also, they added, the language which would be spoken in the future in the neighbouring countries conquered by France.[14] (Likewise, it would be claimed in Napoleonic France that the Dutch language 'would before

long be reduced to the level of a provincial patois' while French took over all but its lowest-status functions.)[15] They would cleanse it from the corruptions of popular and of courtly use – though it was not made clear how this goal was to be achieved, except by the academicians' self-critical reflection on their own works.[16] In their next meeting, Chapelain clarified this question by proposing that to bring about the elevation of the French language, 'it would in the first place be necessary to regulate its terms and its phrases by means of an extensive dictionary and a very exact grammar'.[17] The letters patent of the Académie, dated January 1635, call for the new body to undertake 'to make the French language not only elegant, but capable of treating all the arts, and all the sciences'.[18] This form of words does not refer explicitly to lexicography. However, the twenty-fourth of the academy's statutes, drawn up shortly after the letters patent, ordains that its principal function shall be to 'work … to give rules to our language, and to make it pure, eloquent, and capable of treating the arts and the sciences'; the twenty-fifth, that the best French authors shall be read 'to observe the words and phrases which could serve for general models'; and the twenty-sixth, that 'A dictionary, a grammar, a rhetoric, and a poetics shall be composed.'[19] Of the projects mentioned in this statute, only the dictionary was completed, although, as we shall see in the next chapter, eighteenth-century academicians more than once expressed the hope that the dictionary could be expanded or reworked in such a way as to subsume the others.

Work on it had begun as early as December 1637, when the poet Antoine Girard de Saint-Amant was gathering 'les termes grotesques', in other words lexical items belonging to the burlesque register in which some of his poems of the 1640s would be composed, for 'la partie comique du dictionnaire', the entries in the dictionary which would treat words associated with comedy.[20] By January 1638, Chapelain made the argument to his colleagues that before work could be undertaken on a grammar, a rhetoric, or a poetics, a dictionary must be compiled. He presented a sketch of the dictionary he had in mind, a dictionary evidently influenced by that of the Accademia della Crusca, of which he was proud to be a member.[21] There seems to have been some debate, in which Richelieu himself played a part, as to the details of Chapelain's plan, and the form of the plan which appears in Pellisson's official history is presumably the final draft.[22]

The dictionary, according to the published plan, must be a treasury both of words and of set phrases.[23] It should be founded on the usage of dead authors. A canon of these should be established, and the works of individual authors should be assigned to individual academicians, who

would produce alphabetically ordered illustrative excerpts from them.[24] These would then be brought together in a dictionary which was therefore, again like the *Vocabolario* and its Italian predecessors, to be illustrated by quotations from canonical authors. Exclusion of words or phrases from the dictionary would be a tacit sign that the academy did not approve of them.[25] So, conversely, good usage known to the academicians would be registered even if no evidence for it was to be found in approved authors.[26] The macrostructure of the dictionary would (like that of Estienne's *Dictionaire francoislatin* as well as the great Estienne classical dictionaries mentioned in the previous chapter) be semi-etymological, the basic vocabulary of the language being arranged in alphabetical order with derived forms and phraseological material following their respective roots. However, counterfactual roots would not be used: *construire* and *destruire* would go together at *structure* rather than at a concocted form **struire*.[27] As well as definitions, Latin translations of the words might be provided for the benefit of foreigners; words confined to prose or verse, or to a particular literary register, would be marked; conventional orthography would be observed.[28] An index in which roots and derived forms would be listed in strict alphabetical order would follow; if Latin glosses were to be given, then an index of these could also be provided (such a Latin index was, as we have seen, a feature of the *Vocabolario*). Proper names would be excluded.[29] As for the distinctive vocabulary of skilled occupations and professions, it would be excluded if it did not have widespread conversational currency: anyone who wanted could register it in specialized dictionaries.[30] This was a turn away from the ideal expressed in the letters patent, that the academy should work to make the language fit to treat all the arts and sciences.

A couple of months later, a very important change was made to these ground-rules: it was decided, departing from the example of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, that the citation of approved authors would not be part of the dictionary, on the grounds that this would lengthen the task of compilation and make it more laborious. The authors might of course be *read*, in accordance with the twenty-fifth statute, but they would not be *excerpted*. The exception to this would be when a good author could be cited as validating an expression which might otherwise have been questionable.[31] Therefore, the sole criterion for the inclusion or exclusion of any lexical item was the judgement of the academicians as to what constituted good usage. This made the relationship of the dictionary to the concept of usage ambiguous: on the one hand, the academicians claimed only to be observing and recording good usage, but on the other, they

were conscious of exercising a prescriptive function which required them to reject any words or idioms which were not part of good usage, however widespread their actual use might be. It followed from this that there was a somewhat uncomfortable interdependence between the authority of the new academy and that of its planned dictionary.[32] It also followed that whereas the *Vocabolario* had had some degree of diachronic depth – its readers could at least see that some of the words it registered had been used a long time ago, and that some appeared to be more recent – the dictionary which the Académie française was now contemplating would be fundamentally synchronic.

All these principles having been established, the next step was clearly to appoint a general editor, who would need to be suitably recompensed for his work. It would be his duty to draw up a *canevas* or first sketch of the entries in a given alphabetical sequence, on which his colleagues would then comment. (This modus operandi is in diametric contrast with that of, for instance, the *Oxford English Dictionary*, where the chief editor reads and emends entries prepared by subordinate editors.) Chapelain had been the leading spirit in the planning of the dictionary, but was anxious that its remunerated editor should be Vaugelas rather than himself.[33] After some delay, Richelieu appointed Vaugelas, promising him the renewed enjoyment of a pension of 2,000 francs per year which had formerly been due to him but which had lapsed.[34] Pellisson reports the meeting in which Richelieu remarked genially to the new editor that at least he would not forget to include the word *pension* in the dictionary; 'No, your Eminence', was the reply, 'nor yet the word *reconnoissance* ["grateful recollection"]'.[35] There is a striking contrast between this polite exchange and Samuel Johnson's scornful remark on the English word *pension* ('In England it is generally understood to mean pay given to a state hireling for treason to his country') in a dictionary of the next century which had enjoyed no state sponsorship.

Work began cheerfully: Vaugelas was appointed in January 1639, and by June, Chapelain was able to report to Balzac that 'We are already well advanced in A.'[36] But this encouraging beginning was followed by a slackening of pace. By 1646, the academician François le Métel de Boisrobert wrote, also to Balzac, that he would be lucky to live to see the letter G.[37] Boisrobert was at the time fifty-four years old. Faster progress had been expected, but not all the academicians were equally talented or even equally enthusiastic, and the subcommittees or *bureaux* which met every week to discuss particular alphabetical ranges made progress unevenly. This had been the case in the making of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, but

whereas the Crusconi had devolved dictionary work on a compact subset of their members, the Académie française held more tenaciously to the ideal that all or most of its members had a real share of responsibility for the dictionary project. It became apparent that there were two problems with the practice of lexicography by committees of academicians. First, the making of definitions and the invention of illustrative examples is extremely precise work, for which few people have the necessary skills.[38] So it was that an eighteenth-century academician would complain of the definitions in the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, 'These definitions are made in haste, on the spot, when nothing in the world requires more attention. The phrases or examples are made in the some way, and they too are for the most part so absurd and inappropriate that we are ashamed of them when we read them over with detachment.'[39] Second, the members of the *bureaux* were inclined to quibble at length over minutiae in their meetings, and Vaugelas, as one academician among others, did not have the right, even if he had had the inclination, to require them to make more rapid progress. Nor, understandably, was his own work infallible: hence the omission from the working materials for the letter A of the headword *academie*.[40] Working from the excerpted vocabulary of a body of texts, or from that of a really good dictionary of French, would have been easier, but the academy had rejected the first option, and, at least until the publication of Richelet's dictionary in 1680, no existing dictionary of French was substantial enough to provide the foundation they needed (as we shall see below, Nicot's *Thresor* was to hand at their meetings, but as we have seen already, its entries might be decidedly terse).[41]

The slow movement of the project was observed by men of letters beyond the confines of the academy itself. In his amusing *Parnasse alarmé*, published in 1649 after a period of circulation in manuscript, Gilles Ménage (whose later work on the etymology of Italian we noticed in the previous chapter) remarked that 'With your vocabulary, you're only at A, B, C after more than five years have gone by', adding the good advice to the 'dear Masters of the language' that one cannot fix a language at one point in its development, for 'The word which was fashionable yesterday is not in use today … it is Monsieur l'Usage who makes language and unmakes it again.'[42] The academicians, he concluded, might do best to abandon the dictionary and the grammar which they had in mind: 'Make no innovations, do nothing to the language, and you'll be doing well.'[43] Ménage was never forgiven for having directed even this modest degree of satire against the academy, and was never elected to membership, despite his personal connections with a number of members and his subsequent distinction as

a student of the French language.[44] However, his studies would run in parallel to the work of the Académie in significant ways. Most importantly for our purposes, the first work of Ménage's maturity was an etymological dictionary of French, *Les Origines de la langue françoise*, of 1650, and despite the modesty with which he protested that it was a hasty work, a mere sketch, its importance was immediately recognized.[45] Just as his *Origini della lingua Italiana* would complement the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, so his *Origines* would complement the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. Etymology (beyond the derivational stories which would be told by the semi-etymological ordering of entries) had never been high on the academicians' list of priorities, but could now be displaced with confidence. It is surely not a coincidence that a posthumous second edition of the *Origines* appeared in 1694, the year in which the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* was published.

By the time of the death of Vaugelas in 1650, the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* had progressed to the letter I.[46] His papers were seized by his creditors when he died, and needed to be retrieved from their hands.[47] In 1653, Pellisson defended the unfinished state of the dictionary project stoutly in his history of the Académie, making the claim in passing that the Crusconi had taken forty years to compile their dictionary (in fact, they began in 1591 and published in 1612, but perhaps Pellisson knew that the *brigata dei crusconi* had begun to meet in the early 1570s, and supposed that they had already been working on a dictionary then), and arguing that even if the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* were never to be completed, the project would certainly have furthered the goal of the cultivation of the French language.[48] These sound like the words of someone contemplating defeat. But work continued: Vaugelas' editorial responsibilities were taken over by the historian François-Eudes de Mézeray, whose willingness to take on the project (and a pension of 4,000 livres) was its salvation. However, he must have found the project in an unsatisfactory state; in 1651, the letters A, B, and C were revised.[49] In 1658, when ex-Queen Christina of Sweden made a surprise visit to the Académie, Mézeray had a file of materials including the word *jeu* to hand.[50] (These materials led him to a famous faux pas: reading some of them to Christina, he included the proverb 'Ce sont des jeux de Prince qui ne plaisent qu'à ceux qui les font', which refers to the sadistic or harmful games which princes can play at the expense of others. Christina, who had recently had one of her courtiers murdered, laughed off what might have been an embarrassing moment. The published dictionary would retain the proverb.) Since I and J were treated together in the dictionary, the presence of *jeu* on Mézeray's desk in 1658 suggests that in the eight years after Vaugelas' death, the project had

been going back over old ground rather than making fresh alphabetical progress. Perhaps this was a consequence of the brisk start into the letter A which the academy had made in 1639: a period of more elaborate planning might have been prudent. After eight years had been spent revising the material produced under Vaugelas, however, the next fourteen did see steady movement through the alphabet. By July 1672, work had reached the letter S.

The dictionary project of the Académie from 1672 to 1692

When Richelieu died in 1642, leaving the academy and its dictionary without their original patron, his role was taken over by the chancellor of France, Pierre Séguier, a great collector of books and manuscripts. On Séguier's death in 1672, Louis XIV accepted the personal role of protector to the Académie, and played his part by providing it with two rooms in the Louvre and with financial support (some of it directed explicitly towards the dictionary project) and a gift of books to be the nucleus of its library.[51] From this point onwards, the Académie could look forward to a stable succession of royal protectors just as the Accademia della Crusca could rely on its own grand-ducal patronage. It is no coincidence that work on the dictionary, 'so greatly desired and so long awaited by all of Europe', now entered a new and vigorous phase.[52] Séguier died in January; Louis took the Académie under his protection in March; a plan for forward progress was announced in July, and entered in the newly instituted registers of the Académie. Completed entries from A onwards were to be transcribed and revised, and work on entries in the range S–T was to continue.[53] The revision process was in fact sometimes light: when, in the controversy over his alleged plagiarism which will be discussed below, the academician Antoine Furetière claimed that any resemblance between his entry for *feu* and that of the revised text of the academy's dictionary could be explained by his having written both entries, it was demonstrated that the post-1672 text was substantially identical with an archived version in Vaugelas' handwriting.[54]

A week after the meeting of July 1672 at which the forward progress of the project was planned, Charles Perrault, the collector of fairy-stories, who had been elected to the Académie in 1671, produced 'six dossiers of handwritten papers, in folio format, containing nearly all the words beginning with A': the working materials of the dictionary were clearly now being dusted off and overhauled.[55] On inspection, they were found to be defective in various ways (this anticipates the alarming discoveries

of loss and rodent infestation made by James Murray two centuries later, at the renewal of serious work on what would become the *Oxford English Dictionary* after a hiatus of some years): revision therefore began with C, since that letter was 'the least imperfect'.[56] By January 1673, when a deputation of academicians went to thank Jean-Baptiste Colbert, the Minister of Finances, for the royal support they were receiving, they were able to say that although building a dictionary was, like building a palace, slow work, they were on their way towards the final achievement of the project. (They had in mind the building works on the Louvre which were then under way, some of them to designs by Charles Perrault's brother Claude: these would, in fact, remain unfinished for a century following the move of the royal court to Versailles.) Colbert replied, perhaps with a hint of menace, that he was delighted at the assiduity and ardour with which work on the dictionary was being undertaken.[57] He had made his own contribution to its infrastructure by presenting the academicians with a clock so that they would begin and end their dictionary meetings on time.[58] He made another contribution by arranging that forty tokens, or *jetons*, redeemable for cash, should be distributed at each meeting of the academy. If every academician appeared, each would receive one *jeton*. If fewer than the total appeared, they would divide the *jetons* between them, any remainder being put forward to the next meeting. Each *jeton* was worth 32 sols, or 1.6 livres, so if, for instance, only eight academicians attended a meeting, they would take the equivalent of 8 livres each. This was not a princely sum – a rich man's coachman might earn 100 livres a year, and as we have just seen, Mézeray's pension as editor-in-chief was 4,000 a year – but it was enough of a windfall to excite the more venal academicians, or *jetonniers*, as they became derisively known.[59]

From January 1673 onwards, the meetings of the academy were therefore in danger of being overrun by members whose primary interest was receiving their honoraria. Furetière described their discussion of draft entries in a passage written in 1685, from his recent direct observation. It sounds all too plausible:

> Everyone cavils over every entry, and judges it good or bad as his expertise or his caprice moves him; very often an entry is changed for the worse, or trivial alterations are made to the wording. But this is done with so much noise and confusion that the wisest are silent, and the opinion of the most strident carries the day. He who shouts the loudest is right; each makes a long speech over the smallest trifle. One man repeats like an echo what the last speaker has said, and most often, three or four of them talk together. When a subcommittee is made up of five or six people, one of them reads

> the entry out, one gives his opinion, two converse, one sleeps, and one passes the time by reading some dictionary which is on the table … This is how they make progress.[60]

The dictionaries which were available during these meetings might, according to Furetière, even be put to worse uses than idle reading: at a meeting in 1683, the foremost of the *jetonniers*, François Charpentier, hurled a copy of the *Thresor de la langue francoyse* of Nicot at the head of his enemy, the abbé François Tallement, who retaliated with a copy of Philibert Monet's *Invantaire des deux langues, françoise et latine*.[61] Both dictionaries are folios of about a thousand pages.

In the best account of the making of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*, Charles Beaulieux treats the makers of the dictionary in what he calls 'the age of the *jetonniers*' scathingly: a sequence of subheadings separates his comments on the 'greed of the *jetonniers* … vanity of the *jetonniers* … readiness of the *jetonniers* to be influenced and to cringe … jealousy of the *jetonniers* … violence and coarseness of the *jetonniers*', and 'ignorance of the *jetonniers*'.[62] But it cannot be denied that, for all their faults, they completed a dictionary on a large scale, good enough to have been the foundation of a long and living series of subsequent editions. We know most about the *jetonniers* from the writings of Furetière, who had – as we shall see when we come to the story of his expulsion from the Académie – his own reasons for presenting them and their work in the worst possible light. These writings are powerful, funny, and quotable. Perhaps they exaggerate: Charpentier and Tallement's dictionary-throwing sounds suspiciously like the story of Poggio Bracciolini's assaulting the Vatican librarian Giovanni Tortelli with a codex of Livy, for which there seems to be no satisfactory evidence, or that of Samuel Johnson's knocking the bookseller Thomas Osborne down with a folio, which Johnson himself firmly denied.[63] Be that as it may, Furetière's stories should not distract us from the fact that the *jetonniers* got the job done.

They were, to be sure, firmly encouraged to do so. In June 1674, the Académie received a royal privilege, giving it the sole right to publish a dictionary of French in the next twenty years.[64] This was designed to protect its work against any rival dictionary – and also to impose a deadline, generous but not unduly so, within which its work would have to be completed in order to benefit from the protection. (Since there was no such thing as an international copyright agreement in the seventeenth century, the privilege could only be enforced within the kingdom of France, with results which we shall soon see.) At the beginning of 1675, the academicians showed their assiduity for dictionary work, or their fondness for *jetons*, or

both, by agreeing, at Charles Perrault's suggestion, to add to their existing Monday and Thursday meetings a Saturday meeting to advance work on the dictionary 'which has been awaited so long by the public'.[65] But work still went on slowly. At the first meeting of 1676, two *bureaux* were set up to work in parallel on the revision of words in A and B, the letters which had been shelved in 1671. By May of that year, means of accelerating the project were being discussed again, and in June the watchful Colbert communicated his approval of the academicians' zeal, and assured them that it would be most welcome to the king. He set them a good example by participating personally in the revision of the word *amy*.[66]

In February 1677, it was agreed that, 'to satisfy the expectation of the public and the desires of the king', the printing of the dictionary should begin as soon as the entries in the ranges A and B were ready for the press, and on April Fool's Day of that year, these two ranges were agreed to be ready.[67] It is remarkable that, even at this stage, the Académie should have had a heated debate about the macrostructure of the dictionary, semi-etymological as opposed to alphabetical, as they did on 13 May 1677. Perhaps it was only the printing of specimens which made some of the company realize what a semi-etymological macrostructure, as agreed upon in 1638, would actually look like. (Similarly, James Murray found it necessary to see *Oxford English Dictionary* articles set up in type before he could assess them properly.)[68] Since Pierre-Daniel Huet and Philippe Quinault, who led the argument for strictly alphabetical order, had been respectively eight and two years old when Chapelain had presented his proposal, they may have felt that it represented an idea to which they had never consented and which had had its time. Their argument was not successful, and five reasons are given against it in the registers of the Académie. First, changing a long-established plan now would seem fickle and inconstant, and disrespectful to the early members of the Académie who had proposed it. Second, a semi-etymological order displayed the richness of the language. Third, it made it possible to define related words with the greatest economy. Fourth, a major rearrangement of project materials at this stage would require going back to the beginning: the dictionary would become like the veil of Penelope, woven and unwoven but never finished. Fifth, a new dictionary by a learned body invited a new order, which would distinguish it from all the petty alphabetical dictionaries of the past and present.[69] The fourth of these arguments must have been particularly hard to resist: in fact, Furetière used precisely the same image to describe the way in which entries were drafted and taken to pieces in the normal conduct of the dictionary (he also compared its slow work on a living and

changing language to Martial's barber, who shaved his customers so slowly that before he had finished the second side of a face, the first side would be stubbly again).[70]

Between 1677 and the early 1690s, the dictionary was finished. In 1672, the last outstanding entries between S–T and the end of the alphabet still had to be drafted: U/V would have been a big letter, but W, X, Y, and Z would not. Presumably the preparation of entries for the press was being undertaken in 1677 because the drafting of the whole alphabetical sequence had been finished: five years to finish S–T and draft U/V–Z would be plausible. Printed sheets from A to M were in the possession of Mézeray by the time of his death in July 1683.[71] The revision of printed sheets – a task to which, it was noted, one could never bring too much care and exactness – was well under way in April 1686.[72] A set of 656 pages covering the range *A* to *neuf* and its derivatives including *nouveau*, perhaps of 1686, survives in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal in Paris, as do other briefer runs of printed sheets.[73] Around this time, the possibility of the publication of the dictionary in instalments was being debated. On the one hand, the fact that printed sheets were being run off and stored by the printer exposed the academy to the risk that a set of them would fall into mercenary hands before they could be properly published. It was for this reason that the security arrangements for printed sheets were discussed as early as 1677, and continued to be a matter of concern: in 1686, the academicians were afraid that the sheets formerly in Mézeray's possession would become the basis for a piracy to be printed in the Netherlands, and a piratical edition of a partial alphabetical range did appear at Frankfurt in 1687 (Gilles Ménage owned a copy).[74] On the other hand, there were obvious advantages to the release of the dictionary as a whole, and it was decided that this should be the policy of the academy.[75] In July 1689, two dictionary committees were at work preparing *sien* and *tâche* respectively for the press, which evidently moved slowly: *sainte* was only printed off twenty-three months later.[76] By June 1692, printing of the full alphabetical sequence – in a run of 500 copies – was complete. This was not, however, a moment of triumph, for the dictionary as it stood was agreed to be so thoroughly defective as to be unfit for release without the provision of extensive errata.[77] These were never prepared, and the great majority of the 500 copies of what is now known as the pre-edition of the dictionary stayed in the possession of the printer until 1700, when they were delivered up to the academy; they then remained in its rooms in the Louvre until 1714, when they were pulped.[78] Printing of the emended edition which would be formally published began in July 1692, and continued

until 21 August 1694: its slow progress through the printing house suggests the rate at which sheets of the pre-edition could be corrected and resubmitted as printer's copy.[79]

Does one of the many men who worked on it deserve credit for the dictionary as a whole? After his death in 1683, Mézeray was succeeded in the general editorship of the dictionary by the abbé François Séraphin Régnier-Desmarais, who presided over its completion and publication.[80] Planned by Chapelain, who has been called the 'père du Dictionnaire', with Vaugelas, Mézeray, and Régnier-Desmarais as successive principal editors, the dictionary was emphatically a corporate work rather than that of any of these individuals. In fact, the credit for having contributed more to it than any other academician was claimed by the longest-standing member of the academy, François Charpentier, whom we encountered earlier, accused by Furetière of hurling a dictionary at the head of an enemy. He had been a devoted attender of the meetings of the academy since his election in 1650, so he could at least claim that he had given more hours to the discussion of the work than any man alive.[81] However, the editor was responsible for the *canevas*, or first sketch of the entries in an alphabetical sequence, on which his colleagues would then comment, and so it might be said that Mézeray, whose work had begun somewhere in the letter I and ended near the end of the alphabet, had done more important work on the dictionary than Charpentier, and more of it than Vaugelas or Régnier-Desmarais.[82]

The *Dictionnaire françois* of Richelet (1680)

We must now turn back from the completion of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* in the early 1690s to an event which took place a decade earlier. In 1679 and 1680, a new French dictionary of about 25,000 entries was published, 'undeniably the first true monolingual dictionary of the French language' since Nicot's *Thresor* had made extensive use of Latin glosses.[83] Its wordlist may have owed something to that of Guy Miège's *New Dictionary French and English* of 1677, but the dictionary as a whole was substantially independent of its predecessors.[84] It was the achievement of Pierre Richelet, already known as the author of a work on versification, who offered his public an alphabetically ordered *Dictionnaire françois … avec les termes les plus connus des arts et des sciences, le tout tiré de l'usage et des bons auteurs de la langue françoise*.[85] He had been assisted in its making by François Cassandre, translator into French of the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle, and the two collaborators had been joined by a member of the academy,

Olivier Patru.[86] The publication of the *Dictionnaire françois* in Geneva meant that the privilege for exclusive publication in France granted to the Académie in 1674 could not be used against its publisher, Jean Herman Widerhold, or its printer, Jean-Baptiste Fatio, who operated out of his own château at Duillier, eight miles out of Geneva and apparently secure from the displeasure of the Genevan clergy, let alone the distant king of France.[87]

One remarkable feature of Richelet's dictionary is evident at a glance: it was published in two quarto volumes, each of well over 500 pages, *M–Z* being dated 1679 and *A–L* plus the prelims, which were regularly the last part of a book to go to the printer, being dated 1680.[88] (Early owners could, of course, choose to have the two volumes bound together, to make a fat quarto of about 1,100 pages.)[89] This was, as far as I know, the first monolingual dictionary of a European vernacular of which the first edition was issued in multiple volumes, and this was a gesture of confidence in the importance of the dictionary and of the language it documented. It seems more obvious now than it did then that such ample proportions are appropriate for a major dictionary; well into the nineteenth century, Mark Pattison could explain the commercial failure of Henri Estienne's four-volume *Thesaurus graecae linguae* by saying that 'it is an indispensable condition of a lexicon that it should be in one volume'.[90]

Comparing the work of Richelet to two of its forerunners suggests its strengths and weaknesses. It was, for a start, clearly a more sophisticated dictionary than that of Nicot. One important development can be exemplified from its entry for the adjective *lent*, for which, as we have seen, Nicot had had '*Qui est* Lent *de nature*, Cunctans, Lentus.' Richelet's entry was:

> *Lent*, *lente*, *adj*. Qui a de la lenteur, qui est tardif. (Lent à punir. *Ablancourt*, *Luc*. *Tome 1*.
>
> * L'état de mes afaires ne demande pas de remedes lens. *Vau*. *Quin*. *l. 3*.)

The microstructure is neater in Richelet than in Nicot: a headword is clearly identified, assigned a part of speech and other necessary grammatical information such as the feminine ending in the case of adjectives ('for the benefit of foreigners'), and defined in French.[91] Other entries might offer status labelling, or information about pronunciation or etymology.[92] Their structure was supported by clear, helpful typography.[93] What is more exciting is the provision of illustrative quotations from 'bons auteurs', in this case 'slow to punish' from the translation of Lucian by Richelet's patron Nicolas Perrot d'Ablancourt (who was cited more than 2,300 times

in the dictionary), and 'the state of my affairs does not call for slow remedies', marked with an asterisk to show that it illustrates a figurative use of the word, from that of Quintus Curtius by Vaugelas.[94] Richelet was using the technique of the *Vocabolario della Crusca* to show the French of his own century in use by *honnêtes hommes*, members indeed of the Académie française, as is made clear in the *index fontium*.[95] It is, on this account, Richelet's dictionary 'which can be regarded as the real French imitator of the Crusca in the seventeenth century', even though it neither reached as far back in time as the *Vocabolario* for its authorities nor amassed phraseological material with the abundance of the *Vocabolario*, and Richelet acknowledged the debt explicitly.[96] The modus operandi for collecting quotations was simple, as Patru explained in a letter of 1677 to the poet and translator François de Maucroix:

> We simply mark up the passages [which are to be excerpted] in pencil. A sixpenny scrivener will write everything out on paper, which will only be written on one side, so that it will just be necessary to cut up this paper and put each piece in place, where it will be stuck down. As you know, that's the only way to make indexes.[97]

Since some ten to fifteen thousand quotations appear in the dictionary, the sixpenny scrivener must have worked hard: he has been called 'a veritable anonymous Stakhanovite, and forgotten hero of French lexicography'.[98]

The promise of the title page to register 'the best-known terms of the arts and sciences' shows the further, very wide scope which Richelet saw for his dictionary: 'a sort of compendium of the knowledge which a French reader had to master to understand the human and natural world'.[99] Exciting again is the evidence of direct recourse to the practitioners of mechanical arts like weaving in order to get advice about the vocabulary of those arts, as we see s.v. *trame* 'weft'.[100] This shows a forward-looking quality in comparison both to the *Vocabolario* and to the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*: as Laurent Bray observes in his valuable monograph on Richelet, 'the ideal of the *honnête homme* of the seventeenth century gives way progressively to that of the universality of knowledge of the eighteenth, and (though the case should not be overstated) Richelet already exemplifies this intellectual development.'[101] Turning from the mechanical arts to natural history, *rinocerot* 'rhinoceros' is given an entry of twenty-one lines, largely encyclopedic, with quotations from d'Ablancourt and Vincent Voiture (another academician) to justify the spelling *rinocerot* rather than *rinoceros*, and a final reference to the works of the Scots-Polish naturalist John Johnstone, which Richelet must have expected his readers to consult in the original

Latin rather than in French, and therefore purely for the sake of their encyclopedic content rather than in a spirit of linguistic enquiry.[102]

The *Dictionnaire françois* was in some ways a deliberately personal document, full of allusions to Richelet's friends and enemies, many of them in examples which he made up for want of, or as an alternative to, literary extracts. The adjective *feu* 'the late', for example, is illustrated with 'The late M. d'Ablancourt had a noble soul and an excellent *esprit*.'[103] *Compliment*, defined as 'a short and highly complimentary speech', is illustrated with 'He made his *compliment* to the Académie very gracefully', and there is an ironic touch here: Richelet was aware of the dictionary project of the Académie, and cannot have supposed that his work would be gratifying to its members.[104] *Vocabulaire* is illustrated with a quotation, but an allusive one, namely the words in which Ménage had teasingly suggested to the Académie that its dictionary project should be abandoned: 'let your *Vocabulary* go; give up your grammar.'[105] Richelet reflected on the slow progress of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* in his preface. On the one hand, he admitted, a solitary lexicographer cannot catch every fault in a dictionary. On the other, certain celebrated literary men have been working on such an undertaking for nearly forty-three years, and have still not finished it. Until the publication of their *magnum opus* satisfies the desires of the public, the *Dictionnaire françois* has made its appearance, as 'une espece d'aventurier': a sort of dictionary-errant.[106] The point is made less delicately in a passage of his preliminary remarks on problematic words: the question of whether *cornette* (cf. Latin *cornu*, 'wing of an army') or *escadron* 'squadron' is the better word for a cavalry unit must await the day when the academicians publish their dictionary; and that will not be soon.[107]

The Académie had some measure of revenge. Although Richelet's dictionary could be printed with impunity outside France, it could not legally be imported into France. In 1684, two hundred copies which were being smuggled into Paris were seized and destroyed. A highly coloured traditional story has fifteen hundred copies of the dictionary being denounced to the authorities, after which the Genevan publisher dies of chagrin and the sycophant who denounces the shipment is murdered, but this appears to be apocryphal.[108] However, the *Dictionnaire françois* was not suppressed effectively within France, and was not suppressed at all elsewhere in Europe. The manageable scale of Richelet's dictionary, its provision of citations, and perhaps its personal flavour, gave it a significant readership; it was drawn on by other lexicographers including the Académie's own Thomas Corneille; and further editions appeared until the end of the

eighteenth century, growing by accretion until that of 1759, published in three folio volumes, which was followed by a fifty-year series of editions of an abridged version.[109]

The *Dictionaire universel* of Furetière (1690)

The publication of Richelet's dictionary-errant had been an annoyance, but not a grave threat to the dictionary project of the Académie, which was being carried out on a grander plan. However, just before Christmas in 1684, more sinister news was announced to the company of academicians: that the abbé Antoine Furetière, whose caustic account of the dictionary-making process of his fellow academicians we have already seen, had obtained a privilege for the printing of a 'universal dictionary of all the words in the language', and that he was already having it printed, to the evident prejudice of the dictionary project of the Académie and of the privilege which was supposed to protect it.[110] Furetière had indeed obtained such a privilege on 24 August 1684, and specimen entries of his dictionary were already in circulation, perhaps in the form of eight-page pamphlets devoted to individual letters of the alphabet and certainly as a collection under the title *Essais d'un dictionaire universel, contenant generalement tous les mots françois tant vieux que modernes, et les termes de toutes les sciences et des arts*.[111] This was a book, dedicated to the king, which presented selected entries from all the principal letters of the alphabet, ending with an extract from the privilege of 1684. An 'avertissement' to the reader pointed out that the academy dictionary had only reached the letters O and P.[112] In a series of meetings of the Académie at the beginning of January 1685, it became apparent that Furetière had obtained a privilege for the printing of a very wide-ranging dictionary by representing it as a dictionary of the arts and sciences, the latter being a kind of work which would not be covered by the privilege of 1674, and which had indeed been expressly identified by Chapelain in 1638 as an inoffensive potential companion to the main dictionary project. He must, it was agreed, consent to the revocation of the inappropriately broad privilege of 1684, to the suppression of the *Essais*, in which non-technical vocabulary was present (the first words treated were *a*, *abbé*, *abintestat*, and *abysme*, of which only the third could be called technical), and to the removal of all such material from the drafts of his dictionary before its publication in full.[113] Furetière was, however, obdurate. Examination of some of his specimens suggested to the academicians not only that he was trying to pre-empt the publication of their dictionary by hurrying an imitation of it into print, but that

he was plagiarizing directly: 'he had employed the definitions, the phrases, and indeed the very words of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, either with no change at all or with changes so trivial that they simply showed up the pretence at disguise'.[114] He was accused of having stolen dictionary materials belonging to the academy from the residence of Mézeray following the latter's death in July 1683.[115] Whether he had done so or not, he had certainly taken part in meetings of the academy, and profited by what he learned there about the dictionary-making process. This was a graver betrayal than that of Olivier Patru, who at least seems to have absented himself from meetings of the academy after setting his hand to Richelet's project.[116] Furetière was excluded from the Académie on 22 January 1685, and his privilege to publish a dictionary was revoked on 9 March.[117]

Furetière made his own case vigorously. In 1684, he published a *factum* (the word usually means 'memorial, as submitted in legal proceedings') in which he pointed out, reasonably enough, that if the academicians sought to promote the glory of France by displaying the *politesse* of the French language, they should leave others free to show its *abondance*.[118] An appreciation of the latter quality was why he had called his dictionary a 'universal dictionary of all the words of the language': he saw his dictionary as contrasting with the selective *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. Other dictionaries, he added, were given privileges, notably the *Dictionaire general et curieux* of César de Rochefort, published in 1684 with a privilege of December 1683.[119] This was in fact as much an encyclopedia as a dictionary, offering not only 'the principal words' but also 'eloquent discourses' and furnished with a subject-index – as such, it was a very early example of the alphabetic encyclopedia – but again, Furetière's point was not unreasonable. If Rochefort's dictionary was different enough from that of the Académie to be licensed for publication, so, he argued, was his. For that matter, Pierre Danet had just been allowed to publish a *Nouveau dictionnaire françois et latin*; if adding Latin to a dictionary made it acceptable, he would be prepared to do this.

As for the charge of plagiarism, he continued, it was obviously false. As he elaborated upon this point, he gave a most interesting analysis of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* as he understood it on the basis of his twenty-two years as an academician. His universal dictionary, he wrote, was made 'principally to give information about the sciences and the arts, and not about words alone, and to enable foreigners and the French readers of the future to read all of French literature, old and new'.[120] The definitions in his dictionary were philosophical, or scientific; those of the available specimens of the academy dictionary were grammatical.[121] The *Dictionnaire de*

l'Académie, he said, would only register seven or eight thousand words; his would register forty thousand, and would preserve for posterity all those which were rejected by the academicians.[122] The selectivity of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, which would supposedly exclude technical language, rare words, and archaisms alike, was being emphasized, and Furetière was working, at a date when the dichotomy between dictionaries and encyclopedias was not fully established, towards a statement of its resolutely non-encyclopedic nature. The *factum* of 1684 included a parallel presentation of a specimen of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* from *genisse* to *gorge* and the corresponding ranges in Richelet's dictionary and his own. It was followed by two more *factums*, in 1685 and 1687, and these were reprinted or reissued several times; the *Essais* were reprinted in 1685 and reissued two years later.[123] The real importance of this flurry of publications is that in them, Furetière was making the theory and practice of lexicography a matter for public debate as they had never been before. The content of dictionaries had been scrutinized (as in the case of the condemnation of John Cowell's *Interpreter* in 1610 and 1644 on the grounds of the absolutist political doctrine of some of its entries), and their makers had been accused of plagiarism (as in Thomas Blount's denunciation in 1673 of the adaptations of two of his dictionaries), but Furetière was inviting the understanding of dictionaries at a very much higher level.[124] He was, indeed, helping to define the academy tradition in lexicography by his comparison of dictionary projects inside and outside the tradition.

The disagreement between Furetière and the Académie dragged on; in April 1687, there was still some hope that Furetière would agree to confine himself strictly to the special vocabulary of the arts and sciences, in which case his dictionary would complement that of the Académie rather than being universal or comprehensive.[125] But no resolution had been reached by the time of his death in 1688. The *Dictionaire universel* was printed in the Netherlands in the following year, and published by Reinier Leers of The Hague and Rotterdam, with an imprint date of 1690.[126] The fact that, after so much labour and controversy, its maker did not live to see it in print was, as Pierre Bayle remarked, 'a striking example of the vanity of the occupations of learned men'.[127]

Reinier Leers was a major scholarly publisher with a particular interest in French-language material which had been banned in France. He produced the *Dictionaire universel* in three handsome folio volumes, with a portrait frontispiece engraved by the eminent Gerard Edelinck, and a double-column *mise-en-page* more elegant and spacious than that of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, let alone the dictionary of Richelet. It registered,

as Furetière had promised, about forty thousand words.[128] The order was alphabetical, though headwords for derived forms were set in smaller capitals than those for more basic forms: LEPRE 'leper' but LEPREUX 'leprous'. Neither etymologies nor citations were usually provided, though there were made-up examples.[129] The subject-matter of the encyclopedic entries was wide-ranging, including the sciences (especially natural history), religion, government, architecture, and the fine arts.[130] Some of them were elaborate; the entry for *rhinoceros* runs to twenty-six lines. A number were supported by references to secondary sources.

The different scales of Furetière's and Richelet's dictionaries, and the different aims of Furetière's dictionary and the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, can be exemplified by turning to Furetière's entry for *lent*:

> LENT, ENTE. adj. Qui a l'action, le mouvement doux et pesant, qui n'avance gueres de chemin, qui ne fait guere de besogne. Ce valet est *lent* à tout ce qu'il fait. La tortuë marche d'un pas *lent*. Plus les Planètes sont esloignées, plus leur mouvement nous paroist *lent*, quoy qu'il soit plus viste. Le mouvement de cette horloge est trop *lent*.
>
> On appelle en Medicine vne fievre *lente*, celle qui est interne, et sans paroistre violent au dehors. Un pous *lent*, celuy qui ne se fait pas gueres sentir, qui n'est gueres esmeu. On dit aussi Un remede *lent*, un poison *lent*, quand l'effet de son action ne paroist qu'aprés bien de temps.
>
> En Chymie on appelle feu *lent*, le feu de sable, de cendres, de lampe, et autre petit feu propre à faire infuser, digerer, ou preparer les matieres avec beaucoup de temps.
>
> LENT, se dit figurément en Morale. La colere de Dieu est *lente* à venir. Cet homme a l'esprit *lent*, l'humeur *lente*. La prudence demande une deliberation *lente*. Une passion, une amour *lente* est celle qui languit. C'est un feu *lent* qui le consume.

After giving the literal sense, with four examples, of which three bear on the natural world or on machinery, Furetière provides a paragraph on the uses of the word in medicine (it may refer to a low fever, a weak pulse, or a slow-acting remedy or poison); another on its use in the laboratory ('un feu lent' is a fire which provides gradual heat); and another on its figurative use in the moral world, where we can speak of slow deliberation or, metaphorically, of being consumed by a slowly burning fire. There is certainly encyclopedic material here, more than Richelet's pioneering provision, but also a strong impulse to make the dictionary readable. In his 'Preface' to the first edition, Bayle argued that the dryness (*secheresse*) which characterizes so many dictionaries is not to be found here, just as Jacob Grimm would comment on the dryness (*Trockenheit*) of the early German dictionary tradition.[131] Even an unfavourable evaluation of the *Dictionaire universel*, written by an

academician in 1727, remarked that worthless as Furetière's work was, whenever one opened it, one ended up reading the whole page because the citations of encyclopedic material were so interesting, in contrast to the gloomy and repulsive dryness (*sécheresse* again) which made one clap the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* shut as soon as one could.[132] The dictionaries which Bayle went on to praise in his 'Preface' – those of Robert and Henri Estienne and of Charles du Cange – were all rich in information about the cultural significance of the words they registered, and so was the *Dictionaire universel*.[133] The same train of thought shapes Bayle's politely expressed references to the dictionary project of the Académie: the academicians are creating a guide to polished literary style, whereas Furetière has sought to register the whole of the vocabulary of French.[134] (If, Bayle added sardonically, the publication of the academy's dictionary should be followed by criticism as harsh as that which had been directed against the *Vocabolario* by Paolo Beni in 1612, it was to be hoped that the public would chastise this outrage.)[135]

The last page of Bayle's 'Preface' to the *Dictionaire universel* turned to the question of universality. If this dictionary were to be universal in the strictest sense of the word, proposed Bayle, it should have a historical dimension, and should register the vocabulary of Villehardouin, Froissart, and the medieval romances.[136] Having conceived of a lexicography so comprehensive in its simultaneous coverage of modern technical vocabulary and that of medieval texts that it would not be practised until the nineteenth century, Bayle went on almost immediately to express a different vision, also more than a hundred years ahead of its time. Perhaps the medieval material should be presented in a separate volume, with a title like *Archaeologus* or *Glossary of the French Language*.[137] In that case:

> the history of words could be made part of it – that is to say, the period of their reign and of their decadence, with the changes of their meaning. In dealing with these old terms, it would be necessary to follow the practice employed in dictionaries of dead languages, namely to quote extracts from some author who had used them. It would not be a bad thing to extend the scope of the dictionary to the works of the old Provençal poets; and nothing would be better suited to perfecting the science of etymology than precise research into the distinctive words of the various provinces of the kingdom [of France].[138]

This sketch of a dictionary of Old French and Old Occitan on historical principles, telling the life story of every word, illustrating it with quotations and using dialect material for etymological purposes, is truly outstanding: it would be more than a century before lexicographical theory would catch up with Bayle's flash of genius here.

A second edition of the *Dictionaire universel* appeared in 1701, also in the Netherlands, edited by Henri Basnage de Beauval, a Protestant refugee from France. As for material bearing on the histories of words, Basnage was happy to include it when it came to hand, but did not see it as vital to his project, remarking that 'these are trifles, but interesting trifles'.[139] Basnage also emended entries in which Furetière had shown a 'thundering and insulting zeal' in his references to Protestantism and, more importantly, added illustrative quotations from good authors: *lent* was now illustrated by the quotation from Vaugelas which had been used by Richelet, and by two others from seventeenth-century literary authors, Jean-François Sarrazin and Antoinette Des Houlières (among women authors, Madeleine de Scudéry, the marquise de Sévigné, and Madame de Villedieu were also quoted regularly). Entries bearing on medicine were revised by the physician Pierre de Regis, a reminder that the wide encyclopedic scope of the *Dictionaire universel* made it impossible for any one compiler to handle all of its entries with equal dexterity.[140] There were a number of further editions; the *Dictionnaire universel* (as its title was spelt from the second edition onwards) therefore flourished in parallel to the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*.[141] Its tradition was continued by the *Dictionnaire universel français et latin*, better known as the *Dictionnaire de Trévoux* from its place of publication, which sought to rectify some of the supposedly Protestant tone introduced by Basnage while adding new material; its first edition appeared in 1704 and its last, in eight folio volumes, in 1771.[142]

Three kinds of dictionary

The point at which the tradition which began with the 1690 *Dictionaire universel* crossed the line between dictionary and encyclopedia might be debated. But if we go back to the dictionary made by Furetière, we can see that it stands in an interesting complementary relationship with the *Dictionnaire françois* of Richelet and the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. Furetière's dictionary was encyclopedic; Richelet's was literary; the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* might be called a grammatical dictionary, or even a linguistic dictionary, concerned to present the core vocabulary of the contemporary language with particular attention to its derivational processes.[143] When we left this dictionary a few pages above, it was almost ready for publication; in the next chapter, we shall examine the published dictionary, and see how it was received and how it developed.

CHAPTER 4

The Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise *from its publication to the end of the eighteenth century*

'It is very easy to make a dictionary', as Régnier-Desmarais remarked ruefully in an essay which he intended to publish as a preface to the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* – but only as long as one is sufficiently unambitious. Making a large-scale dictionary is another matter.[1] Sixty or so years after the project of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* was first conceived, the first edition was published; this chapter describes the published book and its receptions and revisions to the end of the eighteenth century.

The publication of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* (1694)

As we have seen, the first printed pages of the pre-edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* appeared long before the publication of the finished dictionary, which can be dated to the presentation of the dedication copy to Louis XIV at Versailles on 24 August 1694. The dictionary as officially released and presented to the Roi Soleil comprised two tall folio volumes, of 672 and 671 numbered pages respectively. It bore the imprint of the widow of Jean-Baptiste Coignard, identifying him as printer-in-ordinary to the king and to the Académie, and of his son, the inheritor of his printership-in-ordinary, also called Jean-Baptiste.[2] The published volumes have been described as 'sumptuous, unforgettable, worthy of a zenith of France'.[3] An engraved frontispiece showed the bust of Louis XIV being decked with garlands by Poetry, Rhetoric, and Grammar, while a copy of the *Dictionnaire* lies at the foot of the column on which it stands.[4] The title page announced the dictionary as 'LE DICTIONNAIRE DE L'ACADÉMIE FRANÇOISE, dedié au roy', and the dedication itself was headed with a vignette of the academicians approaching their enthroned monarch. Its first word, 'Sire', began with an engraved and decorated S whose curves enclosed the radiant face of the sun and the sphere of the earth, with Louis' motto 'Nec pluribus impar', signifying that just as the sun would be equal to the task of illuminating many worlds, so Louis

would be to that of ruling many nations. The dedication observed that the French language did not have words strong enough for Louis' valour, his wisdom, and so on.[5] Nor was this worship of the monarch merely a rhetorical flourish, for it had implications for the linguistic thought which was to inform the dictionary:

> If it has ever been right to say with certainty that a living language can attain fixity, and depend no longer on the caprice and tyranny of usage, we have cause to believe that ours has arrived, in our days, at that glorious point of immutability, since the books and other texts which will speak of YOUR MAJESTY will always be regarded as having been made in the Golden Age of France, and will always be the delight of all peoples, and the study of all monarchs.[6]

The perfection of the reign of Louis XIV raised the French language to a corresponding, and fixed, perfection. At first sight, then, the dictionary was a celebration of the absolutist French monarchy, of which the Académie française has been called the 'literary arm'.[7]

Turning beyond the dedication to the preface, which was the work of Charpentier, the reader of the first edition would learn much more.[8] It began by pointing out the usefulness of the extant dictionaries of Greek and Latin, and also their great shortcoming: they were not the products of the periods in which those languages were at their height. 'We have no dictionaries from the age of Cicero or the age of Demosthenes.'[9] If we did have such dictionaries, they would differ from existing dictionaries of the classical languages in one important respect: they would not need to give written authorities for the words they registered, because their makers would already be first-hand authorities on the usage of a literary golden age. 'The Dictionary of the Académie is of this sort. It has been begun and completed in the age when the French language has been in its most flourishing state.'[10] This was an elegant way of accounting for what might have been seen as a grave shortcoming of the dictionary compared to the most prestigious dictionaries of its age – those of the classical languages and the *Vocabolario della Crusca*. Another omission could now be accounted for: since the French language was now in a state of the highest excellence, close indeed to perfection, there could be no need in the dictionary for obsolete words – nor, considering that the excellence of French lay in its beauty and elegance, of words confined to technical use, 'which are seldom used in conversation'. The dictionary was, proudly, confined to the French language which was common to all, and which was used in the normal conversation of *honnêtes gens*. This was also the language of orators and poets, but there was no incongruity in seeing their usage as that of the best

normal discourse: since the prescriptive writings of François de Malherbe, it had been possible to see the language of poetry as restricted, precise, and clear, excluding both the provincial and the archaic, and excluding both the language of peasants and that of courtiers.[11] (A little later, a third exclusion was mentioned: that of terms which might 'injure modesty'. These again are not used in the conversation of *les honnêtes gens*. In practice, however, the dictionary did include forms such as *chier* 'shit' and *pisser* 'piss', just as the *Vocabolario* had included forms such as *merda* 'shit'.)[12]

The ambiguous relationship of the dictionary to usage, made inevitable by the decision of 1638 to do away with quotations from canonical authors, is again evident in these preliminaries. The dedication sees French as freed from the 'caprice and tyranny of usage' because it has arrived at a 'glorious point of immutability'; the preface sees the best French as that which is used today by *honnêtes gens*. The engraved vignette at the top of the page on which entries for A begin shows an allegorical figure representing the Académie, writing down laws dictated to her by Usage, above whose head is the tag 'si volet usus', from Horace. As every reader was surely expected to know, the line which follows is 'quem penes arbitrium est et ius et norma loquendi': 'if it be the will of custom, in the power of whose judgement is the law and the standard of language'. But Horace's point was that language is not fixed. The words just before 'si volet usus' in the *Ars Poetica* are 'Multa renascentur quae jam cecidere, cadentque | Quae nunc sunt in honore vocabula': 'Many words will be reborn which have now died, and many which are now in high esteem will fall.' This was just what Ménage had said in his *Parnasse alarmé* in the 1640s, concluding that the Académie had better give up its plan to make a prescriptive dictionary.

After its programmatic opening, the preface became a little more technical. Making a merit again of what might have appeared to be a restriction, it noted that technical terms are in fact much easier to define than those of everyday discourse: *telescope* is in this respect an easy word, but *to see* is not. An explanation of the semi-etymological structure of the dictionary followed, with the observation that 'it was judged that it would be pleasant and instructive to arrange the dictionary by roots'.[13] That arrangement draws one to read through a group of entries from root to derivatives and compounds, 'because one sees, if the expression is permissible, the history of the word, and observes its birth and its progress'.[14] Here, the word *histoire* anticipates the current use of *historical* to describe dictionaries in which the full story of a word is documented from its first datable attestation to its last, or to the time of compilation of the dictionary. The *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* was by no means a historical dictionary in

that sense, and its emphasis on current usage rather than on that of past authors gave its entries a strongly synchronic feel, but in tension with this, its structure was implicitly diachronic.[15]

Some of the criteria for inclusion were discussed further: neologisms would not be welcomed, technical terms might be included if they were in conversational use, proverbs might be included even if they had been degraded through their use by the lower orders.[16] Orthography was discussed, as was the sensible decision not to indicate pronunciation; the careful provision of grammatical information was defended. The preface closed with an admission that the making of the dictionary had been slow, a defence of the inevitable meticulousness of the dictionary-making process (reinforced with a repetition of Pellisson's claim that the Accademia della Crusca had taken forty years to make its dictionary), and a statement that comments which would make the improvement of subsequent issues possible would be very welcome. The only other preliminaries were a list of the current academicians, the royal privilege which forbade the republication of the dictionary by any unauthorized party, and a very short list of abbreviations. Compared to the preliminaries of the recent third edition of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, this was an austere introduction to the dictionary: about twenty pages, rather than three hundred. But austerity was the keynote of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. Hence its very limited wordlist, which ran to 5,492 main entries and 13,269 subentries, slightly fewer than the first edition of the *Vocabolario*, let alone the third.[17]

Each page of the main text of the dictionary was laid out in double columns. 'Mots primitifs' – words which were not derived from other words – were printed in capitals, and were followed by derived and compound forms in small capitals, and interspersed with cross-references, in capitals; lest this typographical complexity should make the page difficult to navigate, each column was interspersed with three-letter guides, in large capitals, to its alphabetical sequence. So, on page 638, the left-hand column begins with the entry 'LEGUME', the headword being in capitals since this is a *mot primitif*. Then the centred heading 'LEN', in large capitals, introduces cross-references to 'LENDEMAIN' and 'LENDORE', to be sought under 'DEMAIN' and 'DORMIR' respectively; an entry for the *mot primitif* 'LENITIF'; one for the *mot primitif* 'LENT', followed by entries for the derived forms 'LENTEUR', 'LENTEMENT', 'ALENTIR', 'ALENTI', 'RALENTIR', and 'RALENTI'; and so on. (A looser interpretation of semi-etymological order would have been possible: Robert Estienne's *Dictionaire francoislatin*, for instance, had treated *lendemain* at *len-* rather than referring it to *demain*.) An alphabetical index at the end of the volume, as called for by Chapelain

in 1638, provided a second means of locating every entry. This was a very fair attempt at making a semi-etymological order easy to use, although it inevitably condemned the reader to having two large folio volumes open at once when moving, for instance, from *construire* to *structure*, or from *quintessence* to *estre* (modern French *être*), or from *couvent* to *venir*.

The *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* has this entry for the French cognate of *lento*, the word which we saw handled in the *Vocabolario della Crusca* at the very beginning of Chapter 2:

> LENT, ENTE. adj. Tardif, qui n'est pas viste, qui se remuë, qui agit avec peu de promptitude. *L'asne est un animal lent et pesant. le mouvement de Saturne est plus lent que celuy des autres planetes. que cet homme est lent! il est si lent en tout ce qu'il fait. lent à parler. lent à escrire* etc. *c'est un esprit lent, une humeur lente. il a le poux lent. un feu lent. un poison lent. une fievre lente. donner un feu lent. cuire à feu lent*.

This is neatly done: the definition style is in this case more sophisticated than that of the *Vocabolario*, offering phrasal explanations rather than single-word equivalents, and the entry is terser than that of Furetière. A lot of work is done by the made-up examples printed in italics.

The reception of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*

The reception of the *Dictionnaire* was mixed. When the academicians presented the king with his copy, he replied that 'this is a work which has been long awaited. Since so many able men have worked on it, I have no doubt that it will be very fine, and very useful for the language. I am glad to receive it; I shall read it in my leisure hours, and I shall try to profit by it.'[18] These words were reported in the contemporary periodical *Le Mercure galant*, which as we shall see had close connections with the Académie, as warmly positive, but they have also been interpreted otherwise – 'less as praise for the result than as an ironic reference to the snail's pace at which it had been achieved' – and it is striking that the *Régistres* of the academy do not have an entry for the presentation: were the academicians disappointed?[19] To be sure, Louis appears to have been equally lukewarm in his dealings with another of the learned academies of his kingdom, the Académie des Sciences.[20] The same day saw the presentation to Louis by its Dutch publisher of another dictionary, a revised first edition of Furetière's *Dictionaire universel* – 'a rather bizarre contretemps', as the dramatist Jean Racine (himself an academician) remarked at the time, adding that the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* 'does not seem to have as many supporters as the other one'.[21]

The lexicographer Alain Rey has written that the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* 'was criticized on two fronts: the elite found the dictionary incomplete and hard to use', the latter being on account of its semi-etymological ordering, 'and the purists found in it far too many phrases they considered vulgar and common'.[22] To this, another lexicographer, Bernard Quemada, has added that the dictionary was disorderly and incomplete; that it was curiously banal in the plainness of its definitions and illustrative examples and the lack of citations or encyclopedic material; and that it was, by the 1690s, out of date in its conception of its political and social role.[23] To this remark, we may compare Laurent Bray's, quoted in Chapter 3 (p. 43), that in Richelet's dictionary of 1680 'the ideal of the *honnête homme* of the seventeenth century' can already be seen giving way 'to that of the universality of knowledge of the eighteenth'. These criticisms are at play in Furetière's denunciations of the preliminary printed sheets, which he had seen.[24] They are latent in other contemporary documents, such as Pierre Besnier's essay on etymology in the second edition of Ménage's *Origines*, which remarks that alphabetical ordering is now the norm for all dictionaries, the implied contrast being with the major semi-etymological dictionaries of the sixteenth century and their successors down to Pierre Danet in 1673, as well as perhaps the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*.[25] Most saliently, criticisms of the sort summarized by Rey and Quemada are to be found in early printed responses to the dictionary itself. *L'Apothéose du Dictionnaire de l'Académie* of 1696, for instance, collected some of the dullest illustrative phrases: '*Take one's shirt off*, *warm a shirt*, *dirty shirt*, *shirtsleeve* – Aren't these good phrases? Unfortunately, they forgot to add *shit in one's shirt*' (an idiom which reminds us that in the seventeenth century, shirt-tails rather than underwear came between a man and his breeches).[26] *L'Apothéose du Dictionnaire* also criticized the defining style of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*: its remarks on the definition of *amour* 'love' as 'the sentiment of one who loves' began 'What a pathetic definition!'[27] It is only fair to add firstly that the structural principles of the dictionary called for derivatives like *amour* to be defined in terms of primitives like *aime*, and secondly that a more precise definition explaining the use of *amour* with reference to romantic, sexually motivated love follows.[28] The definition of *amourette* as 'folle amour' was treated equally contemptuously in *L'Apothéose du Dictionnaire*: a person who has an *amourette*, according to *L'Apothéose*, is one who has 'a little hidden inclination towards someone who isn't his social equal', and as for the academicians who could say that the word meant 'a mad love':

> The Chevalier de F—, when he was diverting himself with his friends, would say sometimes that he had given his breviary to his manservant so that he could say the Office in his place. I would be glad to think that Messieurs the Academicians used to give their files to the porter of their office so that he could write some of the definitions in them.[29]

In *L'Enterrement du Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, of 1697, the same author remarked on the dictionary's 'infinite number of omissions', its failure to confine itself to the common language of *honnêtes gens*, and the shortcomings of its definitions, illustrating these general points and others with 215 new examples.[30]

A different tack was taken in *Le Dictionnaire des Halles; ou, Extrait du Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (*The Billingsgate Dictionary; or, Extract from the Dictionary of the French Academy*), also of 1696, which excerpted all the material which seemed most vulgar from the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, most of it homespun wisdom rather than taboo words. Of course some of the latter were to be found, for instance *chier* and *pisser*, and the anonymous compiler remarked sarcastically in his preface that 'One finds no such politenesses as these in the dictionary of Robert Estienne, nor in that of the Crusca.'[31] Beaulieux lays the 'lavatorial expressions' denounced here at the door of François Charpentier.[32]

These contemporary criticisms were variously motivated, but they were not all unreasonable: the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* was a flawed achievement, as all dictionaries obviously are. We may add to them, and to the well-founded criticisms of Rey and Quemada, the point that the interest in fixing the living language which was expressed in the dedication was vain. As early as 1699, the English antiquary Thomas Baker wrote that the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* 'has been thought to want Correction; and does thereby show, how impossible it is to set Bounds, or give a Standard to Language, for which purpose it was design'd', and Samuel Johnson remarked half a century later that 'to enchain syllables, and to lash the wind, are equally the undertakings of pride, unwilling to measure its desires by its strength. The *French* language has visibly changed under the inspection of the academy.'[33]

However, the achievement of the dictionary, flawed as it was, was also very important. Before the decade was out, foreign bilingual dictionaries of French had begun to appeal to its authority: so, the Huguenot lexicographer and journalist Abel Boyer's French and English *Royal dictionary* of 1699 boasts that its French is, *inter alia*, 'taken out of … the great dictionary of the French-Academy'.[34] In 1712, the German language teacher and lexicographer Matthias Kramer, to whose work we shall return in the

next chapter, published a *Vraiment parfait dictionnaire roial* which boasted on its title page, in a progression from lower-case to small and then to large capitals, that it was enriched with 'all that is most elegant [*beau*], most courtly [*poli*], and best established in the famous ROYAL DICTIONARY *of the Gentlemen* OF THE FRENCH ACADEMY', before returning to small capitals and lower case to add that it also drew on the dictionaries of 'ANTOINE FURETIERE, PIERRE RICHELET, and others'.[35] Just as new editions of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* would, as we are about to see, be produced in France, so the dictionary would be translated wholesale, for instance into Russian from 1773 to 1786 (see Chapter 8 below) and into German from 1782 to 1793.[36] The *Vocabolario* had been confined to the Tuscan topolect and had depended heavily on sources which were several centuries old; now, for the first time, an official body had sought to give a full account of the basic modern vocabulary and the derivational principles of a national language. This account was presented with considerable dignity: this was a national dictionary, of a sort which could be presented to the king and indeed to foreign monarchs: the king and queen of England received theirs in September 1694.[37] It was a work of some typographical sophistication. It deliberately rejected the use of citations, but its ideal was the vetting of every entry by a group of academicians acting as an in-house usage panel. Future academic bodies might debate whether their dictionaries should be based on citation evidence or on the editors' sense of good usage, and they might certainly question what might be called the 'Malherbian reductionist aesthetic' of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, but they could not ignore the dictionary's example.[38]

The *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences* of Thomas Corneille (1694)

A note at the end of the preface of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* stated that some of the academicians had decided to produce a separate dictionary of the 'words particularly associated with the sciences and the arts'.[39] Writing in 1694, the publisher of a collected edition of Furetière's *Factums* observed that since the *Dictionnaire* had taken so long to appear, the dictionary of the arts and sciences which was promised as its sequel could hardly be expected for another ninety years.[40] This sarcasm was the result of understandable competitiveness, since the promised dictionary was obviously the academy's answer to the extensive provision of encyclopedic material in the *Dictionnaire universel*. As a factual prediction, however, it was inaccurate: the *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences* appeared

in September 1694, published like the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* by the house of Coignard.[41] Its chief editor was the dramatist Thomas Corneille, who had succeeded his older and more famous brother Pierre as a member of the academy in 1684. He was not an expert in the use of technical vocabulary, but he was a willing worker, who had played a helpful part in the reading of the proofs of the main dictionary.[42] Even before either work was put on sale to the public, it was made known – in *Le Mercure galant*, a journal with which Thomas Corneille was closely associated – that 'enquiring persons who buy these four volumes can be sure that they will possess the fullest dictionary which has appeared up to now'.[43] A rival closer to home than the three-volume third edition of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, namely the three-volume *Dictionnaire universel*, was, then, to be challenged by the four-volume combination of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* and the *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*.

The *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences* began with a pugnacious preface, attacking 'Le Dictionnaire qui fut imprimé en Hollande en 1688 [i.e. 1690]' on some rather trifling grounds: its author wrote *barrometre* for *barometre*; he thought that the phrase *media noche* was Italian and not Spanish; he thought that preserved tuna fish was poisonous in the hottest summer weather while according to Corneille this is only true of the fresh fish.[44] Corneille's dictionary itself matched the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* in *mise-en-page*, but was of course fully alphabetized, being concerned exclusively with the denotation rather than the derivation of words. It borrowed definitions from its sister dictionary, with acknowledgement, when it treated a word in both general and specialized use: the entry *coeur*, for example, begins with a definition from the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* before giving an account of the anatomy of the heart, partially copied from Furetière.[45] It was natural that Corneille's work, undertaken in haste and without specialized expertise, should have been derivative. Leibniz thought that it was largely from Furetière: 'the renowned French Academy has not only published its long awaited accounting of current French, but also of what appertains to art and manufacture, taken from Furetière, and continued by another academician'.[46] It appears, in fact, to owe more to the *Dictionnaire françois* of Richelet: by one count, about two-fifths of his entries are directly from this source, and another two-fifths are modified from it.[47] This may depend on what is meant by modification. In the range *len-*, for example, Corneille's entries are *lenifier*, *lenitif*, *lenticulaire*, *lentille* (in the sense 'lentil' but not 'lens'), and *lentisque*. Richelet's entries for technical words in the same range are *lenifier*, *lenitif*, *lentille*, and *lentisque*; of these, the first is abbreviated by Corneille, the second and third

rewritten, and the fourth considerably expanded, so that four-fifths of the sample is from Richelet, but none of it verbatim. Corneille's reworkings of Richelet were not always happy: taking Richelet's entry *phenix*, which describes the beautiful plumage and fiery self-renewal of the bird and ends with an approving reference to John Johnstone's scepticism as to its existence, Corneille wrote an entry *phoenix*, adding a few flourishes – for instance that it has 'eyes which sparkle like stars' – but dropping the reference to Johnstone and concluding vaguely that *other* claims about the phoenix in ancient authors are regarded as fabulous. This was not the only occasion on which he appeared more receptive than the best minds of the 1690s to well-established stories about wonderful creatures.[48]

The scope of the *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences* was meant to be wide, extending over the sciences and at least the fine and applied arts, and also including two classes of entry which one might not have expected under the rubric of arts and sciences, namely archaisms and material on the history of the Church.[49] Encyclopedic information is provided somewhat inconsistently, as if Corneille was unsure as to how far his book was about words, and how far it was about things. As was observed in the discussion of Furetière in the previous chapter, in the late seventeenth century, the modern conceptual distinction between dictionaries and alphabetized encyclopedias, which are taken to deal respectively with words and things, had not been fully articulated. So, Corneille's uncertainty was not unreasonable. But times were changing: the English compiler John Harris remarked in the preface to his *Lexicon technicum* of 1704 that the *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences* was not illustrated, and that it 'is only a bare Explication of Terms of Art' which 'seems rather to have been design'd to improve and propagate the *French Language*, than to inform and instruct the Humane Mind in general'.[50] In the same passage, Harris criticized Furetière's dictionary in similar terms, making a contrast with his own, which was 'a Dictionary not only of bare *Words* but *Things*'. It was in fact Furetière's *Dictionaire universel* which continued to be published in a steady stream of editions, under its original author's name and then as the *Dictionnaire de Trévoux*, while the *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences* was reworked only once, in 1732, as a work of the old age of Corneille's nephew, Bernard Le Bovier de Fontenelle.[51] Its story is like that of Bergantini's *Voci italiane* of 1745, which we noticed in Chapter 2: in the eighteenth century, lexically oriented dictionaries of arts and sciences like Corneille's and Bergantini's turned out to be less useful than either universal dictionaries like Furetière's or alphabetized encyclopedias like Rochefort's.

In 1694, however, the *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences* did usefully complement the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. Not only did it stand side by side with it against the *Dictionnaire universel*, it also helped to fulfil the mandate set out in the statutes of the academy in 1635 that the French language should be made not only pure and eloquent but also capable of treating the arts and sciences. As we noted earlier, a second edition of Ménage's *Origines de la langue françoise* was published in 1694, so that the same year saw the publication of three dictionaries of French: one of current words in general usage, one of technical words, and one oriented towards the past. This triple publication was, as we shall see in the next chapter, an inspiration to Leibniz as he formed plans for the lexicography of German.

From the second to the fourth edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1718, 1740, 1762)

A second edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* appeared in 1695 under the title *Le Grand Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*, printed by Marc Huguetan in Amsterdam under the fictitious imprint of Jean-Baptiste Coignard.[52] This inserted the corrections from the end of the first volume of the first edition into the text in their proper alphabetical sequence, but made no other significant changes. Its privilege, granted by the States of Holland and West Friesland, is dated 13 February 1693 and refers to the dictionary as having been previously published in France, showing that Huguetan expected to reprint the pre-edition, and changed his plans when this was suppressed and the edition of August 1694 appeared instead.[53] Huguetan's reprint appears to be a rare book: potential purchasers in the Low Countries must have preferred the dictionaries of Richelet and Furetière. It is not reckoned in the conventional numbering of editions of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, in which the edition of 1718 is the second, that of 1740 the third, and so on.

The need to revise the dictionary was perceived very soon after its publication, and at a meeting at the end of January 1695, it was agreed that this should be undertaken as the 'principal and ordinary work' of the academy, rather than the preparation of the grammar which had been called for in the original statutes; this resolution was not to the taste of every academician, and had to be renewed at two subsequent meetings.[54] A fully revised second edition appeared in 1718, under the title *Nouveau dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*. The word *nouveau* was not simply a response to the fact that editions of Richelet's dictionary since 1694 had been appearing

as *Nouveau dictionnaire françois*. The great difference which made the Académie call its second edition, and none other thereafter, 'new' was its replacement of semi-etymological order by fully alphabetical order. This major change, which took the most important diachronic element out of the dictionary, was agreed on in 1700, after the revision process had been under way for several years.[55] It was alluded to by Samuel Johnson when, reflecting on the impossibility of making a perfect dictionary, he wrote that 'the embodied criticks of *France*, when fifty years had been spent upon their work, were obliged to change its oeconomy, and give their second edition another form'.[56] As well as this, the preface to the *Nouveau dictionnaire de l'Académie* claimed that many words had been added – for instance, *idéal* appears there after having been omitted from the first edition – and that nearly all the entries had been retouched.[57] So, for instance, *ami*, whose definition in the first edition s.v. *amy* as 'One who feels affection for someone and goes about to do that person all sorts of good offices' had been the fruit of a long debate as to whether friendship is necessarily reciprocal, is defined more neatly in the second as 'The person with whom someone is joined in mutual affection'.[58] A suggestion by the academician Charles-Irénée Castel de Saint-Pierre, who is now remembered for his pioneering project for a European union, that the vocabulary of the arts and sciences should be registered in the new edition was not acted upon.[59]

This second edition was overseen by the aged abbé Régnier-Desmarais, the perpetual secretary to the academy, until his death in 1713; he was assisted by Thomas Corneille.[60] It was even suggested, again by the abbé de Saint-Pierre, that Régnier-Desmarais should be named as editor on the title page, though this was not done in the end, and the dictionary continued to be presented as the collective work of the whole academy.[61] The rules drawn up to govern the conduct of the new perpetual secretary specified that whereas he must on the whole confine himself to correcting the dictionary in accordance with the instructions of the academy as a whole, he might add 'examples drawn from the best authors of the language' without consulting his colleagues.[62] These examples would be presented without identifying their authors, and would therefore not be readily distinguishable from the made-up examples of which the dictionary was full: the emphasis on the best authors was not a sign that the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* was being reconceived, but a restraint on the secretary, prohibiting him from taking it upon himself to add examples from his own linguistic intuition or from questionable sources. The new secretary who took over the responsibility for the correction of the dictionary was the

classicist André Dacier, who lived to see the *Nouveau dictionnaire de l'Académie* on its slow progress through the press – by December 1714 it had reached the letter E, by January 1717 the letter L – and to present the dedication copy to the new king, the eight-year-old Louis XV, on 30 June 1718.[63]

In the following year, the Académie discussed the appropriateness of working on a further revision of the dictionary, a course to which some academicians were strongly opposed. They reflected that the French nation, always anxious for novelty, would be unimpressed to see yet more lexicographical work going on, and that the example of the continued dictionary-making of the Accademia della Crusca (whose members were by this time working on the fourth edition of the *Vocabolario*) would not protect the Académie from the censure and raillery of the public.[64] However, it was agreed that the revision of the dictionary should be taken further: the second edition was evidently not yet perfect. In 1727, an academician, perhaps the abbé Pierre-Joseph Thoulier d'Olivet, suggested a radical rewriting in a letter to the royal librarian (and his fellow academician) Jean-Paul Bignon:

> It would be necessary to begin by burning our dictionary as it stands, because it gives occasion to a kind of idolatry which is no less dangerous than that of China. We have made, in the course of eighty years, an accumulation of words explained by definitions and phrases which have neither rhyme nor reason … the little children laugh at it, as also do those of our number who have a bit of sense; all the same, when we are puzzled about a word or phrase, we go on our knees to consult this fetish.[65]

This letter was supported by a memorandum, which commented on the inefficiency of composing definitions and inventing examples in committee meetings, and argued that nothing worthwhile could ever be done with the dictionary if it was not founded on citations from texts. 'We have good models to follow in this matter': the *Thesaurus latinae linguae* of Robert Estienne, the *Thesaurus graecae linguae* of Henri Estienne, the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, and the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana* of the Real Academia Española (for which see Chapter 6 below), of which the first volume had just appeared.[66] The idea of enriching the dictionary with citations was discussed, but a majority of academicians voted against it.[67]

So, when a third edition was actually published, in 1740, the most remarkable innovation it offered was an extensively revised orthography. The academicians had agreed that the orthography of the first two editions was no longer satisfactory, but they found it harder to decide what the replacement should look like, and at the end of 1735, after six months

had been spent in debating the matter, they decided to make Olivet 'the sole plenipotentiary' in this regard.[68] This was not entirely a compliment: the work of overhauling the dictionary in this respect was neither easy nor entertaining – an 'irksome occupation' – and it is possible that Olivet accepted it because he was at the time rebuilding his reputation after a scandal which had sent him away from Paris in the previous year.[69] Although he made no claim to be a spelling reformer – on the contrary, the preface to the third edition refers to the academy's continuing readiness to observe universally accepted usage – the orthography which he came up with was simpler and more systematic than that of the first two editions.[70] Another development in this edition was the introduction of a number of terms which had previously been regarded as belonging to the technical vocabulary of the arts and sciences but which the academicians now regarded as having been normalized in non-technical usage.[71] So, for example, the first edition had registered *lentille* in the senses 'lentil' and 'freckle', but the third also noted the sense 'lens'. In this respect, the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* was catching up with Furetière, who had registered the optical sense in 1690; Thomas Corneille had missed it, though he had noted in his entry for *lenticulaire* that a lenticular piece of glass 'approximates the shape of a lentil'.[72] Just as Olivet had overhauled the orthography of the third edition by himself, he had to do the majority of the proofreading, a reminder of the problem of asking a body of unequally talented and unequally industrious persons to work together on a dictionary project.[73] This slowed down the production of the dictionary. So, earlier, had the failure of the printer (another Coignard, perhaps the son of the one who printed the second edition and whom Olivet had called 'the stupidest printer in the world' a few years earlier) to prepare enough of the accented letters which occurred frequently in the new orthography as it replaced, for instance, *despescher* with *dépêcher*.[74] A copy was naturally presented to the king, on large paper and bound in morocco; thirteen other presentation copies went to French notables, and a fifteenth to the Accademia della Crusca, suggesting a new sense of the shared purpose of the two academies.[75]

After a brief, abortive plan that the academy should turn its attention to the preparation of a *Dictionnaire orthographique*, a fourth edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* followed in 1762: the king received his copy on 10 January.[76] Other copies went to the usual dignitaries, and to the Accademia della Crusca, the Real Academia Española, and Samuel Johnson.[77] Its introduction was the work of the then perpetual secretary of the academy, Charles Pinot Duclos, who had also taken a leading part

in the revision process. He drew his readers' attention to the admission of 'basic terms of the sciences, the arts, and even those of the trades' on the grounds that an *homme de lettres* might find these in his reading of non-technical works: here, there is an overt movement from the ideal of including the language of the polite discourse of *honnêtes gens* to the ideal of including that of the solitary encyclopedic reading of educated persons.[78] So, for instance, the entry *lentille*, which had been improved in 1740 by a recognition of the sense 'lens', now received an addition of a further thirteen lines, registering *lentille d'eau*/*lentille de marais* 'duckweed', with some encyclopedic detail, and also *lentille* in the sense 'bob of a pendulum'. Duclos also emphasized the responsiveness of the dictionary to changing usage: 'One must not anticipate the public when it comes to language, but it is appropriate to follow them, submitting oneself, not to emerging usage, but to usage which is generally established.'[79] This too was a marked development beyond the fantasies of immutability of 1694. Less important at an ideological level, but more conspicuous to readers, was the separation of words beginning with the vowels I and U from those beginning with the consonants J and V: although previous editions had distinguished the letters ('JAUNISSE' began with a curved J, 'ICELUI' with a straight I), they had nevertheless placed words in I/J in a single alphabetical sequence, and words in U/V likewise, so that for instance *jaunisse* had been followed directly by *icelui* rather than by *je*. A series of quarto reprints of this edition in a smaller typeface appeared between 1765 and 1793, bringing the dictionary to a wider readership, and an abridgement, *Vocabulaire françois ou abrégé du Dictionnaire françois de l'Académie françoise*, appeared in 1771.[80]

The dictionary projects of Voltaire and Pougens (1778 onwards)

On 7 May 1778 a new dictionary project was taken up by the Académie, at the instigation of its oldest member, Voltaire, who had been born before the publication of the first edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, and had revised 115 entries in the fourth edition.[81] This was meant to produce a dictionary which should provide the etymology of every word together with its diverse senses, which would be illustrated by 'examples drawn from the most approved authors'.[82] Picturesque and lively expressions from the works of authors as early as the sixteenth century would be included if they were thought to deserve to be revived, and the whole work would be 'as delightful as it is necessary, at once a grammar, a rhetoric, and a poetics'.[83]

A similar plan had in fact been floated in 1719, when the Académie was debating whether to continue with lexicography after the publication of the *Nouveau dictionnaire de l'Académie*, and had likewise been promoted as allowing the dictionary to perform the functions of the grammar, poetics, and rhetoric for which the original statutes of the academy had called.[84] The undertaking which Voltaire imagined would be shared out between individual academicians, and the contributions of each would then be reviewed by the academy as a whole. Voltaire's dictionary would have been historical to a greater extent than the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* (and, particularly, to a greater extent than the fully alphabetized editions of 1718 onwards which abandoned the implicitly diachronic, semi-etymological structure of 1694), but this was not a project to make what we would call a historical dictionary. There was no suggestion, for instance, that the examples should be arranged chronologically, or that an early example from an obscure author would be preferable to a late example from an approved one, or that medieval materials should be drawn on.

An academician present at the meeting at which the project was announced was Jean-Baptiste de Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye, whose very extensive *Glossaire françois* had been announced in a pamphlet of 1756, but would not (apart from one volume of an abortive edition) be published for a hundred years.[85] Sainte-Palaye did have historical principles in mind which recall those expressed by Bayle in 1690 in the brilliant 'Preface' to the *Dictionaire universel* of Furetière which was discussed above: he wrote in 1756 that by illustrating each word with multiple examples in unmodernized spelling, he would show 'the different stages through which the same word has passed, receiving a number of successive alterations in its pronunciation, its spelling, and so on', which would be 'like links in a chain, bringing us nearer and nearer to the original of the word which we use today'.[86] This was a long way from the thinking which underlay Voltaire's project: Sainte-Palaye was thinking about the historical development of the language rather than simply expressing a willingness to cull flowers from the works of past authors as long as those works were recent enough to be read without difficulty.

Voltaire's project itself was clearly somewhat idealistic, and might have been recognized as such without the benefit of hindsight. For instance, the plan to make the dictionary a delightful grammar, rhetoric, and poetics in one by illustrating it with pleasing literary extracts at once recalls Johnson's gloomy discovery, published more than twenty years before, that to 'intersperse with verdure and flowers the dusty desarts of barren philology' was by no means always practicable.[87] A highly selective alphabetical collection

of such material might certainly have been undertaken – something more on the scale of Voltaire's own *Dictionnaire philosophique*, which was published under several titles from 1764 onwards, and of which the fullest version ran to 118 articles – but Voltaire's project does seem to have been much more ambitious than that.[88] Moreover, the revision of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, discussed at a meeting less than a fortnight later, was bound to compete with the making of a separate dictionary on a different plan.[89] At the end of May, Voltaire died, and the registers of the Académie for the rest of its eighteenth-century career do not mention his dictionary project again: 'the short-lived effervescence which he had imparted to the academy subsided with him', concluded an academician in 1791.[90]

Another historical dictionary project was undertaken in 1776 by the extraordinary Marie-Charles-Joseph de Pougens, who, despite having become totally blind in 1779 as a result of incompetent medical treatment after his sight had been impaired by smallpox, collected or arranged the collection of half a million quotations from French authors towards his dictionary.[91] He must have had amanuenses read to him, interrupting them to tell them when a sentence should be transcribed for the sake of a word in it, and he must then have had them file the transcribed sentences alphabetically and read them back to him when he wanted an overview of the citations for a particular word. But still, his work would have been impossible had he not had inspiring patience and a most remarkable ability to keep multiple items simultaneously in his active memory. By 1794, he could report that men of letters and *philosophes* had for a long time demanded a complete French dictionary, objecting to the inadequacies of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* and to the academicians' rejection of the usage of others in favour of phrases of their own invention to illustrate the meanings of words.[92] Voltaire, he noted, had called for 'a less arid and more complete Vocabulary', a turn of phrase recalling Bayle's reference to the *secheresse* of some lexicography.[93] Other countries had excellent dictionaries: the fourth edition of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, the English dictionary of Johnson, the Portuguese dictionary of Bluteau (for the last three, see Chapters 6, 7, and 8 respectively). He had been working, despite 'the painful circumstances of my life', on a dictionary of French to rival these.[94]

The dictionary which Pougens proposed would have six key points. First, it would record the changing forms of each word it registered, 'as far as it has been possible for me to sort them out through the irregularity and uncertainty of our tongue in the age when it came forth, still inchoate, from the breast of the *langue romance*'.[95] Notable here is the sense

that French was to be traced back to its very beginnings: to the point where it could be distinguished from a general proto-Romance or late vulgar Latin. This work had, by 1794, been largely achieved, thanks to Pougens' access to the manuscript materials of Sainte-Palaye. Second, it would offer unfanciful etymologies grounded in a thorough knowledge of the ancient languages of northern Europe: five eighths of this work, amounting to twenty-one thousand articles, had been completed. Third, the definitions would be based on reading and on consultation with *philosophes* and *gens de goût*: this last phrase suggests a tradition continuing from the seventeenth-century academicians' valorization of the usage of the *honnêtes gens* of their day. Fourth, the definitions would be supported by 'phrases or *pensées* drawn from the French classical authors, dead or living'.[96] As the last word suggested, Pougens had no objection to current usage; he added explicitly that he would include good neologisms, marking them with an asterisk. Fifth, each entry would end with material on synonyms, and sixth, a final volume would be devoted to commentary on the language, with special attention to archaic French words or cognates of French words in other languages which supplied lexical gaps in current French. (A sketch of this last part of the project was printed in 1794, in the form of a dictionary of French words to which negative prefixes could potentially be attached, supported with illustrations from the best authors in other European languages who had used analogous negative forms: the first entry is for *abaissé*, which Pougens suggests could have a negative **inabaissé*, on the model of English *unabashed*, which he knew from its use by Pope.)[97]

Pougens' project was, like Voltaire's, not historical in the modern sense: there is, for instance, no suggestion that the earliest possible example of a given word would be sought out. But its interest in changing forms and in the use of quotation evidence is impressive; had it been realized, this would have been a synchronic dictionary with a deep diachronic element. As the years went by, Pougens modified his plans for it, as we shall see briefly in Chapter 9.

The fifth edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1798)

The Académie française was, together with the other royal academies, naturally vulnerable to the revolutionary spirit. The text of 1791 which has just been quoted for its comment on the death of Voltaire was a bitter attack on the academy by Sébastien-Roch Nicolas de Chamfort, who had

been elected to its membership in 1781. He denounced it as 'mediocre, incomplete, inadequate'; gave a distorted impression of how it had supposedly revolted Voltaire; and compared its slow composition with that of the dictionaries of Furetière, Johnson (whose dictionary he called 'an English dictionary, the best of all': the best of all English dictionaries, or of all dictionaries?), Thomas Corneille, and the compilers of encyclopedias such as Bayle.[98] A response of the same year by the academician André Morellet made the case, 'for the twentieth time, that the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* bears witness to the usage which governs the French language, to that which is the most general among those who speak correct and pure French', and 'that bearing witness to usage is not the business of a single man, nor even of two or three' but that of 'a company of well-informed men', whose work as a body must necessarily be undertaken slowly.[99]

The academy was disbanded in August 1793. The official working copy of the fourth edition of the dictionary, marked up with marginalia and other corrections by Duclos, the overseer of the fourth edition, and by his successors in the perpetual secretaryship, the encyclopedist Jean le Rond d'Alembert and the essayist Jean-François Marmontel, was rescued by Morellet.[100] This copy was subsequently legally appropriated, and served as printer's copy for a fifth edition, which was ordered to be produced in a print run of 15,000 copies – a long way from the small and tentative first edition of the *Vocabolario della Crusca* at the beginning of the previous century.[101] This, the final edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* of the eighteenth century, was published in 1798. The title page emphasized that it had been 'reviewed, corrected, and augmented by the academy itself' (a claim rejected by Pougens, who regarded the fourth edition of the *Dictionnaire* as the only authentic one): the abolished institution evidently had a certain posthumous cachet.[102] The foreword of the new edition began by reflecting on the place of the Académie in the *Ancien Régime*, identifying it in spite of its undeniable moments of flattery of the king as having provided a truly democratic space, where 'the name of *King* was rarely spoken; the odious name of *Subject*, never'.[103] After this slightly desperate piece of special pleading, the foreword went on to describe the place of a dictionary in the life of a nation: 'a language, like the spirit of the people which speaks it, is always on the move', and a good dictionary will help the whole people to secure their language without limiting it – to secure it, that is to say, on the way from strength to strength.[104] This led into an attempt to argue that a prescriptive dictionary could be a republican institution. The individual users of a language must understand each other: 'the most general and most dangerous cause of our errors, of our

faulty reasoning, is our continual abuse of words'. Each word must be given its precise value, and this is work for a dictionary.[105] This argument was in tune with the centralizing and rationalizing language policies of the First Republic, and also had an intellectual pedigree going back to the seventeenth-century schemes for universal languages, like the philosophical language of John Wilkins, which had the aim of 'unmasking many wild errors, that shelter themselves under the disguise of affected phrases'.[106] It was, on the other hand, in contrast with the interest in language as the work of the whole people which was expressed by other lexicographers of the long eighteenth century, as we shall see when we discuss the thought of Matthias Moth in Denmark in Chapter 5, and that of Daniël van Alphen in the Netherlands in Chapter 8.

The *mise-en-page* of the new edition was much less handsome than that of its predecessors. Its triple-column layout, perhaps inspired by that of the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana* of 1780, to which we shall return in Chapter 6 below, saved paper (the set was of two volumes of 768 and 776 numbered pages, compared to the 984 and 967 of the previous edition) but was not, and perhaps could not have been, handled with elegance. The text was revised and expanded, often in much the same way as we have seen in previous editions: the entry *lentille*, for example, was now followed by a new entry for the adjective *lentilleux* 'freckled', which had in fact appeared in an edition of Robert Estienne's *Dictionaire francoislatin* as early as 1549.[107] A little before *lentille*, the adjectival and substantival senses of *lenitif* were distinguished more carefully than before. The entry count was considerably higher than that of the first edition: a recent machine count identifies 26,386 headwords, and a total of 38,632 entries and subentries.[108] The really striking change to the text of the new edition was the provision of a fascinating appendix of post-Revolutionary innovations. This offered new words – *alarmiste*, *centigrade*, *guillotine*, *sans-culotte*, *ultra-revolutionnaire* – and new senses of old ones, from *acclamation*, with reference to debating and electionary procedure (as in 'Motion carried by acclamation'); through *aristocratie* ('since the Revolution, this word has designated the former noble and privileged classes, and in general, the enemies of the new Government'); and *souverain*, with reference to collective rather than personal sovereignty; to *tricolore*, *urgence*, and *véto*.[109]

By the end of the eighteenth century, then, although the Académie française itself was dormant, the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* was still alive, and adapting to the dramatic changes in French public life which had been brought about by the Revolution. It was part of a complex lexicographical

scene. Although Sainte-Palaye's dictionary of Old French continued to languish in manuscript, other dictionaries of pre-modern French were available. The *Origines* of Ménage had not yet been replaced as the standard etymological dictionary, despite a proposal for a new one from the fertile mind of the abbé Saint-Pierre and the appearance of a *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue française* as the ninth volume of Antoine Court de Gébelin's *Monde primitif*, but that was not surprising: in 1800, the seventeenth-century English etymological dictionaries of Junius and Skinner had still not been superseded.[110] The tradition of Furetière and the *Dictionnaire de Trévoux* had come to an end in 1771, but a two-volume abridgement of Richelet's dictionary, the *Dictionnaire portatif de la langue françoise*, had been republished as recently as 1798, and the three-volume *Dictionnaire critique* of Jean-François Feraud, which is rich in very interesting metalinguistic commentary, had been published in 1787 and 1788. Bilingual and specialized dictionaries were very numerous. The nineteenth century would see something of an overhaul of the lexicographical inventory: neither Richelet nor Feraud would be republished after 1818.[111] But the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* would continue in the place of honour which the tenacity of generations of academicians had earned for it since 1694.

The founding of an academy tradition

The legacy which was left to future lexicographers as a joint result of the separate and even contrasting lexicographical work of the Accademia della Crusca and the Académie française was the beginnings of an academy tradition. Both the *Vocabolario* and the *Dictionnaire* presented the vocabulary of one privileged variety of a living language normatively and authoritatively. Such a presentation might be seen as strengthening a literary language, or as deadening it. The latter case might be argued with some passion: it has been said that thanks to the *Vocabolario*, the Italian language 'was cut off from living usage and became a cadaver, anatomised, studied, artificially reproduced', so that 'Italians accustomed themselves to learning and writing their language as if it were Latin or Greek.'[112] For good or ill, the academy dictionary inevitably made at least an implicit claim to establish and regulate a centralized form of the language it documented. Although the point should not be overstated, it is not altogether a coincidence that the *Vocabolario della Crusca* was a product of the tightly controlled monarchical Florence of the Medici grand dukes, and the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* of the absolutist France of the period from Richelieu to the Revolution.[113]

By no means were Italian and French the only languages which were being promoted and codified in early modern Europe.[114] A number of lexicographers, working both inside and outside formally constituted academies, were ready to emulate the work which had been done in Florence and Paris by the middle of the seventeenth century. In the following chapters, we shall see the ways in which, and the extent to which, the academy tradition as established in Florence and Paris affected the work of lexicographers and would-be lexicographers elsewhere in Europe, starting with seventeenth-century Germany.

CHAPTER 5

The Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft and its offshoots in Germany and Denmark from the 1640s to the mid eighteenth century

The last two chapters traced a single dictionary tradition, that of the Académie française, from its beginnings in the early 1630s, as a response to the work of the Accademia della Crusca, through the publication of the first *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* in 1694, to the end of the eighteenth century. In this chapter, we will pursue another tradition from its Cruscan-influenced origins, namely that of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft, a body which projected dictionaries from the 1640s onwards, and which had a direct or indirect influence on dictionaries and dictionary projects in Germany, with an important offshoot in Denmark, well into the eighteenth century.

The Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft and its dictionary projects (1640s onwards) and Kaspar Stieler's *Teutschen Sprache Stammbaum und Fortwachs* (1691)

The Académie française was actually the second international offshoot of the Accademia della Crusca, though it was the first to publish a dictionary. The first academy to be founded outside Italy on the Cruscan model had its origins in the visit of a minor German prince, Ludwig of Anhalt, to Florence from 1598 onwards. In his extended residence there, Ludwig studied the Tuscan language, enjoyed the social life of the city, and, after two years, was admitted to the Accademia della Crusca, his academic name being 'L'Acceso'.[1] He returned to his inheritance in Germany a confirmed Italophile. In 1617, his Hofmarschall, Kaspar von Teutleben, encouraged by Ludwig, founded a society on the model of 'those Italian societies' which had been established for the cultivation of education and good morals and 'particularly to the useful exercise of each country's vernacular language'.[2] This was called the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft, the Fruit-Bearing Society. Its members each took a different plant as a personal symbol, and each had an academic name, the first – von Teutleben – being 'der

Mehlreiche', or 'the man rich in flour', in direct tribute to the allusion to the sifting of flour in the device of the Accademia della Crusca.[3] The theme of language study which was mentioned in 1617 reappeared five years later in Ludwig's first printed remarks on the purpose of the Gesellschaft: 'The members should above all concern themselves with maintaining and exercising our highly honoured mother tongue in its original form and right meaning without the use of strange foreign patchwords.'[4]

One way for the new society to maintain and exercise the German language with special attention to its vocabulary would have been to make a dictionary, more elaborate than the sixteenth-century works of Dasypodius and Maaler, and even than the unfinished *Teütsche Sprach vnd Weißheit* of Georg Henisch, of which the first and only volume had appeared in 1616.[5] The historian of the language sciences Harro Stammerjohann has said that 'it is difficult to imagine that the Fruit-bearing Society should have been founded without the idea of a dictionary'.[6] In fact, there appears to be no direct evidence for the explicit discussion of a dictionary project by its members before 1640, but puristic ideas about the German language were evidently in the mind of its founder, and he must have been well aware that comparable ideas had led to the making of a dictionary by the Accademia della Crusca.

No dictionary, however, was to be produced by the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft acting as a corporate body, although at least three of its members called for one. In 1640, the grammarian Christian Gueintz of Halle (who would become a member of the Gesellschaft in the following year) wrote to Ludwig that a dictionary (*Wörterbuch*, explained with the gloss *Lexicon*) and phraseology, to be gathered from the best writers, was an urgent desideratum.[7] The specification of the best writers suggests the influence of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*. Judging from Gueintz's praise, in the following year, of the virginity of the German language, long uncontaminated by borrowings from others, he is likely to have had a puristic dictionary in mind, and this would of course have been in keeping with the puristic principles which Ludwig had already enunciated for the Gesellschaft.[8] His use of the word *Wörterbuch* was not neutral: this (modelled on Dutch *woordboek*, first attested in 1584 and itself a product of linguistic purism) was a very new puristic alternative to borrowings like *Lexikon*. It was first attested in an expanded edition of Comenius' *Janua linguarum* of 1638 and thereafter in writings associated with members of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft.[9] Gueintz himself approached the making of a dictionary in his orthographically oriented *Deutsche Rechtschreibung* of 1645, the greater part of which comprises a roughly alphabetized list of

about a thousand German words, with comments on their spelling and, in many cases, examples of their use in Luther's Bible translation.[10]

A more elaborate and specific argument was made in two publications of the 1640s by the poet and grammarian Justus Georgius Schottelius.[11] In his *Teutsche Sprachkunst* of 1641, he stated that he had begun work on what was to be a complete German dictionary – 'ein *Lexicon* oder vollstendiges Wörterbuch der Teutschen Hauptsprache'; the word *Hauptsprache* identifies German as a cardinal language with no apparent parent, like Greek or Hebrew, rather than an offshoot of another, like Italian or French, both of which had Latin as a parent.[12] In this dictionary, 'each word would be brought to its stem or root'.[13] In the historiography of German lexicography, the principle which Schottelius had in mind here is called the *Stammwortprinzip*: dictionary entries for productive roots, *Stammwörter*, would be presented in alphabetical order, each being accompanied by all the forms derived from it.

The *Stammwortprinzip* sounds at first like a semi-etymological principle of arrangement, of the sort which had been sketched three years earlier by Chapelain. But since Schottelius saw German as a *Hauptsprache*, the identification of Germanic lexical roots was a more portentous matter for him than the identification of French *mots primitifs* was for Chapelain and his colleagues. In the tradition on which he drew, these (typically monosyllabic) roots were regarded as wonderfully forceful, and as of immemorial and uncontaminated antiquity. His immediate inspiration was a text by the Dutch polymath Simon Stevin, who had made a first list of Germanic lexical roots in the introduction to his *Beghinselen der weeghconst* (*Principles of the Science of Weighing*) of 1586, a treatise on statics, which was written in Dutch and therefore called for an explanation of why Dutch was a suitable language for mathematical writing; this first list had been expanded in 1608.[14] Stevin's own interest in the forceful monosyllabic quality of the Dutch language had been inspired by the work of the visionary antiquarian Goropius Becanus, who believed that just this quality proved that Dutch preserved the primitive language of mankind.[15] So Schottelius' interest in roots had an intellectual pedigree which goes back to the antiquarian Germanic language studies of the sixteenth century.

As well as having deeply diachronic implications, the *Stammwortprinzip* gave lexicographical form to a prized feature of German which operated at shallowly diachronic and synchronic levels, namely the very productive affixes such as (in Schottelius' spelling) *ab-*, *an-*, *auff-*, *auß-*, and so on, which permitted the production of a great many derived forms from

the lexical roots of the language – just as the vastly copious vocabulary of ancient Greek was shown in the semi-etymological arrangement of Henri Estienne's *Thesaurus graecae linguae* to be derived from a comparatively small set of roots in that language. Some of the derivational affixes of German, with some of the derived forms which they produced, were listed further on in the *Teutsche Sprachkunst*.[16] The words in the dictionary which Schottelius imagined would be illustrated by attaching 'good examples from all kinds of authors'.[17] Again, the influence of the *Vocabolario della Crusca* is likely. He noted that towards the end of supplying these examples, he had gathered 'a fair supply, of many thousands of words, phrases, and sayings from several authors'.[18]

Two years later, in his *Der Teutschen Sprache Einleitung*, Schottelius renewed his dictionary proposal, commenting that words would be defined 'aus dem Grunde Teutscher Deutung' (from the basis of their German meaning).[19] To this end, not only would books be consulted but 'der Teutsche rechte Gebrauch' (correct German usage) would be taken into account, a point which suggests awareness of the concern with usage which was shaping the lexicographical work of the Académie française. Schottelius was, then, balancing the methods of his Tuscan predecessors and his Parisian contemporaries. The 'Grunde Teutscher Deutung' which he had in mind cannot simply have meant an etymologically determined basic meaning if it was to be determined by 'der Teutsche rechte Gebrauch': he must have imagined distinguishing essential and derived senses of a word, just as he imagined distinguishing the 'Stamme oder Wurtzel' (stem or root) of a family of words from the derived forms. This is an early example of German interest in the historical development of the senses of a given word; as we shall see in Chapter 7, this interest was expressed more explicitly and with more sophistication by Johann Christoph Adelung in the next century.

In 1644, the poet Georg Philipp Harsdörffer echoed Schottelius in a call for the collection of all German *Stammwörter* in a complete dictionary. This would be supported by a dictionary of *Kunstwörter*: technical terms from, for instance, mining, hunting, navigation, and handicrafts.[20] This double project went beyond the limitations of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, in which, as we have seen, technical vocabulary was sparsely represented. It might be seen as taking up the potential of the 1635 statutes of the Académie française, which had juxtaposed making French 'capable of treating the arts and the sciences' and documenting it in a dictionary, and as doing so in a much better integrated way than Chapelain's dictionary plan of 1638, in which the registration of technical terms had simply been dismissed as a

possible project to be taken up by someone else. Harsdörffer continued to develop his plan for several years, in consultation with Schottelius (who told him that he was too busy to write the projected dictionary himself) and Prince Ludwig. In his ambitious and wide-ranging *Specimen philologiae germanicae* of 1646, he developed his earlier sketch, to propose the making of a dictionary 'in which all the root words, compounds, derivatives, phrases, proverbs and so on of our language should be set out in alphabetical [i.e. semi-etymological] order … and likewise all the juridical, feudal, medical, surgical, technical, and craftsmen's expressions should be gathered into one complete work'.[21] Finally, in 1647, he presented a plan for a *Vollständiges Wortbuch* of 'die Majestetische Deutsche Haubtsprache', to be founded on a comprehensive reading of German authors old and new, and to be undertaken 'just as the Accademici della Crusca had done for the Italian language'.[22] This was to be undertaken jointly by twenty members of the Gesellschaft, each of whom would work on one letter of the dictionary for a year.[23] He presented a specimen entry for one *Stammwort*, namely *brich*, *brechen* 'break', providing glosses; morphological and etymological information; and lists of suffixed, compounded, and prefixed derivatives with some Latin equivalents.[24]

Schottelius then gave an elaborate sketch of such a dictionary in the expanded second edition of the *Teutsche Sprachkunst* in 1651. He set out eight basic principles for it, from the necessity of 'a comprehensive tally of all German root words', through the principle of explanation on the 'Grunde Teutscher Deutung', to the inclusion of technical words, in a list of subject-areas more elaborate than Harsdörffer's, ranging from mining and manufacture to philosophy and other arts and sciences.[25] His elaboration of Harsdörffer's specimen entry (in which the *Stammwort* becomes *Bruch* 'a break') showed an overwhelming interest in the provision – indeed, the accumulation – of derived forms, from *brüchlich* 'friable' to *radebrechen* 'to speak broken …' (e.g. 'Deutsch radebrechen', 'to speak broken German'). A few forms are glossed or commented on in Latin or German, and there is some phraseological material; Schottelius notes that definitions would be provided in the published version.[26] Perhaps the shift of his own priorities towards grammar is suggested by the movement of the dictionary proposal from the first chapter of the *Teutsche Sprachkunst* of 1641 to the tenth of the expanded edition of 1651. He was, however, still hoping that the dictionary which he and Harsdörffer had projected would be achieved when he published his *Ausführliche Arbeit von der teutschen HaubtSprache* in 1663, which includes an alphabetical list of no fewer than 4,884 *Stammwörter*.[27]

One problem with these plans may have been the physical decentralization of the institution in which they were being formed. The Accademici della Crusca were for the most part Florentines, living in a single fairly compact city, and the members of the French academy were, at least for the most part, based in Paris, while the Gesellschafter 'were recruited from the farthest regions of the German empire, from eastern Prussia to Alsace, from Austria to Schleswig-Holstein'.[28] This obviously made it difficult for the Gesellschaft to act as a body in the complex business of compiling a dictionary, the more so since Ludwig's egalitarian principles made it an academy of equals rather than an organization with a command structure. In 1645, Schottelius asked Ludwig to give orders for the making of a dictionary, but this was not Ludwig's way of proceeding.[29] Harsdörffer's plan for the simultaneous work of twenty scattered editors was impractical: even if so many willing editors had been found and if, still more improbably, they had all remained committed to the project until they had done their share, the dictionary which they produced would certainly have been fatally inconsistent.

Members of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft had the custom of publishing under their academic names: Gueintz, for instance, was 'der Ordnende' (the one who regulates), and the title page of his *Deutsche Rechtschreibung* of 1645 duly confined its indication of his authorship to the phrase 'Durch den Ordnenden verfasset', while Harsdörffer was 'der Spielende' (the one who plays), and his plan for a dictionary of 1647 identified him as such. The last major work to be published by a member of the Gesellschaft under his academic name was a dictionary, *Der Teutschen Sprache Stammbaum und Fortwachs, oder Teutscher Sprachschatz*, published in 1691 by Kaspar Stieler, 'der Spate', or in Latin 'Serotinus': the latecomer.[30] It is this work, more than any other, which realizes the dictionary projected by Schottelius.

Its famous frontispiece brings the generative metaphor of the *Stammbaum* or family tree to life, depicting the Germano-Celtic king Sarron, one of the many inventions of the mythographer Annius of Viterbo, seated under a tree whose branches bow down to the ground and take root there, becoming trees in their own right, so that a whole forest can spring from one original trunk and be in effect a single mighty organism. This is at once a druidical grove and a tropical tree, and we need not be astonished to see a rhinoceros grazing in its shade: the lore taught by Sarron was supposed to have been diffused far and wide.[31] *Der Teutschen Sprache Stammbaum und Fortwachs* registers 68,000 headwords in more than 1,300 pages of main text, arranging them by rough alphabetical order

of the *Stammwörter*, of which there are between four and six hundred, these being (as in the *Thesaurus graecae linguae*) marked by the use of large type for the lemma.[32] There is a 436-page alphabetical index of all the forms registered: so, for instance, *Stammbaum* 'family tree' is under *Baum* 'tree' in the dictionary but can be found between *stamm* and *Stammbuch* in the index.[33] The dictionary does not use illustrative quotations, although it is evidently based on wide reading.

The native German quality of words is sometimes insisted on in ways which will surprise a modern reader: *Pause* is on the same opening as *Baum*, on the grounds that it need not be seen as a loanword from Latin *pausa* via French *pause*, but as a German word whose original form was *baußen*, *bausten*.[34] Likewise, *Gran* 'grain (unit of weight)' is seen as from German *Korn* rather than Latin *granum*.[35] Therefore *Granat* 'pomegranate, garnet' is listed as well, as is *Granate* 'grenade'. Forms which Stieler did acknowledge as of foreign origin were registered in a supplement, present only in a few copies of the dictionary and therefore presumably added after the majority had been printed off.[36] (Stieler's interest in foreign words continued after 1691: two thousand of them, taken from German newspapers, are listed in his *Zeitungs-Lust und Nutz* of 1695.[37]) The metalanguage is Latin, but the object of the dictionary was to register German words, not to assist Latin prose composition.

Der Teutschen Sprache Stammbaum und Fortwachs was not universally admired: Stieler's etymologies were perhaps weaker than those of his contemporaries, and at least one of his eighteenth-century successors complained that some of the derived forms he registered were of his own invention, a charge which has also been brought against some of the seventeenth-century English hard-word lexicographers.[38] But in retrospect, it clearly represents an important development, and the warm praise of the twentieth-century scholar and collector Curt von Faber du Faur does not seem overstated:

> A monumental work forming a treasure house of Baroque German; it seems almost unbelievable that a single person could have produced such a work without the help of others. The once gay and light-minded student [von Faber has Stieler's early poetry in mind] has become a bookworm of awe-inspiring industriousness, but he has kept the feeling for language which enables him to put each word in its proper place and to discover all of its possibilities. Added to this is his thoroughness which drives him to search for more and more new sources – the man has read simply everything there is![39]

Peder Syv, Matthias Moth, and their Danish dictionary projects (*c.* 1668–1692, 1697–1717)

Until the last quarter of the seventeenth century, the non-specialized lexicography of Danish was bilingual or polyglot: there was nothing in the Danish tradition like Pergamino's *Memoriale* or Nicot's *Thresor* or Henisch's *Teütsche Sprach und Weißheit*.[40] Just as the fullest English wordlist available in print in the mid-seventeenth century was that of an English–Latin dictionary, John Rider's *Bibliotheca scholastica*, so the default Danish dictionary was Poul Jensen Colding's Danish–Latin *Dictionarium Herlovianum* of 1626, whose name means 'the dictionary of Herlufsholm' and immortalizes the grammar school of which Colding was the headmaster.[41] (Just as English had a more learned but much more specialized dictionary in the form of John Cowell's law dictionary *The interpreter*, so Danish also had Christen Ostersen's *Glossarium juridico-danicum* of 1641, a substantial book of more than 600 pages, with well-referenced and careful entries not unlike Cowell's, and inevitably with an interest in obsolete words which occur in law codes, the very first entry beginning with the note that the word in question is old.)[42] A copy of the 1625 edition of John Minsheu's polyglot dictionary *Ductor in linguas*, marked up with handwritten Danish equivalents for all its entries, was in the library of Frederik Rostgaard by the 1720s, perhaps as a resource for the dictionary project which he left unfinished on his death.[43]

However, the cultivation of the Danish language was, by the mid-seventeenth century, being urged by a number of learned persons. One of these was Colding, in the preface to the *Dictionarium Herlovianum*. Another was the Copenhagen professor Rasmus Bartholin, a mathematician and scientist with a particular interest in crystallography, whose academic oration *De studio linguae danicae* of 1657 was a call for the development of the Danish language and its use in as wide a range of written functions as the other European vernaculars.[44] Bartholin's oration, by the way, first appeared in a collection of his scientific papers, *De naturae mirabilibus quaestiones academicae* of 1674, and there is surely a connection between it and the interest in vernacular science writing of his English acquaintances in the circle which would form the Royal Society, to which we shall return in Chapter 7.[45]

Notable among the early supporters of the use of Danish was a Lutheran minister called Peder Syv. He is remembered today as a collector of ballads, who republished the pioneering antiquarian collection of Anders Sørensen Vedel, *Et hundrede udvalgte danske viser* of 1591, with a further hundred

ballads which he had collected himself, in 1695. He was also a collector of proverbs, and the author of the first discussion of the Danish language to be written in Danish, *Nogle betenkninger om det Cimbriske sprog* (*Some Thoughts on the Language of the Cimbri*: the Cimbri were an ancient people who had originated in Jutland), which was published in 1663.[46] This work followed Harsdörffer's *Specimen philologiae germanicae* of 1646 closely.[47] So, in it, Syv proposed the compilation of a Danish grammar, and also of a Danish dictionary along the lines of Harsdörffer's proposal for a German one. Syv's projected dictionary would, like its model, list root words in alphabetical order, followed by their derivatives, 'and likewise those which are used in law, medicine, the sciences, the mechanical arts, and elsewhere'.[48] It would be puristic, excluding 'foreign, new, unnecessary words' in favour of old ones.[49] Having gone this far in accordance with Harsdörffer's description, Syv went on to suggest that what he had in mind would be a wide-ranging collection of German, Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian material, admitting that it would be the work of more than one man if it could be accomplished at all.[50] When he made this last point, he may have had academy dictionary projects in mind: at the end of his Danish grammar of 1685, he mentions the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft, the Accademia della Crusca, the Académie française, and the more recently founded Swedish Collegium antiquitatis as academies in which language and antiquities are studied.[51]

Further on in the *Nogle betenkninger* is a section called 'Om en oordbog eller glosebog' ('On a wordbook or gloss-book'): the section-heading is the first attestation of Danish *ordbog*, which Syv doubtless modelled on the use of German *Wörterbuch*/*Wortbuch* in the circle of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft, as discussed in the previous chapter.[52] Here, Syv explained that where contemporary Danish had lexical gaps, they could generally be filled with words from old texts, 'which could be burnished up like old bronze implements and brought into use'.[53] A list of some of the early texts known to him, and a list of about two hundred older Danish words which struck him as interesting or valuable, with their modern equivalents, followed.[54] This suggests that what he had at the back of his mind in the earlier passage may have been two dictionaries: a Harsdörfferian dictionary of modern Danish supported by a dictionary of older Danish with Germanic cognates, or perhaps by a union dictionary of older Germanic languages. Peder Syv's vision of medieval Danish as underpinning a dictionary of the modern language had no counterpart in the Italian and French traditions, and was more explicit than similar tendencies in the German tradition: this was because of the strong Danish awareness of the

country's medieval linguistic and cultural heritage, which is to be seen in the mid-seventeenth-century study of runic monuments (one of which appears on the emblematic title page of the *Nogle betenkninger*) by Ole Worm and others.[55] Indeed, the image of 'old bronze implements' suggests not only the frugal husbandman fettling up his old tools in the winter evenings, but also the restoration of the bronze antiquities from Denmark and elsewhere which Worm and others collected.[56]

Between 1668 and 1680, Syv made a number of lists of old Danish words, while working on his collection of Danish proverbs, which appeared in print in 1682 with a promise that the most difficult words in the proverbs would all be glossed in the forthcoming dictionary.[57] By this year, he was actively planning a Danish dictionary, with the working title 'Lexicon danicum eller dansk ordbog om de gamle og ny ord': old and new words would, this suggested, both appear in it, but the old words would have pride of place.[58] His working manuscripts for this dictionary are extant; the oldest covers the alphabetical range A–M. In this oldest manuscript, the Danish headwords, medieval and contemporary, are followed by glosses and explanations in Danish, and some cognates from other Germanic languages. (In the *Nogle betenkninger*, Syv wrote rationally about the affinity of the Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Dutch, and English languages, and about the wild results which could be obtained from the uncontrolled comparison of forms in the biblical languages and Sami, or in Danish and Turkish.)[59] Some material is taken from Ostersen's *Glossarium juridico-danicum*: just as Cowell's *Interpreter* was a quarry for English antiquaries in the late seventeenth century, so Syv was putting Ostersen's dictionary to antiquarian use.[60] But then, Syv changed course. From N onwards, the working manuscript provides short Latin glosses and very few cognates: it becomes a Danish–Latin wordlist rather like, and doubtless meant to succeed, the *Dictionarium Herlovianum*. Material from the first part of the alphabet was subsequently reworked to bring it into line with this new modus operandi.[61] Although Syv was still calling his dictionary *Lexicon Danico Latinum etymologicum* at a late stage, the reworked material is neither antiquarian nor etymological, except in so far as entries are arranged by the *Stammwortprinzip*.[62]

The reason for Peder Syv's change of mind can be identified. Matthias Moth, a senior civil servant under Kristian V of Denmark, and brother of the king's acknowledged mistress Sophie Amalie Moth, had started work on a simple Danish–Latin dictionary of his own in 1680. When he started, he did not know about Syv's dictionary project. In 1682, he read in Syv's newly published proverb collection that the compiler was

working on a Danish dictionary.[63] Moth was a patriot, but a very busy patriot, working hard in the royal chancellery. He wanted to see a good dictionary of the Danish language, he had thought that he would have to make one himself, and now he had found someone else doing the job. Syv was, however, making a more historically oriented dictionary than Moth thought suitable. That was not a problem: within a few months, Syv had, at Moth's instigation, been granted the title of *philologus regius*, was receiving an annual payment from the royal funds, and was, as a direct result of this patronage, writing the sort of dictionary which Moth wanted.[64] However, he never finished his work. He printed an eighty-page specimen in 1692, comprising an introduction and the letter A. It hardly represented the dictionary which he had hoped to make, and Moth may also have been dissatisfied with it, for no more was printed.[65] By 1695, Syv was in his mid sixties. He had published his new edition of Vedel's collection of Danish ballads, which was in fact to be his last book, and may have made it clear to Moth that he did not expect to complete his dictionary. Moth subsequently tried to obtain Syv's working papers, but in vain; they were bought by Frederik Rostgaard, whom we shall meet again in Chapter 8.[66]

Shortly after the publication of Syv's specimen of a dictionary, Moth appears to have done some excellent thinking. He could see that although the specimen was not incompetent, it was not very copious, and he must have reflected, as Syv had done, that one man's labours might not be enough to build a dictionary of the sort which Harsdörffer had conceived, which would cover the whole of the core and technical vocabulary of a living language. Moreover, Harsdörffer's projected dictionary did not have the registration of regional forms as a priority, and as we shall see, these interested Moth greatly.[67] There were, after all, a number of language varieties in the realms of the king of Denmark, from the prestige variety used at court in Copenhagen to that of the Jutland peninsula, let alone the varieties spoken in Norway and the Faroes. If one man could not deal with the large and varied body of material which Moth was starting to conceptualize, perhaps the work of a number of men might be brought together. Moth was a senior civil servant, used to the administration of written work. Rather than establishing an academy, he decided to select a team of research workers, and to co-ordinate and gather their work before its redaction into a dictionary. The well-organized project which ensued is documented in an archive of fifty-three volumes, now in the Old Royal Collection (Gamle kongelige Samling, or GkS) of the Kongelige Bibliotek, Copenhagen.[68] This is a very rich resource: the sixteen-volume collection of materials associated with the 1692 edition of the *Vocabolario*

della Crusca and the ten-volume Icelandic dictionary of Jón Ólafsson frá Grunnavík are impressive enough for their period.[69] (Larger dictionary manuscripts have no doubt been lost, such as the eighteen volumes of the Icelandic–Latin dictionary of Guðmundur Ólafsson, not to mention the original *cahiers* of materials for the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. The English clergyman Sir Herbert Croft claimed to have collected two hundred volumes towards a dictionary which would eclipse Johnson's, but he must have meant marked-up printed books. Gigantic dictionary archives do survive from the late eighteenth century, such as that of Sainte-Palaye's dictionary of medieval French, in thirty-one volumes of folio and sixty-one of quarto.)[70]

The first member of the project team was an easy choice: Moth's own librarian and secretary Árni Magnússon, later a famous collector of Icelandic manuscripts.[71] Moth was not, however, boundlessly rich, so he could not engage a dozen extra secretaries, and there seems to have been no question of funding a large dictionary project from the royal treasury. So, a team of full-time lexicographers could not be raised. However, Denmark had a significant class of civil servants spread out across the country in regular contact with dialect speakers, educated men who might be supposed to have some spare time for making wordlists: the clergy. (A later Scottish project also saw the clergyman as an ideal lexicographer, working on a dictionary as a 'pleasant relaxation from his apostolic labours'.)[72] Since the Reformation, the Danish clergy had been paid a state salary, so they were indeed civil servants, part of an institutional structure within which Moth had a great deal of influence. They had been called on in this way on two previous occasions in the last seventy years, for a survey of 'any rune-stones, burial-sites, or other historical remains known in their parishes' co-ordinated by Ole Worm in 1622, and for a topographical survey co-ordinated by the historian Peder Hansen Resen in 1666, which provided material for Resen's *Atlas Danicus*.[73] These had both worked well, and Moth now followed their model. He drafted a letter requesting help, of which Árni Magnússon sent copies to the bishops of the six Danish dioceses in November 1697. This announced his intention to make as comprehensive a Danish dictionary as possible, and asked the recipient to 'find contributors to the project within your diocese: these may be rural pastors, schoolmasters, or others who love the Danish language'.[74] The work would be divided among multiple contributors, so that each would deal with two or three letters of the alphabet.[75] Moth specified that alphabetical order should be followed except for derivatives and compounds, which would be placed

under their roots: like Peder Syv, he was imagining a dictionary ordered by the *Stammwortprinzip*.[76] Words should be gathered, with their meanings, both *genuina* 'original' and *translatis* 'secondary' – here we see the interest in sense-development which was already suggested by Schottelius in *Der Teutschen Sprache Einleitung* of 1643 – and phraseological material should not be overlooked.[77] Although the newly published *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* was also semi-etymologically ordered and interested in phraseology, it was not Moth's model at this point, as a parenthesis makes clear: the words to be gathered are both those in general use and those which are not used except by the common people.[78] This point is emphasized in the next sentence: 'It is important that they should attend diligently to gathering *terms* used by seafarers, craftsmen, peasants, and others in their occupations, as well as the names of birds, fish, plants, and the like: in short, specialized vocabularies of everything.'[79] The interest in the terminology of trades and handicrafts is what might be expected from a lexicographer in the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft tradition, but the passage which follows is characteristic of Moth himself and not of any of the intellectual influences which shaped other aspects of his lexicographical thought. Since the collectors will have access to the highly localized dialect vocabulary of their own parishes, each of them 'should diligently gather such *peasant-words which are not in general use*, not only those in the alphabetical range assigned to him, but *throughout the alphabet*'.[80] The emphasis here is strongly synchronic and oral: contributors were not being asked to read, as contributors to the great nineteenth-century projects would be, but to attend to the usage of people who did little or no writing, including the most localized dialect usage.

Each of the six bishops was asked to divide the alphabet up among contributors who would take on two or three letters each, or in other words to find between eight and twelve contributors. So, if all went according to plan, the materials for the dictionary would then comprise six different attempts at each letter of the alphabet, plus between forty-eight and seventy-two dialect glossaries. As a good administrator, Moth must have known that people do not always produce the work which is required of them, so he probably did not expect quite so much material. With a two-thirds completion rate, he would still have four attempts at each letter of the alphabet and thirty or more glossaries to redact into a finished dictionary. He must also have known that people do not always meet deadlines, and his stipulation of a period of 'six, or at the most twelve months' for gathering all the materials required for a comprehensive dictionary seems remarkably sanguine.[81] However, the Danish civil service

of the seventeenth century evidently had high standards in this respect. For instance, a copy of the first circular letter was sent to Henrich Gerner, bishop of Viborg and writer on orthography, on 30 November 1697, and a follow-up letter asking him to reply as soon as possible was sent on 15 January, so taking delivery times into account, he had been allowed just about a month to compose a reply – and that month included Christmas, a season at which bishops are busier than usual. A second reminder was sent on 5 February, at which point Gerner clearly decided that when a privy councillor wants help with a project close to his heart, it should not be withheld. By June, he had sent in entries for ten letters of the alphabet, and he also contributed dialect material from Jutland.[82]

Over the next year and a half, responses to Moth's appeal came in, and he and Árni Magnússon conducted a vigorous correspondence with contributors and potential contributors. Some of it is preserved in the project archives, as are some of the materials which were sent in; others, however, appear to have been discarded after transcription into the first redaction of the dictionary. There were evident disappointments: two of the six bishops produced nothing, and some of the material which came in was of a low quality. A sheet of paper survives on which contributions received are listed and graded, the usual grades being 'optimum … bonum … mediocriter … nil valet' ('excellent … good … mediocre … worthless').[83] One or two contributions look like empty gestures: a four-page specimen of the letter A, neatly written on abnormally large paper, is graded 'inadequate', and leads to the suspicion that its compiler just wanted to hand in something showy to keep his bishop quiet.[84] The sheet with Moth's grades does, however, list multiple contributions for most or all of the alphabet, a number of them good or excellent. The scheme was working.

Dialect glossaries were coming in too, some of them rather elaborate. One of them, from a pastor in Norway, which covers eighteen quarto sheets, ends with a dignified protest: 'To be sure, the notes which I have put down on paper here are few and insubstantial, made not as I would have liked but as my free time from business allowed – and I had such a meagre allowance of that, that I judged that the work would absolutely overcome me.'[85] Perhaps some of the rural clergy were actually harder pressed than Moth had supposed when he decided to enlist their services as unpaid lexicographical assistants. But some – and this may have been a pleasant surprise – had evidently been gathering dialect materials for a long time. For instance, Peder Terpager, who would publish several antiquarian works bearing on the history of Ribe in Jutland, sent in two extensive and attractively written lists of local words, totalling 177 pages in folio.[86] Likewise Peder Winsløw from Skåne, the former Danish territory

on the north side of the Baltic which had been incorporated into Sweden in 1660, had been collecting material on the history, topography, and language of his homeland, which he offered to Moth.[87] Others had been quietly engaged in general lexicography: for example, the project archive preserves a volume of 275 folio pages covering the letters E to H, part of the work of a country pastor called Lavrids Kok who had died in 1691, but whose papers had been preserved and were sent to Moth.[88]

Nor was Moth himself inactive. The project archives do not preserve many of his own notes, but there are a few suggestive ones. A fragment, which survived because it was used as a bookmark, records his enquiries into the different meanings of the word *læst*, a unit of measure which varied from place to place, as units of measure often do.[89] A much more substantial set shows him alphabetizing the vocabulary of a medical text – he had had some medical training early in his life – in two drafts.[90] A vocabulary of sugar-refining is preserved next to one of these.[91] A diachronic perspective is suggested by Moth's use of Horace's 'Multa renascentur quae jam cecidere, cadentque | Quae nunc sunt in honore vocabula' as an epigraph to the first volume of the first redaction of the dictionary, though as we have seen, the largely synchronic *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* alluded to the same part of the *Ars poetica* on the first page of its main text. The archive also includes extracts from two sixteenth-century Danish texts, namely a version of the Pentateuch printed in 1535 and a translation of Saxo Grammaticus printed in 1575.[92] Perhaps Moth hoped that Syv's dictionary materials would add some chronological depth to the project, but he was evidently not pursuing older words very assiduously on his own account.

By August of 1699, twenty-one months into the project, Moth had received a great deal of material. At that point, something momentous happened: Kristian V died. His son and heir, Frederik IV, whose mother had for many years had to tolerate the king's adulterous relationship with Sophie Amalie Moth, promptly dismissed Matthias Moth from his offices of state. This was good news for the dictionary project. Moth had, indeed, lost his influence, which meant that the clergy had nothing to gain from sending him more material; he continued to pursue tardy contributors for a couple more years, but he does not seem to have got much from them.[93] But he already had a huge body of material to work with, and adding to it would only have made it less manageable. His fall from power gave him time to work on the redaction of the dictionary.

On 4 January 1700, he made a start on the letter A.[94] Over the next few years, he put together the first redaction of the dictionary, which is preserved in eighteen folio volumes.[95] He must have been working from

several wordlists simultaneously; since these were in alphabetical order, it should have been possible to survey all of them before beginning on an alphabetical range, perhaps noting in a rough index which wordlists treated which words. Then each entry will have been compiled by conflating wordlists and harmonizing any disagreements between them, with the wordlist of the printed *Dictionarium Herlovianum* available as a control to ensure that no Danish words escaped. Complex entries must have been drafted on scrap paper and then transcribed onto the folio sheets which were bound up into the present volumes of the archive, since those sheets are, although quite extensively corrected, clearly more formal than rough working papers. They are divided into two columns, with one being left blank so that out-of-sequence material could be added – as it was, in profusion. Moth was apparently not using a card-index, which is by far the most efficient way to alphabetize information on the scale on which he was handling it.

The defining language of the dictionary was Danish, but the brief Danish definitions were then followed by a series of possible Latin equivalents. So, to take an example at random, the abstract noun *afmægtighed* 'powerlessness, impotence' was explained in Danish with a simple reference to the adjective from which it is formed, *afmægtig*. After this explanation, Moth added 'Calamitas. Caes. Debilitas. Cic. Defectio. Suet. Defectio virium. Cic. Impotentia. Ter. Infirmitas corporis. Cic. [*added above the line*: Invalentia. Gell.] Languor [.] Ovid. Lassitudo. Caes.'[96] These equivalents did not all result from comparing Danish translations of Latin texts with the originals; the Latin of Caesar, Cicero, Suetonius, Terence, Gellius, and Ovid was being used to map the semantic field of the Danish word. In some cases, Moth's procedure was different: in his treatment of *agnete*, for instance, which is the name of a fish, he gave a sixty-word account before concluding with a single Latin equivalent, *trutta*, taken from the sixteenth-century *Historia animalium* of Conrad Gessner.[97]

Moth evidently decided that the first redaction was inadequate, because after it was finished, he spent several more years gathering and organizing further materials. These led to the making of a final redaction of the dictionary: fifteen volumes of lexical dictionary, and another seven volumes of *Conversationslexikon* – in other words of proper names, technical vocabulary, and other marginal material.[98] Each column in the volumes of the first redaction was cancelled by a vertical line as it was written up in this second redaction. The fair copy of entries in A was made in thirteen days in the second half of February 1715. Moth was still writing only in

one column of double-column pages, leaving the other column blank for additions. But he was now expecting only to add material from cross-references to his sequence, and the neatness with which this was done suggests that the volumes of this final redaction were intended for use as printer's copy. Moth was in a hurry by this stage. Each day, he dated his work as he sat down to it: page 20 of the first volume is endorsed 'd. 17. Febr.', page 49 is endorsed 'd. 18. Febr.', and so on, as if he was anxious to monitor his own progress.

Well he may have been; Moth was now in his sixties, at much the age Peder Syv had reached when he gave up his dictionary project. The last date written anywhere in the project archive is that of a volume of foreign placenames with translations into Danish, 9 January 1717.[99] Moth died twenty-six months later, and it is reasonable to infer that he did not add dated material to the dictionary project during that period because his health or eyesight had failed. What is striking about the volumes in which the final recension is preserved is that they are so neat and clear, so obviously ready to go to the printer. A specimen of the letter A was even set up in type. The quality of the material in them is high, and they have indeed been mined for lexicographical information ever since. So why was Moth's enormous, laboriously compiled dictionary not printed once it was substantially complete?

One answer is that he may have been unable to let it go. This was not the only great project he left unpublished: another was his translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* into Danish, extant in 642 pages of folio, for which he even commissioned some plates.[100] Perhaps he felt, as his health declined, that he would put the finishing touches to his life's work when he became a little stronger – and then became too weak even to make arrangements for the work's completion. Another answer is that although publishers of the time were prepared to take on enormous projects, particularly if they were in Latin and could therefore expect a strongly international readership – hence the twenty volumes of Thomas Rymer and Robert Sanderson's *Foedera* published in London between 1704 and 1735, or the twenty-seven of the *Maxima bibliotheca veterum patrum* published in Lyon in 1677 – the market for an enormous dictionary of Danish was likely to be limited. (Likewise, Resen's *Atlas Danicus* was never published in full – nor was Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeld's four-volume *Lexicon Slavonicum*, another elaborate dictionary of a language variety which was not widely used in western Europe.)[101] The *Vocabolario della Crusca* and the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* were viable as multi-volume publications, but Tuscan and French were international languages in a way that Danish

was not. The project archive passed by inheritance to Moth's daughter, who eventually bequeathed it to King Frederik V.[102] The bequest shows that she understood the importance of the material, but she may have been unable to find anyone to publish it.

But there is another reason why Moth's great dictionary was unpublishable, and that reason is just what we admire about it today. He did not attempt to do the sort of normative work undertaken by the *Vocabolario* and the *Dictionnaire*. His materials are not even directed towards the registration of a prestige dialect of Danish. As we have seen, his dictionary included words from Jutland and Norway, from medical textbooks and from the speech of workers in sugar-refineries. Moth was asking his contributors explicitly for material which would not be found in the works of good authors or in the conversation of *honnêtes gens*. One discussion of the dialect materials in the project archive lists some of their subject-matter: 'dance, song, and music, nursery rhymes, games and sport, tales and legends, Christmas and Christmas games, Shrovetide, spring, autumn, townspeople, banquets, weddings, childbirth, the supernatural, oaths, proverbs'.[103] Not even the richly comprehensive *Oxford English Dictionary* in the nineteenth century was as receptive as Moth's to dialect material from oral traditions.[104]

Moth's position at the centre of political power in the kingdom of Denmark gave him a very broad view of that kingdom *as a whole*, and he likewise saw its language and culture as a whole. In this, he was not alone: the 'first time there was any sign of real efforts to form a special mutual Danish identity came in the decades after … 1660, when the most important frame of reference became the language'.[105] The work of Peder Syv and Frederik Rostgaard, and of grammarians such as Erik Pontoppidan, belongs with Moth's in this respect. However, if the language was to be an effective symbol of national unity, it had to be unitary: just as there was one legal code for Denmark from 1683 onwards to replace a heterogeneous tangle of earlier legislation, there should have been one linguistic code to standardize and stabilize the language.[106] Contributions to such a code were offered in a compact form by Pontoppidan's *Grammatica danica* of 1668, or Henrich Gerner's *Orthographia danica* of 1678–9 and *Epitome philologiae danicae* of 1690, but Moth's project was neither compact nor standardizing.[107] For Moth, the Danish language was not an entity which could be contained in a library, and it was not the possession of the *honnêtes gens* of the best Copenhagen society. It was the living usage of a diverse group of people, living on a number of different islands and two different parts of the European mainland, many of them farmers or

fishermen. The speech of all of those people added up to the totality of Danish. Moth was luminously right, but the dictionary he proposed was therefore unlike any other of its age, and this may have ensured that it remained unpublished.

The social diversity of the material which Moth recorded brings us back to the career of Peder Syv, in which a very interesting element is the conjunction of ballad-collecting and lexicography. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, such a conjunction was to be very productive: students like the great Finnish gatherer of tales and lexicographer Elias Lönnrot would be inspired by the writings of Herder and others to seek out the traditional songs, and the traditional language, of the peasantry. They would, in effect, be engaged in the folkloric study of songs and words – and *folklore* is a nineteenth-century word, first attested in 1846, and a nineteenth-century or at least a Romantic concept. The historian Peter Burke has argued that 'The Scandinavian "forerunners" of the folklorists were … unconscious of any split between learned and popular culture, no doubt because the split came late to those parts.' So, he proposes, in Anders Vedel's Danish ballad-collection of 1591, 'There is no suggestion that these songs belong to the common people; they are described as "Danish songs" (*Danske viser*), not as "folksongs" (*folkeviser*), a term which came into use only in the nineteenth century' – perhaps as a calque on Herder's *Volkslied* of 1774.[108] 'A more difficult case to interpret' is that of Syv; 'It looks as though he rejected popular culture … but did not see the old ballads as part of it.'[109] Perhaps a similar argument might be made for two of the English dictionary projectors of the early eighteenth century, Joseph Addison and Ambrose Philips (for both of whom see Chapter 6 below): Addison has been seen as ahead of his time in his respect for the ballad tradition, and Philips was a collector of ballads.[110]

What are we to make of Matthias Moth's project, which is so close to Syv's in terms both of time and of the personal connection between the two lexicographers? We have seen his remarkably close interest in the strongly localized words used by the common people of rural Denmark, and the positive response with which this interest met when it was made known to dialect-collectors such as Terpager and Winsløw. We have noted, too, that Moth sought to build localized dialect words into the structure of a general dictionary of Danish rather than setting them apart as objects of a separate kind of study. This was an ambition with roots in the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft tradition, but Moth developed it extraordinarily far. The generosity of his cultural-linguistic vision anticipates the statement of Johann David Michaelis in 1760 that 'the language is a

collection of the wisdom and genius of a whole people'.[111] Popular culture as such was not exactly Moth's concern, despite the presence of material on 'nursery rhymes, games and sport, tales and legends, Christmas and Christmas games', and so on in the archive, and he need not be called upon to overturn the received story of the rediscovery of European popular culture from the 1760s onwards.[112] But in the study of popular language, he was a pioneer, the first lexicographer in Europe to see a national language as a single object of study in all its local and occupational varieties.

Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibniz and his historical and etymological German dictionary project (*c.* 1705)

In the years after the final decline of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft, Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibniz toyed with the idea of an 'Antifruchtbringende Gesellschaft', a society in which the German language would be promoted without undue purism, extending the right of abode to words which the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft had excluded.[113] The idea is not only characteristic of Leibniz's promotion of intellectual exchange, but also of his interests in language, which were extensive.[114] He was, in particular, well aware of the value of dictionaries.[115] The dictionaries of the Accademia della Crusca and the Académie française were clearly the most comprehensive to have been achieved in Europe by his lifetime, and in the address 'De concinnando dictionario et perpolienda lingua Germanica' ('On the compilation of a dictionary and the refinement of the German language'), he expressed his regret that the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft had not undertaken a German dictionary to match them.[116]

Leibniz imagined one step towards a comprehensive dictionary of German, a union lexicon of German dialect words, for which he noted John Ray's *Collection of English words not generally used*, of which a second edition had appeared in 1691, as a possible model.[117] In the 1690s, he persuaded the theologian Gerhard Meier of Bremen to begin work on a lexicon of Low German and Dutch, a 'Glossarium linguae saxonicae', which would use data from one of the best editions of Kiliaan's Dutch *Etymologicum teutonicae linguae* (1599 onwards) and from Nathan Chytraeus' Low German *Nomenclator latinosaxonicus* (1582 onwards).[118] It would also cite Old English cognates: Meier wrote to Leibniz in 1699 to say that he was working through a big Anglo-Saxon dictionary, no doubt William Somner's of 1659.[119] But Meier died in 1703 with his dictionary unfinished, and although there were hopes for its posthumous publication as late as 1717, these came to nothing.[120] Some correspondence bearing on

Meier's dictionary project is preserved in the *Collectanea etymologica* published from Leibniz's papers after his death. As well as this correspondence, the *Collectanea* prints Leibniz's 'Unvorgreiffliche Gedancken, betreffend die Ausübung und Verbesserung der Teutschen Sprache' ('Disinterested thoughts concerning the usage and improvement of the German language').[121] This offers a proposal for the registration of a wide synchronic and diachronic range of Germanic language varieties in three dictionaries: of current words in general usage, technical words, and obsolete and dialect words.[122] This is followed immediately by another three-way division of the work for lexicographers of German, this time between alphabetical lexical dictionary, subject-ordered thesaurus, and etymological dictionary, and by remarks on the complementarity of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, the *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*, and the *Origines* of Ménage.[123] Leibniz went on to comment on the presence of technical language in Furetière's *Dictionaire universel* of 1690, and in a planned English dictionary of technical vocabulary of which he had heard a couple of years earlier (as we shall see in the next chapter).[124] Dictionary projects from other European countries had a significant place in his imagination in, and perhaps before, the 1690s.

The one dictionary project to which he himself appears to have contributed was both historical and etymological. Its text is preserved in MS IV, 471 of the Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek in Hannover. It consists of four tall folio volumes. One has been partially disbound but three are still in their original binding, of soft coarse grey pasteboard, with the cords uncovered at the spine.[125] They comprise about 350 unfoliated leaves each, but they are physically much more complex than this might suggest, for they are guardbooks, with numerous slips in different hands pasted onto both sides of the leaves. The smallest of these slips are two or three centimetres long and less than half a centimetre tall, though most are somewhat larger than this, and a few of the largest are only a little smaller than the leaves of the guardbooks. Some of the slips overlap other slips or the sides of the guardbook pages. A few have had further slips stuck to them, so that to read the manuscript one must sometimes unfold a paper concertina of slips stuck to slips to form ribbons of text folded up into the guardbook, and some supplementary folio leaves have been slipped in between the guardbook leaves.

The origins of the slips pasted into the guardbooks which comprise this manuscript can in many cases be ascertained. Some of the first were from the marvellous collection of the Hamburg polymath Martin Fogelius. These were taken from the collection of thirty thousand handwritten slips

which Fogelius used to store and order the results of his encyclopedic learning – a collection which was purchased by Leibniz for the ducal library in Hannover, with the rest of Fogelius' books and manuscripts, and is still in Hannover, being catalogued at the G. W. Leibniz Bibliothek.[126] Fogelius learned to use boxes of slips as an information-management device from the logician Joachim Jungius of Hamburg, as did Leibniz's correspondent Vincent Placcius, who published an important *De arte excerpendi* on this subject.[127] As we have seen, slips seem to have been used in the making of the *Vocabolario della Crusca* and Richelet's *Dictionnaire françois*; the first major dictionary for which numerous slips survive appears to be the *Glossarium latinitatis* of Leibniz's correspondent Charles du Cange.[128]

Leibniz emulated Fogelius and built up his own collection of written slips of paper. Its history can be inferred from the parts of it which ended up pasted into the guardbooks or retained loose among his other manuscripts.[129] First, he began to collect historical information on paper slips, which he may have kept in boxes or pigeon-holes.[130] They were small and of irregular size, so he could not search through them like a nineteenth-century or later lexicographer leafing through boxes of identical quotation slips: he must have had to dump them on a table and rummage through them when he wanted to find something. At first, the slips themselves were not labelled, though their containers would have been. But if two sets of unlabelled slips had become mixed up on his work-surface, Leibniz would have had to classify them all over again in order to put them back where they belonged. So, later, the slips were labelled: those bearing on language were all endorsed with the word *linguae*. Classifying slips under headings such as *linguae*, however, resulted in sets too large to be used conveniently. For his investigations into the early history of humans, in which Leibniz used language as an important tool, he subclassified the slips by numbering them, from 10 into the 1100s.[131] Slips endorsed 'Linguae 36', for instance, all deal with ancient inscriptions and writing-systems, and both slips endorsed 'Linguae 297' deal with the etymologies of common German words. This system was in use until at least the end of 1695: s.v. *Holland* in MS IV, 471, a slip endorsed 'Lingu' is headed by Leibniz 'From my letters to the learned Meier the theologian at Bremen, 4 November 1695'.[132]

By this time, Leibniz may have been finding that a thematic collection of slips ordered under hundreds of numbered subheadings was not the best way to store and retrieve information about words: for that, an alphabetical collection was preferable. He had, moreover, been thinking hard about what dictionary projects might achieve. This is why he was

encouraging Meier, in the letter excerpted in the slip s.v. *Holland*, to work on the 'Glossarium linguae saxonicae' mentioned above. At some time after November 1695, Leibniz had his information on individual German words ordered alphabetically and transferred to the guardbooks which now comprise MS IV, 471. This work appears to have been under way in 1705, a date which features in several sums written onto the first page of entries for words beginning with the letter C, their position relative to the adjacent slips suggesting that they were written after the slips were pasted in. The fact that a slip for the word *Ameise* taken from a source published in 1708 was pasted onto the appropriate page later than some of the other slips for this word is consistent with the hypothesis that a number of slips had been pasted in by 1705.

The slips were pasted in below headwords written directly onto the guardbook pages, of which there are usually two or three per page (the earliest pages have more, and are overcrowded as a result). These headwords are taken from the index to Stieler's *Teutschen Sprache Stammbaum und Fortwachs*, and this explains the presence among them of words like *Garantie*, which are not of obvious interest to a student of German etymology and are not illustrated by material in slip form. There are about eight thousand headwords in all, making a wordlist similar in extent to that of the *Etymologicum anglicanum* of Stephen Skinner.[133] However, numerous slips are pasted in under some headwords, as the result of a long process of accumulation. If MS IV, 471 had been printed, many of its entries would have been much more extensive than Skinner's, and it would have made a very large folio.

Despite their foundational place in the project, slips in Leibniz's and Fogelius' hands are in a minority in MS IV, 471. The great majority appear to be the results of a systematic reading programme designed to provide slips for the project. The sources which were used most heavily were glossarial. For instance, an amanuensis evidently worked through the *Glossarium latinitatis* of du Cange and the *Etymologicon* of Skinner, looking for entries which illustrated the history of German words, from each of which he would produce a slip with the relevant German word as catchword and the text of the dictionary in question after it (though with only a selection of the quotations which du Cange so generously provides). Latin, the metalanguage of both these dictionaries, was in effect also that of MS IV, 471.

Other amanuenses worked through earlier dictionaries such as the *Teütsch Spraach* of Josua Maaler, the fifteenth-century *Teutonista*, and some medieval manuscript vocabularies. These workers filled page after page of

writing-paper with lists of material, each line beginning with a catchword followed by the title of the glossarial source being excerpted and the text of its entry, and these lists were then cut up into narrow slips which were pasted into the guardbooks. Some of them were closely written, which is why some of the slips are so tiny. Other amanuenses again worked from early German texts: one, for instance, excerpted the free translation of the Roman history of Livy made around 1500 by Bernhard Schöfferlin, and another worked from a medieval rhyming chronicle. Modern learned texts were also used, for instance the *Atland* of Olof Rudbeck or the *Monasticon Anglicanum* of Roger Dodsworth and William Dugdale.

The reading programme documented in MS IV, 471 was still active in 1708, when a major source of slips, the *Specimen lectionum* of Diederich von Stade, was published. Some lexical notes which Leibniz made on a blank leaf of a letter of 1714 are pasted in with the rest of the letter, so the guardbooks were being added to at least until that year. The fact that this letter was stuck into one of the guardbooks, and the fact that slips cut from the working papers for Leibniz's edition of the sources for the history of the House of Braunschweig also appear, both suggest that he was an active member of the project team. The overlap between sources excerpted in the slips in MS IV, 471 and sources used in Leibniz's other work on language and history is also significant. When, for instance, a well-chosen quotation from the *Otia imperialia* of Gervase of Tilbury appears s.v. *War wolf*, it seems reasonable to suppose that Leibniz, who had edited part of that text, had drawn it to the attention of an amanuensis. He may well, like Samuel Johnson, have done this by taking a printed book – or even a manuscript – and marking the passage to be excerpted by means of underlining or marginal notes.

Characteristic of the more elaborate entries is the entry for *Öl* 'oil'. This is built up from six slips together with two notes written directly onto the page. The first slip identifies the Gothic word for oil, *alew*, and gives some cognates. The next slip, directly below it, is a long one. It begins by suggesting that *Öl* may be from a form represented by Swedish and Gothic words for fire and flame, oil being inflammable. Then it notes that a Rostock dialect form, *ehl* 'beer' (and, an insertion notes, Danish *öhl* and English *ale*), may have the ultimate sense 'cooked up over a fire': the idea must be that malt is cooked up in water to make a sweetish liquid before adding yeast and letting fermentation begin. Some, the slip continues, have wanted to make a connection between these forms and the ancient Iberian word *caelia*, which seems to have meant something like 'beer'. So, Hiob Ludolf says that he once heard Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn speaking

on this word, which he identified with forms like English *ale*, proposing a common etymon **aelia*: *haec aelia* might become *haec caelia*. The next slip seems to be a summary of this material, adding that in English, the drink is called *ale* if it does not have hops in it and *beer* if it does. Then two slips added to the right give evidence for Germanic words beginning *el-* and having to do with fire; one note written on the page transcribes Skinner's entry for *ale* and another transcribes a discussion by Franciscus Junius of an Old High German word for oil; and a last slip, from Fogelius' materials, presents a different etymological account of the relationship between the ancient Iberian word *caelia* and the modern English word *ale*. Despite the role of Stieler's dictionary in determining the wordlist for MS IV, 471, its treatment of the relationship between *Öl* and the Scandinavian cognates of *ale* (Stieler argues that oil, like ale, is nourishing) is not mentioned here.

There is no editorial intervention in this entry, and this is true for the whole body of dictionary materials. The collection lacked macrostructural features such as an introduction, and the entries lacked definitions and a consistent microstructure. Some were massive collections (*Öl* is not the most extensive) of historical evidence and etymological theories, the latter often being in conflict with each other. Some were blank, or merely reprised material from du Cange or Skinner, or offered a single quotation from a medieval source. The paucity of dialect material is striking, since this was an interest of Leibniz's; so is the paucity of material from the Slavonic languages, which also interested him. Though we have seen evidence that Leibniz was an active member of the project team, he was hardly acting as a dictionary editor; nor was anyone else. When Leibniz died in 1716, the dictionary materials preserved in MS IV, 471 were therefore not ready to go to press. If the project was to be taken further, an editor needed to step in.

The project was taken up, but by a learned person with no real interest in editing a dictionary, who can be identified as Leibniz's successor Johann Georg Eckhardt. His contributions are for the most part written directly onto the leaves of the guardbook. They postdate the pasting of most, but not quite all, of the slips which are now in the guardbooks: it is much more common for them to be written to fill the spaces between slips, with ascending or descending penstrokes sometimes running onto the slips, than for slips to be pasted over their extremities. They are in no way editorial: they amass more information than before, with a worse sense of proportion than before. Many of them draw on the work of Franciscus Junius, his *Observationes* on Willeram being a favourite. Others take the form of essays, frequently displaying an extensive knowledge of the earlier

medieval law codes, with the glossary of Friedrich Lindenbrog as a favourite lexical resource.[134] Here, Eckhardt made the material gathered in MS IV, 471 more heterogeneous than ever: entries consisting of a single quotation now stood beside entries consisting of a three-page essay on legal history. If he was still working on this increasingly unwieldy project as late as 1727, the appearance of Johann Georg Wachter's *Glossarium Germanicum* in that year would have made it clear to Eckhardt that there was no future for a bigger and less systematic rival to this impressive dictionary.

The principles behind Leibniz's dictionary project are clear despite its unfinished state. It would not have been an etymologicon along the lines of those of Cornelis Kiliaan or Stephen Skinner: as we have seen, it is not founded on the systematic collection of dialect material or the original study of cognates.[135] Nor is there an overarching etymological narrative such as the interest in finding the origins of Germanic words in Greek which inspired Meric Casaubon and, before his maturest work, Franciscus Junius.[136] The aim of the slips as they stand seems to be the identification of early attestations of German words, with special attention to their earliest known sense and to their relationship with Latin – both to establish the sense of the German and because medieval Latin words may be the etyma of, or may derive from, medieval German ones. The sources are of much the same kind as those used in the *Glossarium latinitatis* of du Cange or the *Archaeologus* of Sir Henry Spelman, but yet there is more of an etymological drive in this material than in either of those dictionaries, just as there is much more literary material in MS IV, 471 than in the etymologica.[137] The seventeenth-century tradition of lexical research into medieval language and culture to which du Cange and Spelman belong is here being seen as the means to understanding the origins of modern German words.

The project was directed towards the making of a diachronic dictionary rather than a strictly etymological one. Its procedures look forward to the close connection of etymology and cultural history which is to be found in the great nineteenth-century historical dictionaries. In the project preserved in the Hannover manuscript, Leibniz tried to use the resources available at the beginning of the eighteenth century to bring etymology, diachronic lexicography, and cultural history together in a single visionary dictionary. With hindsight, it is easy to see why such a project could never have come near to completion. Even in its unfinished state, however, it bears the mark of a powerful and interesting mind, exploring the limits of what could be achieved by the lexicography of the beginning of the eighteenth century.

CHAPTER 6

The academy tradition from the seventeenth century to 1750
England, Brandenburg/Prussia, and Spain

By the year of the publication of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*, the ideal of the academy, more or less precisely defined, had become widely disseminated. It had also undergone an important change. A case in point is the hope which Sir Robert Cotton and others expressed in 1602 that they might develop the Society of Antiquaries in England into an 'Academye for the studye of Antiquity and History' – for the Society of Antiquaries did not meet with royal approval, and its meetings were discontinued.[1] The first academies had, like the Society of Antiquaries or the Accademia degli Umidi, been unofficial bodies, and as late as the mid to late seventeenth century, something of their spirit can be seen in circles such as those of Hartlib and Durie in England or Bengt Skytte in Sweden. But just as the Accademia degli Umidi was reconstituted under Medici patronage and direction, the first Society of Antiquaries was suppressed, and the Conrart circle in Paris became the Académie française, so, more generally, the academy became a national institution rather than a private one.[2] Some national academies were primarily scientific, historical, or literary rather than being explicitly concerned (at least in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) with the study of language and the making of dictionaries. This was, as we shall see in the first section of this chapter, the case in England. Likewise, neither the Royal Society of Edinburgh nor the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, both chartered in 1783, sought to make a dictionary, although it was suggested that the latter might incorporate information about language into a survey of Scotland or even produce a dictionary of Scots dialect.[3] The Royal Irish Academy, incorporated in 1786, published a paper which included 'a model of a comprehensive Irish dictionary' in 1828, but only began to consider the making of such a dictionary seriously in the 1850s.[4] Other academies engaged in antiquarian and scientific study and undertook normative dictionary projects as well; this was true of the Societät der Wissenschaften of Berlin, which will be discussed in the third section of this chapter. Yet others were founded, after

the example of the Accademia della Crusca or the Académie française, with lexicography as a mandate; this was true of the Real Academia Española, which will be discussed in the fourth and final section.

Projected English dictionaries in the academy tradition (1660 to 1744)

Despite the development in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries of a thriving interest in the cultivation of the English language, no significant language academy was ever founded in England, and no monolingual dictionary on the scale of the *Vocabolario della Crusca* or the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* was undertaken until the middle of the eighteenth century.[5]

Apart from the collegiate universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the Inns of Court at which law was studied in London – the only significant English dictionary produced by an active senior member of any of these institutions before 1800 was the legal *Interpreter* (1607) of John Cowell, professor of civil law at Cambridge – the two most academy-like learned bodies in early modern England were the Society of Antiquaries and the Royal Society. For both of these, the English language was generally a marginal interest: the members of the former had a taste for etymologies, and those of the latter for conceptual clarity.[6] The Society of Antiquaries lapsed in 1607, and its members' interests in language were never brought together in a joint project. The Royal Society, of which the inaugural meeting took place in November 1660, had a greater influence on lexicography.

As early as September 1660, a short continuation of Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis*, by Robert Hooke or another member of the circle from which the Royal Society was about to be formed, imagined an academy which would 'purifie our Native Language from Barbarism or Soloecism' and would also 'make Dictionaries in all Languages, wherein the proper termes of art for every notion and thing in every trade, manufacture and science is genuinely rendred and with its derivation very perspicuous'.[7] The distinction between purifying the language and making dictionaries of terms of art anticipates that between the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* and Corneille's *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*. The virtuoso and diarist John Evelyn was a very early member of the Royal Society, and his proposal of 1665 that the society should compile 'a Lexicon or collection of all the pure English words by themselves … so as no innovation might be us'd or favour'd; at least 'till there should arise some necessity of providing a new edition' brought the puristic and lexicographic plans of

the continuator of the *New Atlantis* together.[8] This dictionary, Evelyn suggested, would include 'all the technical words; especialy those of the more generous employments', these to be 'gleaned from shops, not bookes'; its makers would assemble a working catalogue of neologisms 'such as are daily minted by our *Logodaedali*', and decide which should be registered as acceptable and which stigmatized; and the 'dialects, idiomes, and proverbs … in use in every several county of England' would be investigated, possibly with an eye to registration in the lexicon just as Matthias Moth had registered Danish dialect words.[9]

But purism and lexicography only touched briefly in the plans of the Royal Society. An interest in lean and lucid prose is certainly, and famously, to be found in Thomas Sprat's *History of the Royal Society* of 1667. But although Sprat refers with admiration to Pellisson's history of the Académie française and its dictionary project, he makes it clear at once that the Royal Society was not a body like the Continental language academies. He liked the idea of establishing such an academy in England. During the civil wars, the English language had:

> receiv'd many fantastical terms, which were introduc'd by our *Religious Sects*; and many outlandish phrases, which several *Writers*, and *Translators*, in that great hurry, brought in, and made free as they pleas'd, and with all it was inlarg'd by many sound, and necessary Forms, and Idioms, which it before wanted. And now, when mens minds are somewhat settled, … if some sober and judicious Men, would take the whole Mass of our Language into their hands, as they find it, and would set a mark on the ill Words; correct those, which are to be retain'd; admit, and establish the good; and make some emendations in the Accent, and Grammar: I dare pronounce, that our *Speech* would quickly arrive at as much plenty, as it is capable to receive; and at the greatest smoothness, which its derivation from the rough *German* will allow it.[10]

This work would presumably be carried out by making a dictionary, though Sprat does not say this explicitly – but there is no suggestion that the 'sober and judicious Men' would work under the auspices of the Royal Society. The only dictionary which the society actually published was John Wilkins and William Lloyd's 'Alphabetical dictionary', issued with Wilkins' *Essay towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language*, which was directed at the development of a universal language rather than the cultivation of English.[11] Wilkins did mention the *Vocabolario* in his prefatory epistle to Lord Brouncker, the president of the Royal Society (this was apparently one of the first references to it in English), explaining that a work like the *Essay*, being more useful than a dictionary because it

gave access to a classification of things rather than merely a list of words, deserved the support of 'the combined Studies of many Students' even more than a dictionary project would. And dictionary projects had been the fruit of collaborative work, though even so they had been slow and difficult:

> It has been sayd concerning that famous *Italian* Academy styled *de la Crusca*, consisting of many choice Men of great Learning, that they bestowed forty years in finishing their *Vocabulary*. And 'tis well enough known, that those great Wits of the *French* Academy, did begin their *Dictionary* in the year *1639*. And for the hastning of the Work, did distribute the parts of it amongst severall Committees; and yet that undertaking is (for ought I can understand) far enough from being finished.[12]

But although there were attempts to continue the project which the *Essay* had begun, they were unsuccessful, and the society never sponsored a dictionary or any other major contribution to the study of language. This is not to say that individual fellows lost interest in language or were out of touch with the world in which dictionary projects were imagined. William Petty, one of the founding members, compiled a philosophical wordlist; John Wallis, a very early addition to the fellowship, had published his *Grammatica linguae anglicanae* in 1653.[13] Robert Hooke, to take another example, bought a copy of Pellisson's history in 1677, and in 1684, the translator and natural philosopher Theodor Haak gave him a copy of Schottelius' *Teutsche Sprachkunst* in the edition of 1641.[14] Hooke's library was, in fact, strikingly rich in dictionaries and in books about language.[15] The important role of the Royal Society in English intellectual life in the eighteenth century would ensure that it continued to have at least tangential contact with the study of language: for instance, in the 1780s, William Marsden's pioneering paper on Malayo-Polynesian and his paper on the affinity of Romani with Indic language varieties were published in the form of letters to Sir Joseph Banks, both of which identified Banks as the president of the Royal Society in their titles.[16] But the Society never became anything like a language academy.

Other plans for an English language academy were mooted in the next couple of decades, notably by the poet Dryden.[17] It was not always clear how such an academy would regulate the language: only the *Vocabolario* was yet extant to show that a full-scale dictionary was a possible answer. So, the Irish poet Lord Roscommon and his aristocratic friends entertained the idea of an academy around 1682, but 'instead of making a laborious Dictionary, they purposed severally to peruse our best Writers, & mark such words, as they thought vulgar, base, improper, or obsolete'.[18]

They would then presumably have issued their list of stigmatized words as a book like the Latin *Antibarbarus* by Johann Georg Seybold, of which the first edition had appeared half a dozen years earlier. However, as soon as the appearance of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* had shown that the work of the Accademia della Crusca could be successfully emulated by another academy, there was a reaction in England. In June 1696, the Scottish diplomat and *philosophe* Thomas Burnett of Kemnay wrote to Leibniz that a new and ample dictionary of English was in press, would register common words and the vocabulary of the arts and sciences, 'in imitation of that of the Académie française', and would be illustrated with quotations.[19] Leibniz passed the news on to the savant Claude Nicaise, adding that if the new dictionary included the vocabulary of the arts and sciences, then even if it did not surpass the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* as its makers hoped, it might at least be better than the *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*.[20] No such dictionary of English did appear: Burnett's statement that the work he had in mind was in press suggests that he had heard exaggerated rumours of the fifth edition of Edward Phillips' *New World of [English] Words*, which does indeed register technical and some non-technical vocabulary, and claims the influence of Furetière though not that of the Académie française on its title page, but is not illustrated with quotations.[21] It is the rumours which are of interest here, for they show a sense that the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* could, and indeed might imminently, be imitated in England.

A review of Boyer's *Royal Dictionary* published in 1699 refers to 'the Writings of the great Masters of [the English] Language', naming Archbishop Tillotson, Thomas Sprat, John Dryden, and others, 'out of which might be compos'd a full and perfect Dictionary', preferably under royal patronage.[22] The much cited language academy projects of Daniel Defoe in 1698 and Jonathan Swift in 1712 belong to the same period of imaginative activity as Burnett and Leibniz's correspondence and this review.[23] 'The Work of this Society', Defoe wrote, 'shou'd be to encourage Polite Learning, to polish and refine the *English* Tongue, and advance the so much neglected Faculty of Correct Language, to establish Purity and Propriety of Stile, and to purge it from all the Irregular Additions that Ignorance and Affectation have introduc'd'.[24] Although Defoe was aware of the linguistic authority of the Académie française, he does not mention its dictionary, and, unlike Evelyn, does not suggest that an English academy should compile one.

Prestigious as the academies of France and Italy were in some English circles, their work was not always easy of access: Italian books in particular

could be difficult to obtain in England, and even the official periodicals of Continental academies might more readily be acquired by exchange rather than by purchase.[25] It may have been at the end of the reign of the last Stuart monarch, Anne, that a manuscript collection of academic orations in Italian and Latin was compiled by or for an Englishman, the first of these being Salvino Salvini's 'Discorso in lode del Vocabolario dell'Accademia della Crusca' and the second his 'Discorso sopra L'Origine dell[']Accademia della Crusca'; this collection suggests English interest in the activities of the academy and perhaps, as Frances Yates once suggested, interest in emulating it.[26] It is perhaps to the point that there is a cluster of references to the *Vocabolario della Crusca* in English printed books of the early 1690s.[27] Queen Anne was succeeded in 1714 by Georg Ludwig of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, known to the English as George I. He did not object to learned work (he was the employer of Leibniz, and his sister was, as their mother had been, on friendly terms with the philosopher), but he did not speak English, and after his succession, the likelihood of a royally sponsored English language academy, which had never been great, dwindled towards vanishing point. Projects for an American English-language academy appeared from time to time before and after the independence of the United States, but do not seem to have been strongly tied to plans to make a dictionary.[28]

The making of a dictionary in the academy tradition did not, of course, depend entirely on the existence of an academy, and not every call for a dictionary mentioned academies.[29] Single-authored dictionaries were projected. The writer and politician Joseph Addison apparently made notes towards a dictionary in which quotation evidence from texts such as the sermons of Archbishop Tillotson would be presented 'in the manner of the Dictionary *della crusca*'.[30] The only evidence from Addison's lifetime which associates him with a dictionary project is in fact spurious, but quotations from Tillotson said to have been gathered by Addison came into the possession of Samuel Johnson around 1750, 'too late to be of use' in the making of his own *Dictionary*; moreover, he remembered, 'I thought the passages too short.'[31] A dictionary project in which canonical authors would be quoted, perhaps based on Addison's materials, was advertised in the periodical *The Post-Boy* in June 1717, as follows: 'A Proposal for the publication of a Complete and Standard English Dictionary of the whole English Language as it is written by Orators and Poets, whose Authorities shall be quoted throughout: according to the Method of the celebrated one of the French Academy. In four Volumes folio'.[32] This is striking: the quotation of authorities was of course characteristic of the *Vocabolario*

della Crusca and not of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, but the writer of the advertisement must have had a sense, perhaps derived from his knowledge of Latin dictionaries, that it was a feature of the best lexicography, and that the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* exemplified the best lexicography. This proposal has been associated with a fuller one published in 1724 by the poet and ballad-collector Ambrose Philips, which called for a dictionary in two folio volumes, at the steep price of five guineas the set, and made no mention of quotations, though it did promise 'the *old* and *obsolete* Words and Phrases, to be found in ancient English Authours and Records' – suggesting a historical sense more like that of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft than that of the Académie française.[33] Philips was an associate of Addison's, and it is possible that he took over materials of Addison's including quotations, and proposed an academy-style dictionary with quotations in 1717, but changed his mind over the next seven years, perhaps as a result of examining the modus operandi of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. A discussion of the 1717 proposal in the journal *The Critick* argued interestingly 'that such a Work is not only proper, but even *most* proper, to be committed to a single Person', on account of the problems of inconsistency and delay associated with academy dictionary projects.[34] Philips' dictionary project appears still to have been regarded as current in 1728, when Ephraim Chambers remarked in the article *dictionary* in his *Cyclopaedia* that 'For the *English* [language], we have scarce any [dictionary] worth the Mentioning, unless perhaps that of Philipps', by which he meant an edition of Edward Phillips' *New World of [English] Words*, 'Tho' we are in Expectation of one from a good Hand, on the model of that of the *French* Academy'. Ambrose Philips' dictionary never appeared.

A last imaginary dictionary from mid-eighteenth-century England in which the academy tradition can be seen at work is associated with the poet Alexander Pope. This was not a serious project, for it is known only from records of Pope's conversation of 5–7 April 1744 – the period of his last illness – and as early as January 1744 his only remaining literary ambition had been the making of a final edition of his own works.[35] Pope had been aware of Addison's project for a dictionary illustrated with authoritative examples in the period before 1717. As early as December 1743, Pope had reflected that the only way to decide 'whether a word is English or not, or whether such a particular use of it is proper' was to see whether it was used by irreproachable authorities such as Locke.[36] As he lay dying, he came back to the idea, just as Voltaire would plan an elaborate dictionary in the last weeks of his life (see Chapter 4 above). Pope now imagined a 'design for a dictionary that might be authoritative for our English writers',

and decided on a canon of 'prose authors (from whose works such a dictionary should be collected)' and of 'writers that might serve as authorities for poetical language'. Eighteen prose writers were named, including Thomas Sprat, and nine poets; none of them were earlier than the last quarter of the sixteenth century, and none of the main list were still living, though Pope then added the names of Conyers Middleton, whose life of Cicero had been well received on its publication in 1741, and of his friend Nathaniel Hooke. The intellectual pedigree of this *Wunschlexikon* was evidently mixed. The authorization of words by their occurrence in a narrowly defined canon comes either from the prescriptively oriented lexicography of Latin or from the academy tradition, as realized in the *Vocabolario* and, as we shall see below, the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*. But William Warburton, who would become Pope's literary executor, added to the conversation that 'A dictionary, well executed according to his [Pope's] idea, might put an end to the greater part of our disputes about things as well as take away our doubts about words', and this is surely an echo of Wilkins' *Essay*.[37] Warburton also said that 'It would be difficult … to settle what should be done as to the etymologies of words. If given to all, it would be often very trifling and very troublesome; and if given to none, we should miss some very sensible originals of words.'[38] The problem of how to treat etymologies had, as we have seen, been one with which the academy dictionaries had had to engage, but it did not occur to Warburton that, just as the availability of the etymological dictionaries of Ménage had made it unnecessary for the *Vocabolario della Crusca* and the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* to treat etymology systematically, so that of Skinner's *Etymologicon linguae anglicanae* might release English lexicographers from the same responsibility.

Although a new English dictionary with illustrations from literary authors was only a gleam in Pope's eye in 1744, an excellent plan for the preparation of such a dictionary would be prepared very soon afterwards. This was the work of Samuel Johnson, to whom we shall return in the next chapter.

Ephraim Chambers and his *Cyclopaedia* (1728)

In contrast to these abortive projects for a more or less literary dictionary in the academy tradition, one major English dictionary was realized in the first half of the eighteenth century. This was the *Cyclopaedia; or, An universal dictionary of arts and sciences* of Ephraim Chambers, published

in two handsome folio volumes in 1728, and thus echoing the format as well as the title of Thomas Corneille's *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences* of 1694. Its immediate predecessor in English was the less ambitious *Lexicon technicum* compiled by John Harris and published in 1704, which was quoted in the discussion of Corneille's *Dictionnaire* in Chapter 4 above for its complaint that Corneille's work is a dictionary of words rather than giving an account of things. As Harris' argument shows, the distinction between lexical dictionary and factual encyclopedia was starting to take shape in the early eighteenth century, and the work which Chambers called both *Cyclopaedia* and *dictionary of arts and sciences* is seen with hindsight as an encyclopedia. But insofar as it was an alphabetical work, it was a dictionary in the eyes of contemporaries; for instance, the minutes recording his election to the Royal Society in 1729 describe him as 'Author of the Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences', and Samuel Johnson once told James Boswell 'that he had formed his style … upon Chambers' Proposals for his Dictionary'.[39] Chambers' long preface to the *Cyclopaedia* makes it very clear that he regarded the work as a dictionary, and includes an interesting discussion of the kinds of dictionary and the ways of lexicographers, including some vigorous criticism of the English hard-word tradition.[40] He realized that the alphabetical order of his work inevitably separated related pieces of knowledge, and therefore used cross-references extensively to bring out the connections between entries; this was an important innovation.

Not only was the *Cyclopaedia* seen by its compiler as a dictionary, but the first words of its preface place it self-consciously in the academy tradition:

> 'Tis not without some Concern that I put this Work in the Reader's Hands; a Work so disproportionate to a single Person's Experience, and which might have employ'd an Academy … The bare Vocabulary of the Academy della *Crusca* was above forty Years in compiling, and the Dictionary of the *French* Academy much longer; and yet the present Work is as much more extensive than either of them in its Nature and Subject, as it falls short of 'em in number of Years, or of Persons employ'd.[41]

Chambers continued by listing some of his sources: 'What the *French Academists*, the *Jesuits de Trevoux* … and many more have done, has been subservient to my Purposes.' He returned to the point at some time between 1728 and 1738 in printed proposals for what was to have been a greatly enlarged second edition of the *Cyclopaedia*. The encyclopedic richness of this new edition would 'furnish the best Book in the Universe, and

abundantly indemnify us in the Want of what other Countries are so fond of – Royal, Imperial, Caesarian, and Ducal Academies, Palatine Societies, and the like'.[42] Chambers asked:

> How many Years were the *French* Academists, to the Number of Forty the choicest Wits in *France*, in composing their Dictionary? How often did they alter the Plan of it; and yet when finish'd how many Faults did Furetier find in a single Sheet publish'd as a Specimen? … The Case is much the same with that other celebrated Body Della Crusca, whose Vocabulary after forty Years spent in the Composition, came out with so many, and some such grievous Faults, as gave Occasion to many severe Critiques on it.[43]

The theme of the *Cyclopaedia* as the work of a single man competing with whole academies would be taken up by Samuel Johnson.

Chambers' work was expensive – the first edition cost four guineas, though subscribers got a discount – but it sold well; a fifth edition was published in 1741–3, and considerably enlarged further editions were published later in the eighteenth century.[44] Its readers naturally included the makers of other reference works. So, material from the *Cyclopaedia* would be borrowed, often with abridgement, by alphabetical dictionaries, not least Johnson's; it was also an important source for the *Encyclopédie*.[45] This last development takes the afterlife of Chambers' work beyond the history of lexicography.

The Societät der Wissenschaften of Berlin and its dictionary projects (1700, 1711)

On 11 July 1700, shortly before declaring himself King in Prussia, the elector Friedrich III of Brandenburg founded a learned society, the Societät der Wissenschaften, in Berlin. This was not only one of several assertions of the dignity of the new Prussian monarchy, but also a project dear to the heart of Friedrich's consort, the cultivated and energetic Sophia Charlotte of Hannover, the eponym of Schloss Charlottenburg in Berlin. Leibniz had been the court librarian of Sophia Charlotte's parents, Ernst August and Sophia of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, and the latter had been on friendly terms with him; Sophia Charlotte inherited her mother's esteem for the philosopher. So it was that the foundation of the new learned society was inspired by arguments which Leibniz had been making in a long series of documents from 1669 onwards, addressed to various persons, and culminating in an unpublished version of the 'Unvorgreiffliche Gedancken', the 'Disinterested thoughts concerning the usage and improvement of the German language', which were mentioned in Chapter 5 above.[46] Leibniz

was the first president of the new society – the 'Societät der Wissenschaften' as it was at first called – and his 'Brevis designatio meditationum de originibus gentium, ductis potissimum ex indicio linguarum' ('A brief account of thoughts concerning the origins of peoples, based primarily upon evidence from their languages'), which opened with the claim that languages give us evidence for the events of human prehistory, was the first paper published in the first issue of its journal, the *Miscellanea berolinensia*.[47]

The cultivation of the 'most ancient German *Hauptsprache*' – the word *Hauptsprache*, as in the writings from the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft discussed in Chapter 5 above, identifies German as a cardinal language rather than as derived from another – was one of the aims which Friedrich intended for the new society.[48] In particular, it was to make a 'Schatz des teutschen Alterthums', a treasury or thesaurus of German antiquity. This was to be a collection of German words relevant to the reading of legal documents, to be taken from documentary and other sources.[49] The aims of this project were evidently a very long way from those of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, being explicitly concerned with the past rather than with good contemporary usage. They were much nearer to the aims of the lexicographical thinkers in the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft, and indeed to those of Leibniz himself. In 1702, Leibniz was able to report to Friedrich that much had been achieved by the society in its researches into 'the antiquity of the German language', and that the aim of these researches was 'a well-made German verbal treasury'.[50] After this, however, this first intention to make a dictionary seems to have lapsed: in its early years, the society was too poorly funded to support a major scholarly undertaking.[51] It cannot have helped that Leibniz was based a hundred and fifty miles away in Hannover, where, as we have seen, he had a historical dictionary project of his own to attend to. Johann Leonhard Frisch became a member in 1706, and would many years later produce the important dictionary discussed in Chapter 7 below, but this work was not undertaken under the auspices of the society.[52]

In 1710–11, the Societät der Wissenschaften was renewed, and its plans for a German dictionary were likewise reinvigorated. They were made the business of one of its four divisions, the classis historico-philologica Germanica, of which Frisch was a member. Nor were Frisch and Leibniz the only members of the society with an interest in lexicography; the secretary of the society, Johann Theodor Jablonski, compiled a *Nouveau dictionnaire françois–allemand* in 1711, and Matthias Kramer became a member in 1712, so that he could announce his membership on the title pages of his dictionaries, just as Samuel Johnson would announce his

honorary doctorate on the title page of his own.[53] But nevertheless, there was never enough interest in the dictionary project for it to make consistent progress. A letter of 1711 from Johann Theodor Jablonski reports insufficient participation in the making of 'a dictionary which shall be, as the King puts it, "comprehensive"'.[54] In the same year, Johann Theodor's brother Daniel Ernst Jablonski set out a plan for a three-part dictionary, 'Etymologici, Technici und Usualis' – in other words on just the lines mentioned by Leibniz in the 'Unvorgreiffliche Gedancken' and discussed in Chapter 5 above.[55] This would have taken the *Vocabolario della Crusca* as its model in at least one respect, the use of the vernacular (and not Latin or French) as the defining language, with Latin glosses in a strictly ancillary position.[56] Other documents of the same period record the same abortive project. Friedrich I died in 1713, and was succeeded by his son Friedrich Wilhelm I, a single-minded soldier who had no interest at all in encouraging the making of learned dictionaries.[57] Leibniz died in 1715. Thereafter, although the society maintained at least a nominal interest in the cultivation of the German language, and members such as Frisch, Kramer, and Johann Georg Wachter worked on dictionaries of their own, it did not sponsor a German dictionary project.[58] One suggestion that it might co-operate with a lexicographer, namely Christian Ernst Steinbach, author of a little German dictionary of 1725, was turned down.[59] Herder's *Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache* was a prize essay submitted to the society – the Académie Royale des Sciences et Belles Lettres, as it had been called since 1740 – but it was not directly lexicographical. In 1792, the statesman Ewald Friedrich von Hertzberg suggested again that the Académie Royale might make a dictionary, in emulation of the academies of France, Spain, Russia, and Tuscany.[60] Although he hoped that such a dictionary might be 'more perfect than that of Herr Adelung' and, most interestingly, 'at the same time a complete history of the German language', it was nevertheless to the figure of Leibniz that he turned as the begetter of the project he had in mind, a sign of how little had changed since the beginning of the eighteenth century.[61] His proposals were not acted on until after 1800.[62]

The Real Academia Española and the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana* (1726–1739)

In Spain, to which we now turn, the story of eighteenth-century academy lexicography was very different. Indeed, the story of vernacular lexicography in Spain from the fifteenth century onwards is distinctive. The

Spanish language had been documented in the pioneering Latin–Spanish and Spanish–Latin dictionaries of Antonio de Nebrija, published in 1492 (the year of his great *Gramática castellana*) and 1495 respectively, and running, again respectively, to about 28,000 and about 22,500 entries.[63] These were on the one hand the refined product of a tradition of medieval Hispanic lexicography, comparable to and contemporary with Ambrogio Calepino's refinement of a tradition of medieval Latin lexicography. On the other hand, they were the origins of monolingual and bilingual sixteenth-century dictionary traditions, the latter including dictionaries in which Spanish appeared with Arabic and with Nahuatl.[64] Although this is not the place for a full discussion of Nebrija and his work, its historical context should be noted: the two major Spanish kingdoms had been united in 1479 when Ferdinand, husband of Isabella I of Castile, succeeded to the throne of Aragon, and the last Islamic kingdom on the Iberian peninsula had been conquered in 1492. The same year saw the expulsion of all Jews from Spain. Nebrija's work on the Spanish language was therefore being published just as the kingdom of Spain was being newly defined by dynastic union, conquest, and ethnic cleansing. He was aware of the relationship between language and power: hence his dedication of the *Gramática castellana* to Isabella, and his famous observation in its prologue that 'siempre la lengua fue compañera del imperio', which might be translated 'language has always gone hand in hand with sovereignty'.[65] The analogy with later academy projects – the sponsorship of the Accademia della Crusca by the first grand duke of Tuscany, the founding of the Académie française under the patronage of Richelieu as part of that statesman's brilliant promotion of the power and glory of the kings of France, the founding of the Societät der Wissenschaften in Berlin just as the Elector of Brandenburg was about to claim royal status – is very clear.[66]

The lexicographical work of Nebrija was more sophisticated than that undertaken on any other European vernacular in the fifteenth century. However, as we have seen, the effect of the *questione della lingua* in sixteenth-century Italy was to encourage the development of the lexicography of Italian, and the less vigorous language debates of sixteenth-century Spain did not encourage a parallel development.[67] I have already argued that when the *Vocabolario della Crusca* appeared in 1612, it had no real rival in Spain. However, the *Tesoro della lengua castellana o española* of Sebastián de Covarrubias Horozco, published in 1611 and quoted at the beginning of Chapter 2 above, was certainly one of the most impressive European dictionaries of its day, even if it was not quite in the class of the

Vocabolario. It was the first monolingual dictionary of Spanish, and one of the first large monolingual dictionaries of any European vernacular. Like the work of Nebrija, it linked the Spanish language and royal power: it bore the imprint of the royal printer, the 'impressor del Rey', and its title page identified it as dedicated to the king, Felipe III. The entry count of the *Tesoro* was actually lower than that of the dictionaries of Nebrija – about 11,000 main entries and 6,000 subentries.[68] However, it was a very substantial book, a folio of some 700 pages, rich in encyclopedic information and in citations of Spanish and foreign authors. (This is particularly true of entries in the range *A–Cam*; from *candela* onwards, Covarrubias, who had undertaken the work in his sixties, was anxious to finish it, even if this required economies of scale.)[69] Sixty years later, Stephen Skinner would remark that he had chosen not to follow Covarrubias' example in his *Etymologicon linguae anglicanae* lest the book should swell to such a size that it would fill a wagon, or call for an elephant to carry it about.[70] Encyclopedic information was in fact provided so generously because the *Tesoro* was an etymological dictionary of a very particular kind, inspired by an earlier masterpiece from the Iberian peninsula, the richly encyclopedic *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville.[71] That is not to say that its etymological content is unsatisfactory: Covarrubias is mentioned with respect by the great twentieth-century etymologist of Spanish Yakov Malkiel, not only for his serious and necessary enquiry into the vocabulary of Arabic but also for the insights to which his lived experience and awareness of oral tradition guided him.[72] Whereas the members of the Accademia della Crusca appear to have been uncertain enough of the public for their *Vocabolario* to have made the print run of the first edition a short one, Covarrubias contracted with his printer for a respectable 1,000 copies: he suspected that his *Tesoro* would be a saleable book.[73] By the time of his death in 1613, Covarrubias had prepared a supplement of 2,179 further entries, which was eventually edited in the twentieth century.[74] A second edition with a supplement by another hand, of 1673–4, was issued with a new edition of the other great seventeenth-century etymological treatment of Spanish, Bernardo José Aldrete's treatise *Del origen y principio de la lengua Castellana*, which had first been published in 1606.

A century later, in 1713, the year in which the Treaty of Utrecht brought the War of the Spanish Succession to an end and confirmed the kingship of Felipe V, Juan Manuel Fernández Pacheco, marqués de Villena and duque de Escalona, founded a Spanish academy, the Academia Española, soon incorporated under royal patronage as the Real Academia Española.[75] Villena had the good sense to see that rather than making this a general

academy of arts and sciences – an idea which he had entertained – he should give it a single clear goal.[76] So it was that, in the words of the preface to the first volume of the Spanish dictionary which the academy published in 1726, the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, the principal goal of the academy from Villena's preliminary conversations with his learned associates onwards was the making of 'a copious and exact dictionary in which the greatness and capabilities of the Spanish language would be displayed'.[77] This goal was discussed in the academy's first formal meeting, of 3 August 1713, and was written into its first royal charter, of November 1713, and its printed statutes of 1715.[78] This project would, in contrast to that of the Societät der Wissenschaften, flourish. The new kingdom of Prussia was not rich, and its resources were stretched by military activity, whereas Spain, despite its seventeenth-century decline, was the seat of a great empire. The money for making a dictionary was therefore available in Spain as it was not in Prussia. Moreover, in contrast to the absent Leibniz, Villena was able to attend meetings of his academy – and, having served as a viceroy in the previous decade, he was no stranger to administration.

The dictionary which the academy was to undertake was expressly intended to emulate the *Vocabolario della Crusca* and the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*.[79] Those two rather different dictionaries by themselves were, with hindsight, the foundation of a tradition. But a tradition is a significant *line* of succession, and it is meaningless to say that two points are in line with each other: showing that three points line up together is a different matter. So, the appearance of the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana* as a work modelled on both the *Vocabolario* and the *Dictionnaire* can be said to mark the beginning of a clearly recognizable academy tradition in European lexicography.

There was a well-established corpus of Spanish literature to be read in order to make the dictionary: the short history of the academy in the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana* mentions Luis de Granada, Quevedo, Cervantes, and Calderón for a start. The dictionary was, it was agreed, to provide a basis for reading these authors and others of similar quality. It would, at least to that extent, fix the language – 'fijar la léngua' – and indeed purify it and give it lustre, in accordance with the academy's motto, 'Limpia, fija y da esplendor'. Whereas the Accademia della Crusca had a *frullone*, which separates flour from bran, as its badge, the Real Academia Española adopted a crucible, in which metal is separated from dross – the symbolism recalls the badge of the academy of the Infiammati, which showed Hercules on the funeral pyre, burning the dross of his

mortal body away.[80] The purifying work of the dictionary would be done with reference to 'su última perfección en el siglo passado': the perfection which Spanish was supposed to have attained in the seventeenth century.[81] This aim called for a dictionary illustrated from the best literary authorities, and the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana* would indeed come to be known as the *Diccionario de autoridades*. In this respect, it was closer to the *Vocabolario* than to the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, and its prologue acknowledged that as the second edition of the *Tesoro* of Covarrubias had been its most important domestic model, so the third edition of the *Vocabolario* had been its most important foreign one.[82]

A pilot range of entries, from *Ab* to *Ad*, was drafted at a very early stage, perhaps even before the foundational meeting of 3 August 1713.[83] In the week following that meeting, a list of guidelines for work on the dictionary was drawn up by one of the academicians, a civil servant and editor of early historical accounts of the New World, Andrés González de Barcia Carballido y Zúñiga.[84] It was approved at the meeting of 10 August – the project moved briskly from its very beginnings – and printed as an eight-page pamphlet under the title *Planta, y methodo, que, por determinacion de la Academia Española, deben observar los academicos, en la composicion del nuevo diccionario de la lengua castellana; a fin de conseguir su mayor uniformidad* ('Plan and method which, by order of the Spanish Academy, the academicians are to observe in the composition of the new dictionary of the Castilian language, in order to make it as consistent as possible'). This document bears the imprint of the royal printer: the academy was not yet called the Real Academia Española, but it already benefited from royal goodwill. The plan it sets out is for a dictionary which would register all and only the words which belonged to the Spanish language, excluding proper nouns and words whose signification was patently indecent.[85] It would be arranged 'in strict alphabetical order', but this would in fact be semi-etymological: although the basic words, *vozes primitivas*, would be in alphabetical order, each of them would be followed by its derivatives and compounds as by phraseological information, as had been done with the *mots primitifs* and their derivatives in the first edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*.[86] Status labelling would be provided, as would some etymological information, the latter being confined to the identification of the donor languages of loanwords.[87] In the case of variant spellings, prescriptive commentary would be provided.[88] Ill-conceived neologisms were to be banished, and better, older forms restored: *pontificar* 'pontiffize', for instance, should be expelled in favour of *presidir en la Iglesia Universal* 'preside over the Universal Church'.[89] Details of how

canonical works should be excerpted follow: extracts made by one academician should be copied out onto one side of a sheet of paper so that the sheets could be cut up and the extracts distributed in slip form to his colleagues. Each extract should be identified by author, edition, and page number, and a list of standard abbreviations for thirty particularly important authors and texts follows.[90]

The work of compiling the dictionary was, as these instructions and the full title of the *Planta, y methodo* suggest, divided among academicians.[91] Inevitably, some made more substantial contributions than others, and one 'careless and irresponsible aristocrat' – Jaime de Solis y Gante, elected because he was a relation of a founding member of the academy, the duque de Montellano – not only failed to attend meetings or write anything for the dictionary but lost the materials which had been entrusted to him.[92] He was duly expelled from the academy. His expulsion suggests the extent to which his case was an exceptional one, whereas in the Académie française it would have been much more normal.[93] A great many of the early eighteenth-century Spanish academicians (including the duque de Montellano himself) did take some part in the preparation of the dictionary, and its preparation therefore moved forward with admirable speed – 'to our great shame', remarked a member of the Académie française, reflecting on the time which the preparation and the first revision of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* had taken.[94] When the preliminaries came to be composed in the 1720s, they were shared between five academicians, and this again suggests the collegiality of the enterprise.[95] The first volume received its *Aprobacion* and *Licencia* in 1724, scarcely a decade after the foundation of the Academia and the composition of the *Planta, y methodo*, and was published with an imprint date of 1726.[96] The sixth and last volume bore an imprint date of 1739.

The importance of the citations from canonical authors was, as we have noted, emphasized strongly enough in the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana* for it to come to be known as the *Diccionario de autoridades*. Near the beginning of the general prologue to the dictionary, by the civil servant and cataloguer of Golden Age drama Juan Isidro Faxardo, or Fajardo, is the statement that 'As the basis and foundation of this dictionary there have been set those authors who in the opinion of the academy have treated the Spanish language with the greatest propriety and elegance.'[97] This meant that words used in canonical literary texts were included even if they were obsolete (but not, as specified in the *Planta, y methodo*, if they were taboo), but that the vocabulary of the arts and sciences was not as systematically treated as in the *Dictionnaire de Trévoux*, a

work of which the Spanish academicians were aware.[98] Faxardo expressed the hope that the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana* would be followed by a separate dictionary of the 'voces próprias pertenecientes à Artes liberales y mechánicas', the vocabulary of the liberal and mechanical arts, like Thomas Corneille's. In the event, this hope was not fulfilled by the academy, but by the publication of the *Diccionario castellano con las voces de ciencias y artes* of Esteban de Terreros y Pando in four volumes, registering some 60,000 entries, between 1786 and 1793.[99] Proverbs and sayings were included in the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, and this is not surprising: they had played a significant part in the *Vocabolario della Crusca* and the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. More striking is the flexibility which allowed the compilers to include regionalisms (about 1,400 of them, of which 126 were from Spanish America), medieval forms, neologisms, words from non-literary documents, and words (including a number of Gallicisms) for which no written authority could be found.[100] The goal of fixing the Spanish language was not allowed to narrow their vision unduly. After Faxardo's prologue and a history of the Real Academia from its beginnings to 1726, the preliminaries of the dictionary continued with a short account of the origins of the Spanish language, an essay on the etymologies in the dictionary, and an essay on the orthography of Spanish as adopted in the dictionary, before listing the authors in prose and verse on whose works the dictionary had been based (they are arranged in chronological groups) and providing tables of abbreviations.[101] The material on the history of the language was an innovation in the academy tradition, as were the separate essays on etymology and orthography.

The dictionary ran to about 42,500 entries, more than double the entry count of the *Tesoro* of Covarrubias even if the subentries of the latter are included, and likewise more than double the entry count of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*.[102] They were, in the end, fully alphabetized except that participles were placed after the corresponding infinitive forms: since the *Planta, y methodo* of 1713, the second edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* – the alphabetized *Nouveau dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* of 1718 – had appeared, and this may have set an example to the Spanish academicians.[103] In Chapter 2, we saw the treatment of Italian *lento* and cognates or alphabetically adjacent words in several dictionaries, including the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, and noted that Covarrubias' *Tesoro* does not have an entry for the Spanish cognate *lento*. There is, of course, such an entry in the much more comprehensive *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*:

> LENTO, TA, adj. Tardo, flematico y sossegado. Sale del Latino *Lentus*, que significa lo mismo. OV. Hist. Chil. lib. 3. cap. 5. Todos los accidentes y achaques de viejos, que son alguaciles de la muerte, llegan à executarlos à sus casas mas tarde, y à passo mas *lento* que à otras Naciones. IBAÑ. Q. Curc. lib. 3. cap. 5. No pide el estádo de mis interesses remedios *lentos*, ni Médicos timidos y tardos.
>
> LENTO. Se toma tambien por poco vigoróso ò eficaz en su linea: y assi se dice, Calentúra lenta, fuego lento, &c. Lat. *Lentus*. LAG. Diosc. Lib. 2. cap. 68. Hecho esto, la pondras sobre las *lentas* brasas, y la menearás a menúdo con una espátula.

This is a neat piece of work. After the headword, marked as an adjective and therefore given with an indication of the feminine form *lenta* after the masculine form *lento*, comes a gloss in Spanish, an indication of the Latin etymon, and two illustrative quotations, one from Alonso de Ovalle's *Historica relacion del reyno de Chile* of 1646, and one from Mateo Ibañez de Segovia y Orellana's translation of Quintus Curtius, published in 1699. A second paragraph notes the metaphorical use – just as in Italian and in French, a fever or a fire can be called 'slow' in Spanish – and observes that this too originates in Latin; a quotation is given from one of the canonical texts listed in the *Planta, y methodo* of 1713, Andrés de Laguna's translation of Dioscorides, first published in 1566. The typography is unpretentious but rational, with the key word picked out in italics in the text of each quotation, and the author's name set in small capitals; this last feature makes it easier to see where each new quotation begins. Overall, the *Diccionario* was a truly impressive achievement; the French academician who was quoted above on the speed with which it was prepared said also that it 'can be regarded as the perfect model of a dictionary'.[104]

The publication of the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana* in six folio volumes was a grand assertion of the amplitude of the Spanish language, carried out with 'ardent zeal for the glory of the nation'. [105] In sheer bulk, the set of volumes matched the six volumes of the nearly contemporaneous fourth edition of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, and trumped the two volumes of the *Nouveau dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*. Giving splendour to the Spanish language meant giving splendour to the Spanish monarchy, and so the title page of the first volume, printed in red and black, emphasized the dedication of the dictionary to Felipe V, whose name was printed in the largest size of type used on the page (the only line of type as big as that which read 'DON PHELIPE V.' was the first, 'DICCIONARIO'). Its engraved frontispiece, by the former court painter Antonio Palomino,

shows a portrait of Felipe V, supported in the air by cherubs, with the crucible of the academy burning below it like the smoking altar of an ancient god. Mercury treads the air before it with a volume, presumably of the dictionary, tucked casually under the arm which holds the caduceus. Louis XIV had only been elevated on a pillar in the frontispiece of 1694 to the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, to which the frontispiece of the *Diccionario* evidently refers. The *Diccionario* was expressing its makers' adoration of the absolutist monarch in the strongest conceivable terms.

The ample and inevitably expensive format of the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana* limited its circulation. Further editions were not to be published on the same scale. In fact, the making of a second edition turned out to be much slower than that of the first had been. A set of principles for a revised edition was printed in 1743, and another was drawn up in 1757 and printed in 1764.[106] However, in this period, the academy was busy with the preparation of a book about orthography and a grammar – recalling the much-postponed grammar projected by the Académie française – of which the latter appeared in 1771. A first volume of a new edition of the *Diccionario* was published in 1770, covering the range A–B. It was fully alphabetized, participles and all; it was corrected, both by the refinement of definitions and by the elimination of ghost words; and it was augmented, offering 2,620 new entries.[107] A copy was presented to the Académie française in 1773, together with a set of the first edition of the *Diccionario*, and perhaps this suggests a developing sense of the international importance of the Real Academia, as recognized by Ewald Friedrich von Hertzberg in 1792 as he expressed the hope that the Académie Royale of Berlin might emulate the dictionary-making which had been achieved in Spain, and by Charles Pougens in 1794, as he remarked on the superiority of the *Vocabolario della Crusca* and the *Diccionario* to any dictionary of French, including the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*.[108]

In the ensuing decade, a change of editorial direction took place, and in 1780 an edition of the whole dictionary appeared, 'reduced to one volume for ease of use', and running to about 46,000 entries.[109] The thousand folio pages of this new dictionary were laid out in triple columns of 91 lines, set in small type, but this compression was not enough to reduce the six volumes of the first edition to one, and etymological information (limited as this had always been) and quotations from authorities had to be dispensed with.[110] Whereas the dictionary of 1726–39 had been compiled along the lines of the *Vocabolario*, the dictionary of 1780 was therefore much more like the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. It turned out to be very successful. The one-volume 1780 edition had presented additions and corrections to A

and B in a supplement; a 'second edition' of 1783 incorporated these in its main text and presented new additions and corrections to A, B, and C as a supplement; a third edition of 1791 presented revised entries as far as F and unrevised entries thereafter.

Academy dictionaries and national languages at mid-century

By the mid-point of the eighteenth century, three European languages were documented in academy dictionaries: Italian, French, and Spanish. In each case, the dictionary in question registered, at least primarily, a high-prestige variety associated with literary or metropolitan usage. By the same point, multiple German academy dictionary projects had been proposed and had failed to bear fruit. An English dictionary project, Johnson's (to which we shall turn in the next chapter), had been advertised in an impressive printed *Plan*, and was in progress: most unusually, this was a commercially sponsored enterprise, carried out in complete independence from any academic body.

Apart from the great absolutist monarchies of France and Spain, the Italian-speaking and German-speaking states, and Great Britain, there were only a few major independent countries in Europe with distinctive national languages. These were Portugal in the west, the United Provinces (the Netherlands) in the north-west, Denmark (including Norway) in the north, Sweden (including Finland) to the east of Norway, Poland (including Lithuania) across the Baltic from Sweden, the Russian empire to its east, and the Ottoman empire in the south-east of the continent, extending into Asia.

Of these countries, Poland and the Ottoman empire were, for very different reasons, in exceptional positions. In the case of Poland, its rulers for most of the period from 1697 to 1763 were two German-speaking electors of Saxony, August II and August III, neither of whom was interested in the promotion of the Polish language or Polish intellectual culture. August III was succeeded by a Pole, Stanisław August Poniatowski, who was a member of the academies of Berlin and Saint Petersburg and of the Royal Society of London, but who lacked the means to found a comparable institution.[111] Although the idea of a large Polish dictionary was floated in his reign, the national importance of the Polish language was not as powerful a concept then as it would become after the national disaster of the third partition of Poland in 1795.[112] The first volume of the first monolingual Polish dictionary, Samuel Gottlieb Linde's *Słownik języka polskiego*, would only appear in 1807. Printing was a marginal activity in the eighteenth-century

Ottoman empire, and although at least two printed bilingual dictionaries were produced in Istanbul at the press of a Transylvanian-born convert to Islam, İbrahim Müteferrika, from 1729 onwards, the constitution of a body responsible for the making of a printed dictionary on the scale of the western European academy dictionaries would have been out of the question.[113]

So it was that, following the successful treatments of Italian, French, and Spanish; the repeated failures to treat German; and the ongoing treatment of English by a freelance lexicographer working for a consortium of booksellers, a well-informed observer in 1750 might have expected future academy dictionary projects to be proposed or undertaken in Portugal, the United Provinces, Denmark, Sweden, and the Russian empire. The academy dictionary projects of the second half of the eighteenth century were in fact undertaken in precisely these countries.

CHAPTER 7

Samuel Johnson and Johann Christoph Adelung

Another remarkable dictionary entry

In 1755, the first monolingual English dictionary worthy to be compared to the *Vocabolario della Crusca* was published. Its entry for *lenity*, a word from the same region of the alphabet as the Italian word *lento*, for which we saw the *Vocabolario* entry at the beginning of Chapter 2, was as follows:

> LE'NITY, *n. s.* (*lenitas*, Lat.) Mildness; mercy; tenderness; softness of temper.
>
> Henry gives consent,
> Of meer compassion, and of *lenity*,
> To ease your country. *Shakespeare's Henry VI.*
>
> *Lenity* must gain
> The mighty men, and please the discontent. *Daniel.*
>
> Albeit so ample a pardon was proclaimed touching treason, yet could not the boldness be beaten down either with severity, or with *lenity* be abated. *Hayward.*
>
> These jealousies
> Have but one root, the old imprison'd king,
> Whose *lenity* first pleas'd the gaping crowd:
> But when long try'd, and found supinely good,
> Like Aesop's log, they leapt upon his back. *Dryden.*

This entry is, of course, from Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary of the English Language*.

Unlike the *Vocabolario*, Johnson's *Dictionary* was not founded on a strong vernacular tradition. The first free-standing monolingual dictionary of English had been Robert Cawdrey's *Table alphabeticall* of 1604, which presented 2,498 entries in its first edition, and was compiled for readers who wanted to understand hard words but did not know enough Latin to look them up in an English–Latin dictionary.[1] Its entry for *lenity*

was quoted in Chapter 2 above: '*lenitie*, gentlenes, mildnes'. By the first decade of the eighteenth century, lexicographers in the English vernacular tradition were working towards registering the whole vocabulary of the language in a single monolingual dictionary. The 'first folio universal dictionary' was *The New World of Words*, compiled by John Kersey in 1706 on the basis of Edward Phillips' *New World of English Words*, with an entry count of about 38,000.[2] The *Dictionarium Britannicum* of Nathan Bailey and others, published in 1730, offered about 48,000 entries, including 'Terms of Art, in all the Arts, Sciences and Mysteries' (*mystery* means 'technical operation'), with etymologies and ample enyclopedic information. A second edition of 1736 pushed the word count to about 60,000, and padded out a number of entries with proverbs and discursive editorial material.[3] However, the default model for an entry in the second edition of the *Dictionarium Britannicum* was closer to the entry structure of the *Table alphabeticall* than to that of the academy dictionaries. Bailey's entry for *lenity* was 'LE'NITY (*lenitas*, L) meekness, mildness, gentleness'. Johnson's *Dictionary* towered above works like Bailey's, and this was, first and foremost, because of its place in the academy tradition.

Johnson's *Plan of a Dictionary* (1747)

On 18 June 1746, Samuel Johnson signed a contract with a consortium of London booksellers to produce a new dictionary of the English language. He was to receive 1,500 guineas for the work, some of it to be paid in advance, but would have to meet the expenses of the compiling process out of that sum.[4] Sir John Hawkins wrote of the origins of the project that 'the booksellers of greatest opulence in the city [of London] … had long meditated the publication of a dictionary, after the model of those of France and the Academia della Crusca'.[5] Hawkins was not an immaculate biographer, but he did know something about Johnson's dealings with the booksellers – indeed, at one time he possessed the contract of 1746 itself, which has now been lost – and his statement that they wanted Johnson to produce something like an academy dictionary may well be true.[6] They must certainly have expected something which would be more than a tweaked version of Bailey's dictionary for their 1,500 guineas, and they must have been aware that the *Vocabolario della Crusca* and the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* were appearing in edition after edition.

Before Johnson and the booksellers signed the contract, he drew up a project proposal, under the title 'A short scheme for compiling a new

dictionary of the English language', of which the holograph manuscript survives, with the added comments of two readers. At this stage in the development of his lexicographical thought, Johnson was finding his way. The very first question which occurred to him was 'by what rule or by what marks of Distinction the words are to be chosen': the dictionary he projected would, like those in the academy tradition, have exclusionary criteria. On the first page of the 'Scheme', he rejected the idea that the 'use of a Dictionary' should be 'no other than that of preserving the purity and fixing the use of English words', again suggesting that he had the academy tradition in mind, as manifested in passages like the sentence in the introduction to the first edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* which had asked 'whether a living language can attain fixity'.[7] At the end of the 'Scheme', he allowed himself to imagine a dictionary 'by which the pronunciation of the Language may be fixed, and the attainment of it facilitated, by which its purity may be preserved and its Use ascertained, its Reputation encreased, and its duration lengthened.'[8] The vision is, once again, decidedly in the academy tradition. There is one explicit reference to academy lexicography in the 'Scheme': the stigmatization of 'Barbarous and impure Words and expressions' with 'some note of infamy' would 'be equivalent to the proposal made by Boileau to the Academicians that they should review all the polite authours, and correct [interlined: 'cleanse them from'] all the impurities which they found in them'.[9] This remark was carried forward to the printed *Plan of a Dictionary*. It actually goes further than Boileau's original suggestion, which was that only works agreed to be stylistically faultless should be admitted to the canon of the best authors in the first place.[10] I strongly suspect that Johnson read the words not in the 1740 edition of the *Oeuvres* of Boileau, where they appeared in an addition to the 'Bolaeana' at the beginning of the first volume, but in the first book in which they were printed, Olivet's continuation of Pellisson's history of the Académie française, where they may have caught his eye because they come just after an occurrence of the word 'Dictionnaire'.[11] Was he leafing through the *Histoire de l'Académie* because he was looking for ideas about dictionary-making?

At other points, the 'Scheme' diverged from the academy tradition, or at least from the ideas of its latest representatives. One of these points is the remark that 'It may not be improper that the Quotations should be ranged according to the ages of the Authors.'[12] No such arrangement had been used in a dictionary in the academy tradition, though Johnson's thought shows the same latent historical tendencies which would appear a

few years later in the discussions of the Académie française. Another point of divergence is a passage on alphabetization:

> the Etymology or Derivation is next to be considered, and the words are to be placed in their different classes whether Simple as Day, Light or compound as Day-light whether primitive as to act or derivative, as Action, actionable active activity, this will much facilitate the attainment of our Language which now stands in our Dictionaries a confused heap of words without dependence and without relation.[13]

In these sentences, Johnson was toying with the idea of semi-etymological ordering, inspired either by the first edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, or by Henri Estienne's *Thesaurus graecae linguae*, or Robert Estienne's *Thesaurus latinae linguae*. One of the readers who commented on the 'Scheme' supposed the influence to be an Estienne dictionary, and asked 'Whether Stephen's Method which seems to be meant here will not be more puzzling?'. The other agreed, asking 'Is not Faber's method, quite thro', the best?' – the reference is to Basilius Faber's alphabetically arranged Latin dictionary *Thesaurus eruditionis scholasticae*, first published in 1571 but re-edited into the eighteenth century – and making the good points that a person unfamiliar with English would not know under which root to seek a derivative, and that there might indeed even be disagreements on this subject between well-educated native speakers. This practically minded reader concluded that 'A Dictionary has no more to do wth Connections & Dependance than a Warehouse book. They are both mere Repertoriums, & if they are not such they are of no use at all.'[14] Johnson carried this passage of the 'Scheme' through into the printed *Plan* as well, but abandoned the idea of semi-etymological ordering thereafter.[15] In both of these respects, the difference between Johnson's ideas and those of contemporary lexicographers in the academy tradition is that Johnson is thinking more historically than his contemporaries.

The senses of words were, according to the 'Scheme', to be arranged logically, starting with the most concrete.[16] The dictionary was to be illustrated with quotations for every sense of every word, from 'the best authorities of all ages', though obsolete words would only be registered if they had been in use as recently as the reign of Elizabeth I, 'from which time we date the golden age of our Language'.[17] These features need not have originated exclusively in the academy tradition: the theory which underlies Johnson's plan for the ordering of senses goes back to Locke, and Johnson would have been more familiar with the rich deployment of quotations in Latin and Greek dictionaries than with that in the *Vocabolario della Crusca*.[18] The reference to the golden age of the English language,

however, echoes the ideas of the *Vocabolario*, for whose makers the golden age had been the time of the *Tre corone*; the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, for whose makers it was the present; and indeed the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, for whose makers it had been the seventeenth century. And the *Plan* enlarges on 'best authorities' with the claim 'that many of the writers whose testimonies were alleged, were selected by Mr. Pope' – a reminder of Johnson's place in the series of proposals for an English-language dictionary in the academy tradition.[19] The relationship between Pope's dictionary project and Johnson's interested the biographer and historian of the Royal Society Thomas Birch, who wrote in 1748 of the authorities which Johnson intended to use that 'Pope and Spence settled the catalogue of these Writers some years ago.'[20]

The revision of the 'Scheme' which was printed as *The Plan of a Dictionary of the English Language* in 1747 added material on Johnson's place with respect to the academy tradition. In its opening paragraphs is a reference, directed to his then patron Lord Chesterfield, to 'times, in which princes and statesmen thought it part of their honour to promote the improvement of their native tongues, and in which dictionaries were written under the protection of greatness': the reference is to the grand-ducal and royal sponsorship of the academy dictionaries, and to Richelieu's and Colbert's encouragement of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*.[21] The decision to include some technical vocabulary is made with the reflection that 'The academicians of France … rejected terms of science in their first essay, but found afterwards a necessity of relaxing the rigour of their determination,' and that 'it would surely be no proof of judgement to imitate them in an error which they have now retracted'.[22] In the concluding paragraph, Johnson reflects that if the worst comes to the worst, he will not blame himself for having 'retired without a triumph from a contest with united academies'.[23] (Conversely, an early French-language review of the *Plan* remarked that the task of undertaking such a dictionary as Johnson proposed 'is as weary as it is unglamorous, and is better suited to a corporate body than to a single person' before concluding more cheerfully that if the dictionary was as good as the *Plan*, it would be worth waiting for.)[24] So, from the first sentence of the 'Scheme' to the editions which closed the *Plan*, Johnson had dictionaries in the academy tradition in mind, sometimes as rivals, but more importantly as models to be emulated: this latter theme is clearer in Johnson's references to the academies than in those of Chambers. Although he referred to the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* more than to the *Vocabolario della Crusca* (and may not have known the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*), he refers to 'united academies' rather

than to a single academy: the *Dictionnaire* and the *Vocabolario* were both evidently in his mind.[25]

He, and contemporaries of his, continued to think of the academy tradition as he worked on the *Dictionary*. Boswell records a famous boast in a conversation with William Adams, a fellow of the Oxford college at which Johnson had been an undergraduate:

> *Adams*. But Sir, how can you do this in three years? *Johnson*. Sir, I have no doubt that I can do it in three years. *Adams*. But the french Academy which consists of forty members took forty years to compile their Dictionary. *Johnson*. Sir, thus it is. This is the proportion. Let me see forty times forty is sixteen hundred. As three to sixteen hundred so is the proportion of an englishman to a frenchman.[26]

Boswell places this story between materials from 1747 and 1748, and 'I can do it in three years' suggests that he was right to place it there, or at least that it belongs to a very early date in the process of composition of the *Dictionary*, when all of Johnson's task lay before him. Some seven years later, when the earl of Chesterfield made his unfortunate attempt to patronize Johnson by commending the still unpublished dictionary in *The World* in November 1754, he was particularly maladroit in his remark that 'the celebrated dictionaries of the Florentine and French academies owe their present size and perfection to very small beginnings' – Johnson had long intended to equal those dictionaries as they stood, not to have his work compared to 'very small beginnings', whatever those may have been.[27]

The making of Johnson's *Dictionary of the English Language* (1755)

Seeing the academy dictionaries as models to be emulated was one thing; actually producing a dictionary in the academy tradition was another. The making of Johnson's *Dictionary* was, as Allen Reddick has shown in a brilliant monograph based on the examination of early working papers found among those from a later revision of the dictionary, by no means straightforward. Early biographers circulated misleading stories about the process, for instance that Johnson began with 'an interleaved copy of Bailey's dictionary in folio', and these have proved durable.[28] In fact, Johnson's account in the 'Preface' is absolutely right: 'I applied myself to the perusal of our writers, and noting whatever might be of use to ascertain or illustrate any word or phrase, accumulated in time the materials of a dictionary, which, by degrees, I reduced to method.'[29] He began by collecting

quotations, marking up hundreds of books in the course of many months while his assistants copied out the quotations he had marked.[30] (Cutting books up so as to paste printed quotations onto slips does not seem to have been an option: in order to have both sides of every page available for cutting, Johnson would have had to buy two copies of every book to be excerpted, and the booksellers' 1,500 guineas would soon have been depleted by doing this.) After some thousands of quotations had been gathered, the assistants started to transcribe them into home-made fascicles, leaving space for the addition of more quotations and of editorial material such as definitions and etymologies, both of which were of course the responsibility of Johnson. A sense of how much space would be needed was gained with reference to the wordlists of published dictionaries.[31] In late 1749 or early 1750, this system broke down: Johnson was gathering so much quotation material, and responding carefully to the variety of senses which could be discovered in it was taking him so far beyond his original formulae for the handling of multiple senses, that the fascicles were becoming hopelessly overcrowded and confused.[32] He was to look back critically on the mechanical view of sense-development sketched in the *Plan*, in words of which Boswell singled out the second sentence as an example of 'perfection of language': it 'is specious, but not always practicable; kindred senses may be so interwoven, that the perplexity cannot be disentangled, nor any reason be assigned why one should be ranged before the other. When the radical idea branches out into parallel ramifications, how can a consecutive series be formed of senses in their nature collateral?'[33] Moreover, Reddick suggests, the publication of Benjamin Martin's dictionary *Lingua britannica reformata* of 1747 gave Johnson a chance to see another lexicographer of English working on the breakdown of senses in a formulaic spirit very much like that of the *Plan* – and to perceive that Martin's treatment was neither consistent nor successful.[34] Yet another problem was that some of the quotations which Johnson had gathered were so long that they would make the entries of the dictionary difficult to consult.[35] Johnson started again: material from the first manuscript was reworked and recopied (some of it may have been cut and pasted) onto loose sheets, and these served as printer's copy.

It was in the process of reworking between the abortive first manuscript and the second manuscript in loose sheets that Johnson was able to construct definitions which were really responsive to the usage in the quotations he had gathered (a final opportunity for reworking was provided by the process of proof-correction).[36] This can be seen in the entry for *lenity* with which this chapter began. Cawdrey had defined

this as 'gentlenes, mildnes', and Bailey as 'meekness, mildness, gentleness'. Johnson agreed that 'mildness' was a good gloss, but then added 'mercy; tenderness; softness of temper' to it, surely on the basis of the quotation evidence. The offer which Henry VI makes in Shakespeare's play is a matter of 'meer compassion, and of lenity', in other words of mercy; the opposite to *severity* in Hayward's antithesis between severity and lenity is something like tenderness; and the old imprisoned king in Dryden's play was not exactly being merciful or tender when he displayed lenity, but was showing softness of temper. As Reddick puts it, 'Johnson's mind … was of a critical bent: each usage in a particular context suggested a different inference or subtlety of meaning for which he had to account.'[37]

The first seventy sheets of the *Dictionary* (*A* to *carry* sense 21) were printed by December 1750, and over the next five years, Johnson worked at the completion of the manuscript and the correction of proofs, using up the booksellers' advance as he did so.[38] The dictionary was published on 15 April 1755, in two folio volumes, the retail price being four pounds ten shillings, a fraction higher than the four guineas of the first edition of Chambers' *Cyclopaedia*. A run of 2,000 copies was printed, and evidently sold well; a substantially identical second edition was published from 14 June 1755 onwards in 165 sixpenny weekly numbers, just as had been done with the 1741 edition of the *Cyclopaedia*, to meet demand from those who could not afford the lump sum.[39] The entry count, 42,773, was lower than that of the most extensive monolingual English dictionaries – that of the 1736 edition of Nathan Bailey's *Dictionarium Britannicum* was 'probably 60,000 words or more' – but in line with, for instance, the 47,453 of the fourth edition of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*.[40] This entry count reflected the exclusionary principles with which the 'Scheme' had begun, as Boswell understood. When he met Johann Bartholomäus Rogler in Leipzig in 1764, and gathered that Rogler's recent revision of Christian Ludwig's *Dictionary, English, German, and French* had not only added words from Johnson's *Dictionary* but also words which Johnson had excluded, Boswell was indignant: 'from the unlucky inclination to be voluminous, which is so remarkable in Germans, he has *enriched* it [Ludwig's dictionary] forsooth with three thousand words taken from *others*, so that he has amassed all the rubbish which Mr. Johnson has with so much judicious care kept out of his book. *O quale caput*! I gave it him pretty plainly.'[41] Boswell considered adding a version of this anecdote to his discussion of the *Dictionary* in the *Life of Johnson*, but thought better of it in the end.[42]

The structure and reception of Johnson's *Dictionary*

The *Dictionary of the English Language* consisted of four elements: a preface, a history of the English language, an English grammar, and the main text.

Dictionaries in the academy tradition had always been presented with prefaces, but Johnson's was strikingly unlike theirs because of the powerfully autobiographical elements which make it such a wonderful literary achievement. I have argued elsewhere that Johnson's model for this is to be found in early modern work on ancient texts: particularly in the prefaces of Henri Estienne, and most particularly in Estienne's preface to the *Thesaurus graecae linguae* of 1572.[43] To turn from autobiographical content to rhetorical performance, the idea of the learned preface as a literary tour de force is likewise one which comes from the early modern philological tradition, in which the best prefaces (sometimes identified as De Thou's to his history of his own times, Casaubon's to his edition of Polybius, and Calvin's to the *Institutes*) were very highly prized.[44] However, Johnson's preface locates his dictionary in the academy tradition, making the point more firmly than the *Plan* had done. After remarking that his work had not been carried out 'under the shelter of academick bowers', an expression which might evoke Continental academies or English universities, he reflects that 'the aggregated knowledge, and co-operating diligence of the *Italian* academicians, did not secure them from the censure of *Beni*' and – as quoted in the discussion of the eighteenth-century editions of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* in Chapter 4 – that 'the embodied criticks of *France*, when fifty years had been spent upon their work, were obliged to change its oeconomy, and give their second edition another form'.[45] The vision of fixing the language which the academy tradition inspired in the 'Scheme' and the *Plan* was, famously, renounced in the 'Preface': it would be a foolish lexicographer who 'shall imagine that his dictionary can embalm his language … With this hope, however, academies have been instituted'.[46] Equally famous are Johnson's words 'If an academy should be established for the cultivation of our stile, which I, who can never wish to see dependence multiplied, hope the spirit of *English* liberty will hinder or destroy …'.[47] But these words are by no means a rejection of what Johnson had learned from the academy tradition of lexicography.

Johnson's history of the English language was more elaborate than the corresponding history of the Spanish language in the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*. It belonged to an English tradition rather than to a Continental European one: the preliminaries of English dictionaries

had included historical material since Edward Phillips' 'Preface, by way of introduction to the right knowledge of our language' in his *New World of English Words* of 1658.[48] The texts which are placed in historical sequence to make up the bulk of the history – *chrestomathy* might be an apter word than *history* – appear to have been of Johnson's own choosing; he may have had some help from the historical remarks on English poetry which form part of his friend Thomas Warton's *Observations on the Faerie Queene of Spenser*, published in March 1754 and read by Johnson within a couple of months.[49] His grammar likewise belonged to an English tradition, at least insofar as its main source was the work of an English writer, John Wallis.[50] Its closing paragraph began 'Thus have I collected rules and examples, by which the English language may be learned.'[51] This surely implies an interest in reaching a foreign readership, and a sense of the place of the *Dictionary* in the wider world of learning.

The main text of the dictionary was, as the example of *lenity* shows, rich above all in quoted material: by 'the materials of a dictionary' Johnson meant the quotations. Robert DeMaria, Jr. has said well that 'the *Dictionary* is the greatest sustained example of Johnson's, or perhaps anyone's, powers of reading in English'.[52] (Earlier in the same argument, DeMaria discusses Johnson's encyclopedism with reference to that of Chambers, and to the whole ideal of learned academies, linguistic and scientific alike – 'a dream of comprehensive and universally available knowledge that flourished in the late Renaissance along with the rise of the printing industry' – concluding that the *Dictionary* 'is historically and generically linked to this grand dream and the academies founded to promote it'.)[53] The quotations are, in Johnson's words, 'from the writers before the restoration [of 1660], whose works I regard as *the wells of English undefiled*, as the pure sources of genuine diction'.[54] In fact, he did quote eighteenth-century authors, and even living ones, including himself, but seldom quoted authors earlier than the 1570s. So, like those of the *Vocabolario*, Johnson's quotations were always taken from printed texts, and for the most part from a canon of pre-contemporary work, although the distance in time between Johnson and, for instance, Shakespeare was less than that between the Accademici della Crusca of 1612 (let alone those of the eighteenth century) and Dante. One advantage which Johnson had over his Italian predecessors was access to a very widely known vernacular Bible translation of superb literary quality – that of 1611 – and he used this translation extensively. Again like those of the *Vocabolario*, Johnson's quotations are not dated, and they are not historically ordered. A critique of the dictionary published in 1755

pointed out that 'Many critical readers would be glad to be acquainted with the *Æra* of words'.[55]

The importance of the quotations is signalled by the spaciousness of their layout; this contrasts with that of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, of which all four editions had run quotations together in blocks. It owes more to the use of white space in the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, whose presentation in two volumes it emulates. Johnson's was, indeed, the first English dictionary to be presented with the typographical grandeur of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. Its double-column folio pages and the elaborateness of its use of font and indentation to distinguish the parts of entries (including the different numbered senses of entries for words more strongly polysemous than *lenity*) were unprecedented in monolingual English lexicography, and even the pages of the grandest English dictionaries, those of the Latin–English tradition, scarcely compare with the typographical achievement of a double page of Johnson's.[56]

As well as writing superbly worded definitions, Johnson provided etymologies for the words he registered. Commenting on the superiority of the *Dictionary* to its English-language predecessors, Boswell actually put 'the learned, yet judicious research of etymology' before 'the various, yet accurate display of definition, and the rich collection of authorities'.[57] What is interesting about Johnson's etymologies is not their quality so much as their presence in the dictionary at all: the *Vocabolario della Crusca* and the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* had not, as we have seen, provided etymologies systematically, and by doing so, Johnson aligned himself more with a Germanic-language tradition of interest in 'the obscure recesses of northern learning' than with the academy tradition.[58] He did not pretend to make original contributions to this tradition, but he read his two main sources, the etymological dictionaries of Junius and of Skinner, critically, and the assessment of their relative merits in his preface is thoughtful.[59]

When the dictionary was published in 1755, Johnson immediately had copies sent to the Académie française and the Accademia della Crusca.[60] This was a scholarly courtesy, to be sure, but it was also an assertion of the right to extend that courtesy. The Accademia thanked him for his two magnificent volumes, commenting on their affinity with the *Vocabolario* as well as the learning and labour which had shaped them.[61] The Académie, as we saw in Chapter 4, sent copies of the fourth edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* to various French royalties and dignitaries, to the Accademia della Crusca, to the Real Academia Española, and to Johnson, a recognition that as a lexicographer, he was in his single person equal to an entire academy. Other copies of the *Dictionary* found their

way far across Continental Europe: there was one in the library of Princess Ekaterina Dashkova, the director of the Russian Academy (and herself, as we shall see, an important figure in the history of lexicography).[62] When, in 1794, Charles Pougens reviewed the superiority of other European dictionaries to the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, he gave the climactic place to 'the illustrious Johnson', who 'had the glory of enriching his fatherland with a dictionary in which one finds, at the same time, the etymologies of words, their definitions, and quotations taken from the best writers of England'. It was the achievement of Johnson which Pougens specially wished to emulate.[63]

British admirers of the *Dictionary* commented, perhaps at Johnson's instigation, on the grandeur of his solitary achievement. Boswell, for instance, remarked that 'the world contemplated with wonder so stupendous a work atchieved by one man while other countries had thought such undertakings fit only for whole Academies'.[64] (He then added 'or other bodies of learned Men' and crossed it out again: he must have wondered whether some of the dictionary-making bodies of Continental Europe might not have been strictly academies.) David Garrick claimed more boisterously, as soon as the *Dictionary* was published, that:

> Talk of war with a Briton, he'll boldly advance,
> That one English soldier will beat ten of France:
> Would we alter the boast from the sword to the pen,
> Our odds are still greater, still greater our men …
> First Shakespeare and Milton, like Gods in the fight,
> Have put their whole drama and epic to flight; …
> And Johnson, well arm'd like a hero of yore,
> Has beat forty French, and will beat forty more!

This effusion was much reprinted: clearly it spoke to eighteenth-century Britons.[65] It belonged to the same tradition as the following reminiscence of Hester Piozzi's: 'His reply to the person who complimented him on its [the *Dictionary*'s] coming out first, mentioning the ill success of the French in a similar attempt, is well known; and, I trust, has been often recorded: "Why, what would you expect, dear Sir (said he), from fellows that eat frogs?".'[66] The joke is unworthy of Johnson, and the story may be apocryphal, but the point stands that Johnson's *Dictionary* could be associated, if not in his own mind then in those of contemporaries, with British robustness as opposed to the feebleness of the frog-eating French. Even Archibald Campbell, at the end of his attack on Johnson in *Lexiphanes*, put his criticism of Johnson's humorous definitions of *pension* and other words into the mouth of a comic French hairdresser who, quoting these

definitions in the presence of British members of the classes insulted by them, is repeatedly beaten for his pains.[67] This aspect of the reception of Johnson's dictionary is part of the story of British national self-definition against the Continental European nations, and particularly against the French, in which the superiority of the English language to French was a significant sub-theme.[68]

A third edition of the *Dictionary* appeared in 1765, in a run of 1,024 copies, published to coincide with Johnson's edition of Shakespeare of that year; a fourth, painstakingly revised, and now offering 43,279 entries, appeared in 1773.[69] An abridgement, with the quotations removed, was published in an edition of 5,000 copies at the beginning of 1756, and ran to many subsequent editions.[70] The place of the main work in the academy tradition continued to be stated in these publications. So, for instance, Johnson's preface to the 1756 abridged edition begins 'Having been long employed in the study and cultivation of the English language, I lately published a dictionary like those compiled by the academies of Italy and France', and the printed proposals for one of the first posthumous editions of the *Dictionary* recall the days before Johnson, when 'the Learned in this Country … had the Mortification to behold themselves infinitely surpassed in Philological Improvement by the Academicians of Italy and France'.[71] These were not empty words: Johnson's achievement was fully on a par with those of the Accademia della Crusca, the Académie française, and the Real Academia Española.

Two predecessors of Adelung: Matthias Kramer (1700–1702) and J. L. Frisch (1741)

Kaspar Stieler's *Stammbaum* was the only dictionary to be published as a free-standing volume by a member of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft. However, the first two landmarks in eighteenth-century German lexicography, Matthias Kramer's *Herrlich grosse Teutsch–Italiänische Dictionarium* of 1700–2 and Johann Leonhard Frisch's *Teutsch–Lateinisches Wörter-Buch* of 1741, also had close affinities with the lexicographical work of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft.

The first Italian–German dictionary of Matthias Kramer, *Il nuovo dizzionario delle due lingue, Italiana–Tedesca e Tedesca–Italiana*, appeared in 1676.[72] It naturally invoked the *Vocabolario della Crusca* in its prefatory material, naming it first in a list of sources and pointing out before a reference to 'this bloody bitter drudgery' of lexicography that not even an academy could produce a faultless dictionary.[73] Its frontispiece showed an

Italian Renaissance gateway leading to a formal garden, decorated with portrait medallions of the *Tre corone*, Bembo, and Kramer. But it was grounded in German lexicographical tradition. In the *Nuovo dizzionario*, Kramer's professed objects were first attentiveness to phraseology and second an ordering of its content by *Stammwörter*: a practice, and indeed a word, which placed it in the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft tradition, although he himself was not a member of the society.[74] This dictionary had a German–Italian pendant of 1678, *Das neue Dictionarium oder Wort-Buch, in Teutsch–Italiänischer Sprach*, produced by reversing its wordlist; in the opinion of Leibniz, this work was 'nothing special'.[75] A second edition appeared in 1693, as *Il nuovo dittionario reale Italiano-Tedesco, fornito di richissima frasiologia*.[76]

Kramer's most important contribution to German lexicography was a German–Italian dictionary, the *Herrlich grosse Teutsch–Italiänische Dictionarium* of 1700–2.[77] This work sought to approach comprehensive coverage of the vocabulary of German.[78] Three times the size of the *Neue Dictionarium* of 1678, it registers about 80,000 words, again ordered by *Stammwörter*. In contrast to Stieler's 400-to-600 *Stammwörter*, Kramer offers about 4,700, listed in the prelims: the list is not identical to that in Schottelius' *Ausführliche Arbeit*, but the two are of similar length.[79] The dictionary is introduced by a reprint of a German grammar for the Italian reader which Kramer had published some years previously, so it was meant for bilingual use, but its spirit is that of German lexicography, and the influence of 'the incomparable Schottelius' and of Stieler is acknowledged in the preface.[80]

There is no alphabetical index of German forms in *Das herrlich grosse Teutsch–Italiänische Dictionarium*, but there are alphabetically placed lists of cross-references, as in Pergamino's *Memoriale* and the first edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, so that the reader seeking the word *abordnen* will find it, with no gloss but a cross-reference to its treatment s.v. *ordnen*, in a list headed *Abm/Abn/Abo* at the appropriate point in the alphabetical sequence of the dictionary. There are also some useful cross-references from one part of a compound to another: for instance, *Stamm-baum* is registered s.v. *Baum*, with the gloss 'albero genealogico', but a cross-reference then directs the reader to *Stamm*, where the compound is treated again more fully, with the synonym *Stamm-register* and the phrase *den Stammbaum eines Geschlechts aufrichten* 'drizzare l'albero della stirpe ò della consanguinità, farne la genealogia' ('draw up a family tree or pedigree, do genealogy'). As this may suggest, Kramer offers a very full registration of German idioms, achieved 'with a pithiness and

richness hitherto unknown in German lexicography'.[81] There is a puristic exclusion of *Fremdwörter*: a note immediately after the range of words in *ab-* promises that words like *Academi* (which would have come next in the alphabetical sequence) which had been borrowed needlessly from other languages but had obtained some right of abode in the German language – a phrase which recalls Leibniz's evocation of 'right of abode' in his anti-puristic reflections of the 1690s – would be relegated to an appendix, but even this project was abandoned, and the words in question are therefore not registered at all.[82]

Kramer's was, in Harro Stammerjohann's judgement, 'both in volume and method … the most modern German dictionary of its time'.[83] More modern than Kramer's, but still connected with the seventeenth-century roots of Kramer's work, was the *Teutsch–Lateinisches Wörter-Buch* published in 1741 by the polymath Johann Leonhard Frisch, whose *Beschreibung von allerley Insekten in Teutsch-Land* surely makes him one of the few people who has ever made significant contributions both to etymology and to entomology.[84] This was closer in spirit to Stieler's work than to Kramer's in one respect: it was a German dictionary with Latin as a metalanguage rather than a true bilingual dictionary. It comprised about 60,000 entries.[85] Frisch had in fact originally hoped to make a historical and etymological dictionary – a plan which he abandoned on the appearance of an excellent German etymologicon, Johann Georg Wachter's *Glossarium Germanicum*, in 1727, and a historical dictionary, the 900-page *Glossarium ad scriptores linguae francicae et alemannicae veteris* presented as the third volume of Johann Schilter's posthumous *Thesaurus antiquitatum Teutonicarum*, in the following year.[86] The dictionary which he then compiled was consciously not only a collection of words of ancient origin, but also of those in general use, including the vocabulary of arts and trades, such as mining, fishing, and hunting.[87] It was illustrated with numerous quotations from pre-contemporary sources, some of them provided with dates. The treatment of ancient, technical, and general words together is very much in the tradition of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft. It made Frisch's single dictionary integrate the three undertakings for which Leibniz had imagined three different dictionaries.

The *Stammwortprinzip* in Frisch's dictionary was not clarified by cross-references as it had been in Kramer's: the reader looking for *abordnen* had to realize that *ab-* was a prefix and that the word was therefore to be found at *ordnen*. However, to make matters easier, when there was any doubt as to the *Stammwort*, the derived form was treated in the main alphabetical sequence.[88] Likewise, the dictionary registered many loanwords in their

alphabetical places. So, for instance, the reader of Stieler would only find *Abrikot* 'apricot' or *Academi* in the supplement (if he or she had one of the few copies which included it); there, the latter was defined 'academia, universitas' or 'Hoheschul', and the derived form *academisch* was noted. The reader of Kramer, as we have just seen, would find neither. Frisch, however, provided entries for both in his main alphabetical sequence. That for *Abricosen* glosses the word as 'Malum Armeniacum'; explains the etymology (from Latin *praecox* 'early-fruiting') with a reference to the entry *abricot* in Ménage's *Origines de la langue françoise*; remarks that apricots are sometimes called *Marellen* or *Marillen* in German; and gives the compound *Apricosen-baum* 'apricot tree'. *Academie* is glossed, as in Stieler, as 'academia' or 'hohe Schule', but then the compound *Ritter-Academie* 'riding-school' is given, followed by two derivatives, *academisch* and *Academist* 'a student of the equestrian disciplines'.[89] Frisch also gave some attention to social variation, noting for instance that *Abend-Mahlzeit* 'evening meal' was used by people of high social standing, and *Abendbrot* 'supper' by people of lower standing.[90] At last, the whole vocabulary of German was the object of lexicographical investigation.

The *Versuch eines vollständigen grammatisch-kritischen Wörterbuches der hochdeutschen Mundart* and the *Grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der hochdeutschen Mundart* of J. C. Adelung (1774–1786, 1793–1801)

After 1741, the general and technical vocabularies of German were covered by Frisch and by earlier lexicographers such as Kramer and Christian Ernst Steinbach, all of whom used Latin or a living foreign language as their defining language; encyclopedic material was being made available in Johann Heinrich Zedler's *Grosses vollständiges Universal Lexicon*, published in sixty-four folio volumes between 1732 and 1750; and etymology and early varieties of German were covered by Wachter and Schilter.[91] The critic Johann Christoph Gottsched had done some work towards a German dictionary before his death in 1766; when Boswell was in Leipzig, Gottsched encouraged him in his projected dictionary of Scots, and 'allowed me to search his etymological library and take thence a list of such books as may assist me in compiling my Dictionary'.[92] After Gottsched died, the learned publisher Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf, a man moved by 'a rare patriotic attitude towards the prestige and purity of the German language', obtained some or all of his lexicographical materials.[93] Like Gottsched, Breitkopf lived in Leipzig, and he showed Gottsched's materials to the historian and

mineralogist Johann Christoph Adelung, who had moved to Leipzig in 1765, and had since then been producing a significant body of learned editorial work, including a revision of du Cange's dictionary of medieval Latin, published in six volumes between 1772 and 1784. Encouraged by Breitkopf, Adelung agreed to compile a German dictionary which would achieve the goals towards which Gottsched had striven.

They must have discussed this matter soon after Gottsched's death, because Adelung described his dictionary in the first volume, of 1774, as the principal labour of about six years, and the sole labour of a couple.[94] In 1780 he looked back on 'a twelve-year hunt after mere words', wishing that he had come 'to the end of such an arid, wearisome and only too often thankless labour' when he still had another volume to go.[95] That means that he began work in 1768, and that the two years for which the dictionary had been his sole labour by 1774 were part of the six years in which it had been his principal one (until 1772 he had also been occupied with the revision of du Cange). The dictionary, *Versuch eines vollständigen grammatisch-kritischen Wörterbuches der hochdeutschen Mundart* (*Essay towards a Complete Grammatical-Critical Dictionary of the High German Dialect*), was first published, by Breitkopf of course, in five volumes, the last being issued in 1786. It presented about 52,500 entries.[96]

Adelung's introduction begins with a blunt assertion of the insufficiency of earlier German dictionaries:

> It is to be presumed that the appearance of this dictionary will astonish nobody; it is much more to be wondered at, that this gap in our scholarship should not have been filled sooner and more fortunately than has been the case up to now. All of the present standard languages of Europe can boast of wide-ranging dictionaries in which their wealth and their essential qualities are more or less exhaustively treated: only German, one of their eldest sisters, has until now had to be inferior in this respect.[97]

Adelung saw his dictionary as a new start, and although there are very few new starts in lexicography, and it has been calculated that he took about a third of the content of his dictionary from those of Frisch and Kramer, it is indeed very different from the work of his predecessors.[98] Friedrich II of Prussia – Frederick the Great – remarked in a work published in 1780 that it was embarrassing to think how recently the first dictionary of German had appeared, and he most probably had Adelung's *Versuch* in mind as this first dictionary.[99]

One thing which made Adelung's work new was its consistent use of German as its only metalanguage. Another was its virtual rejection of the *Stammwortprinzip*. A third, less dramatic but perhaps equally important,

was its attentiveness to discrimination of sense, neatly expressed by the provision of numbered senses and subsenses, which contrasts markedly with the rather shapeless accumulation of material under the *Stammwörter* of Frisch's dictionary.[100] This may show the influence of Johnson's *Dictionary*, about which, as we shall see, Adelung thought deeply. Not only was the arrangement neat, but it was logical, and even had a diachronic quality:

> The meanings, which are wont to be thrown together at random and confusedly in most dictionaries, are ordered in conformity with what is signified: that is, in conformity with how they appear to have developed from each other. Indeed, this law could not be followed everywhere, because the first meaning of a given word … is no longer available, or because some rungs from the ladder of meanings have been lost, or lie hidden in the dialects. In this case the meanings can, indeed, only be ordered conjecturally.[101]

Obsolete senses, or at least senses which had become obsolete in High German, were included for the sake of the completeness of the 'ladder of meanings'.[102]

As we saw in Chapter 2, Florentine philologists as early as the sixteenth century had been capable of placing the texts which they studied into chronologically sequenced groups, but this had not been translated into lexicographical practice: the *Vocabolario della Crusca* did not aim to illustrate the historical development of the words it registered. As we saw in Chapter 3, Pierre Bayle did imagine a dictionary which would record 'the history of words', namely 'the period of their reign and of their decadence, with the changes of their meaning', in 1690, but he made no attempt to compile such a dictionary. The semi-etymological structure of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* was described by the academician François Charpentier as 'pleasant and instructive … because one sees, if the expression is permissible, the history of the word, and observes its birth and its progress', but in that case, the history of the word was that of its derivatives and compounds. Adelung, unlike these predecessors, was proposing a dictionary in which the entries would, whenever possible, begin with the primary meaning of a word and trace its history forward. The strong historical sensibility of earlier German lexicography had, paradoxically, tended to be thwarted by the semi-etymological *Stammwortprinzip*, which placed the same emphasis on morphological development in German as it did in French. But by combining that sensibility with the fully alphabetized macrostructure of the mature academy dictionary tradition, Adelung could see that the presentation of the morphological development of a word is jejune in comparison with the presentation of its semantic development. That vision did not bring him all the way to the historical principles

of nineteenth-century lexicographers: for Adelung, the primary meaning of a word could be determined by reason – it was, for instance, naturally concrete rather than figurative – rather than by the examination of dated evidence. But the diachronic element in his dictionary was stronger than that in any previous general monolingual dictionary had been.

'Perhaps', reflected Adelung directly after the passage quoted above, 'the classification on which we have hit will in some cases appear Linnaean'.[103] This organic view of the development of language was not essential to the historical quality of Adelung's lexicography: he twice used the image of the ladder of meanings, in which each rung is a new sense in a series, and this of course is not an image of organic growth. But the reference to Linnaeus was suggestive, and it allied his work with that of some of the most original thinkers about language of his time. So, for instance, Johann Gottfried Herder would see language in organic terms in his *Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache*, submitted as a prize essay to the Académie Royale des Sciences et Belles Lettres of Berlin at the end of 1770, and published in 1772; and Sir William Jones would find 'system, truth, and science, which never failed to captivate and engage his attention' in Linnaeus.[104]

The title of Adelung's dictionary presented it as a 'grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch' confined to 'die hochdeutsche Mundart'. By *grammatisch-kritisch*, Adelung really meant 'normative': one might compare the prescriptive content of the near-contemporary *Dictionnaire critique* of Feraud which was mentioned at the end of Chapter 4. So, Adelung's was a normative dictionary of High German: 'mit beständiger Vergleichung der übrigen Mundarten' ('with constant comparison with the other dialects'), adds the title page, 'besonders aber der oberdeutschen' ('but mainly the Upper German ones').[105] High German was, for Adelung, the German of Upper Saxony, and particularly of Meissen, which was used as the preferred learned and literary variety even by speakers of other dialects.[106] As for normativity, this was summed up in Adelung's statement that a dictionary was, among other things, a collection of cases on which rules for the teaching of a language could be based.[107] It followed that provincialisms were sparingly treated, though those in canonical texts like the works of Luther and Martin Opitz could hardly be excluded; the same was true of archaisms. Loanwords which had not received 'deutsche Bürgerrecht', or in other words had not been naturalized, were prime candidates for exclusion.[108] That is not to say that Adelung's practice was narrowly didactic or puristic: he admitted a wide range of loanwords, and also admitted words from different registers of German, making exceptions even to his exclusion of the lowest

and most unseemly words – for which, he hinted with what looks like momentary playfulness, the astute reader might look out; more than five hundred low words were stigmatized with a dagger sign.[109] Just as the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* had registered *chier* 'to shit', so Adelung registered *scheissen* 'to shit', without a dagger, and with some good observations on usage and cognates.[110] But his theory was, on the face of it, restrictive, as that of the *Vocabolario della Crusca* and the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* had been. Elsewhere, Adelung was to criticize the makers of bilingual German dictionaries for introducing low words, as when *gormandizer* was supposedly translated 'ein Saumagen zu seyn' ('to be a greedy-gut').[111]

The dictionary was attentive to technical vocabulary, for the pragmatic reason that many people did not understand it and would therefore hope to find it explained in a dictionary.[112] Compounds were, again pragmatically, treated with caution: admitting every semantically transparent compound in German would have swelled the dictionary to unmanageable proportions, and so many had to be excluded, though 'perhaps too many of them have already found a place here'.[113] (The same principle is true for English lexicography, as Johnson noted in 1755, remarking that the examples of compounds which he provided, 'numerous as they are, might be multiplied': James Murray would, in his day, be infuriated by a colleague's documentation of the semantically transparent *railway porter*.)[114] Proverbs were generally excluded as belonging to the lower registers of speech.[115] When entries were illustrated with examples, these were generally given without bibliographical references, though many of them were certainly taken from books, notably Luther's translation of the Bible, which had the advantage of being 'in everyone's hands'; Adelung expressed the hope in the preface to the *Versuch* that he would be able to provide a wider range of illustrations from texts in a future edition.[116] Etymological information was provided in discursive notes at the ends of entries.

Adelung had originally intended to publish his *Versuch* in six volumes, but the last of these, which would have included addenda and corrigenda, never appeared.[117] Instead, from 1793 to 1801, he published a second edition of the dictionary, no longer as an essay (*Versuch*) but simply as *Grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der hochdeutschen Mundart*. The new dictionary ran, by a near-contemporary count, to 55,181 entries.[118] Noteworthy here is the lexicographer's control over his material: a century earlier, Stieler's *Der Teutschen Sprache Stammbaum und Fortwachs* had registered 68,000 words, all of which Adelung could have brought into his dictionary if he had wished. Instead, he was thinking, as Johnson had

done and as modern lexicographers do, about where to set his inclusion criteria.[119]

Adelung's dictionary set a lexicographical standard – it was, to take one example, the natural comparator for an early-nineteenth-century reviewer of Samuel Gottlieb Linde's *Słownik języka polskiego* to cite – and Adelung's influence on his nineteenth-century successors was great; it has been identified as continuing to the present day.[120] It was in his work that a fully monolingual, fully alphabetized, general dictionary of German was first realized. After the failure of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft to make a German dictionary, and the undeniable shortcomings of the *Stammwort*-oriented and at least partly bilingual lexicography of Stieler, Kramer, and Frisch, Adelung had produced something very much like an academy dictionary single-handed and without delay, and had even lived to revise his own dictionary extensively. The similarities between his achievement and Johnson's are obvious. When Joseph Bosworth, the lexicographer of Old English, was writing to his friend Joast Hiddes Halbertsma to encourage him to commit his energies to the making of a Frisian dictionary, he urged 'Your own Friesland (Fatherland) claims this work of you – England, yea Europe claims it of you. Halbertsma must be for Friesland more than Johnson for England, Adelung for Germany, or Killian for Holland.'[121]

J. C. Adelung on Johnson's *Dictionary*

Johnson's *Dictionary*, like the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, was used as the basis for bilingual dictionaries, not least in Germany, where it had been praised from its publication onwards.[122] One of these, the *Neues grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der englischen Sprache* of 1783, was the work of the indefatigable Adelung. The assessment of the *Dictionary* in his prefatory matter is a welcome example of criticism of Johnson by a competent lexicographer – and, moreover, one who could see the *Dictionary* in its European context. It was translated into English in 1798, by the physician and compiler A. F. M. Willich, as 'On the relative merits and demerits of Johnson's English dictionary', and it is Willich's translation which will be quoted here, since although it is not always exact, it is lively and contemporaneous.

Adelung's criticisms of Johnson, positive and negative, fell under seven headings. First, the wordlist of the dictionary was incomplete, particularly with regard to the 'terms of arts and manufactures' and to the vocabulary of natural history; the latter was capable of being improved by the provision of Linnaean specific names in definitions.[123] Here, Johnson's alignment of

himself with the French and Italian traditions was being seen as unsatisfactory by a German critic who had inherited a much stronger sense of the importance of *Kunstwörter*. Second, its status labelling was excellent: if words had been 'exploded from the more dignified written style, as well as from the polite circles of conversation', Johnson could be relied upon to tell the reader so.[124] Adelung's own careful interest in the registers of German was mentioned above in the discussion of his *Versuch*. Third, its provision of grammatical information was generally good; Adelung's only objection was to the treatment of pronunciation, which was a difficult matter indeed for any eighteenth-century lexicographer.[125] Fourth, Johnson 'proves himself a shallow etymologist'.[126] Adelung was by no means the only person to point this out; it might again be said that Johnson was aligning himself with Tuscan and French practice rather than with that of the German-speaking tradition. Adelung remarks that Johnson's ignorance of German does not help – he would not have derived *chirp* from *cheer up* if he had known German *tschirpen*, *zirpen* 'chirp' – and that he sometimes mistakes homonyms for senses of a polysemous word.[127] In fact, of the three cases of alleged pseudopolysemy which Adelung cites, namely *arm*, *buxom*, and *cock*, Johnson recognizes rightly that *arms* 'weapons' are etymologically distinct from *arm* 'part of the body'; Johnson is right to treat *buxom* 'obedient, gay or jolly' as a single word and Adelung is wrong to see it as a pair of homonyms; Johnson is wrong to treat *cock* 'cockerel', *cock* 'cockboat', and *cock* 'haycock' as senses of a single word. Fifth, Johnson's definitions are extremely well expressed, but he was too much inclined to subdivide senses (he was, as we might say, a splitter rather than a lumper).[128] As for the ordering of senses, Adelung wrote that an ideal was 'To ascertain the principal and peculiar signification of a word, from which the others, if there be any, must be derived'. The knowledge prerequisite for this 'must be founded upon a sufficient number of works, written by men who lived in the different ages, in which the language was spoken', and Adelung admitted that he really did not have a deep enough knowledge of English to make radical improvements to Johnson's work.[129] Here, as in his own German-language lexicography, he was thinking about the historical principle by which the ordering of senses might tell the whole story of the development of a word. He did not reproach Johnson for having worked on different principles. Sixth, Johnson's illustrative examples often called for abridgement, and sometimes, when conversational language was concerned, for supplementation; in the latter case, Adelung used Boyer's *Royal Dictionary* of 1699 as a resource.[130] Lastly, Johnson's material on combinations and phraseology was excellent.[131]

Overall, then, Adelung's reading of Johnson's *Dictionary* was sensitive and sympathetic. The respects in which he would most have liked to see change – the registration of technical vocabulary, the provision of etymologies, and the adoption of a diachronic entry structure – are all respects in which Johnson was closer than Adelung to the origins of the academy tradition of lexicography. To put that another way, they are all respects in which Adelung was looking forward to the lexicographical developments of the nineteenth century.

CHAPTER 8

The continuing academy tradition from 1751 to 1800
The United Provinces, Russia, Portugal, Denmark, and Sweden

The Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde, and the Dutch dictionary projects of Van Iperen (1762), of the Maatschappij (1769–*c.* 1794), and of Weiland (1799–1811)

The cultivation of the Dutch vernacular had been urged since the early modern period: two milestones are the poet Hendrick Spieghel's *Twespraak vande Nederduitsche letterkunst*, published in 1582 just as the northern Netherlands were becoming independent of Spanish rule, and Simon Stevin's introduction to his *Beghinselen der weeghconst*, published in the same courageous decade.[1] However, this early puristic work was not followed by the formation of a Dutch language academy: the early modern chambers of rhetoric and the short-lived Nederduytsche Academie founded in 1617 were nurseries of literature rather than of the study of language.[2] There were several possible reasons why no such academy was founded in the Dutch Golden Age. One was that Dutch had an excellent dictionary at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Dutch–Latin *Etymologicum teutonicae linguae* of Kiliaan, and that the reputation of such a dictionary can inhibit plans to replace it.[3] Another was that Dutch philological scholarship was strongly directed towards the study of ancient texts. These might be classical – Cornelis Schrevel's *Lexicon manuale graeco–latinum et latino–graecum* of 1654 or his edition of the ancient *Lexicon* of Hesychius of 1668 arguably have a better title than any contemporary dictionary of Dutch to be called the lexicographical highlights of the Golden Age – or they might be Germanic texts from the early Middle Ages, as in the studies of Jan van Vliet and Franciscus Junius.[4] A third was that Dutch was not exclusively the language of the United Provinces: it was also spoken in the Spanish Netherlands (from 1713 the Austrian Netherlands). A fourth was that the United Provinces did not have a self-confident monarchy like those which patronized the Tuscan, French, and Spanish academies: in the seventeenth and

eighteenth centuries, the closest thing to a hereditary monarchy was the stadtholdership of Holland, Zeeland, and Utrecht, which was vacant for two significant periods, and vested in the king of England for a third. And a fifth possible reason for the absence of a dictionary-making Dutch academy was that Dutch did not have the broad international prestige of Italian, French, and Spanish: just as Matthias Moth's Danish dictionary may have remained unpublished because no publisher was prepared to take it on, so a Dutch academy dictionary would have been a risky financial speculation. So although there was a busy production of bilingual dictionaries of Dutch with French, Latin, English, and Spanish in the seventeenth century, there was no move to replace the trusty Kiliaan with a comprehensive monolingual Dutch dictionary on the scale of the academy dictionaries.[5]

The most important work of monolingual lexicography in this period was a hard-word dictionary, Johan Hofman's *Nederlandtsche woordenschat*. (Its title sounds a puristic note, using the Germanic *woorden-schat* 'word-treasure' rather than *tresoor*, which is from French *trésor*.) This registered 'uytheemsche woorden', incompletely assimilated foreign words, in its first edition, of 1650, which ran to about 3,700 short entries. By its fifth edition, of 1669, the *Woorden-schat* appeared under the name of its revising editor Lodewijk Meyer, and was split into sections of unassimilated loanwords, now called 'bastaardtwoorden' (about 7,300 entries); terms of art, or 'konstwoorden' (about 6,500 entries); and archaisms, 'verouderde woorden' (about 3,400 entries). Further editions appeared until 1805.[6]

Long before this date, however, an important development had taken place and an important initiative had been taken. The development was the revival of the philological study of the Germanic languages in the Netherlands, which had lapsed after the death of Van Vliet in 1666 and the departure of Junius to England in 1674. This revival took place in the work on the philology of Dutch of Lambert ten Kate, notably the two volumes of his historically inflected *Aenleidning tot de kennisse van het verhevene deel der Nederduitsche sprake* (*Introduction to the Knowledge of the Elevated Part of the Dutch Language*) of 1723, of which the latter is an etymological dictionary of Dutch with about 20,000 entries.[7] Ten Kate's fine work on phonetic change cannot be discussed here, but a more minor aspect of his thought resonates with that of a thinker discussed earlier in this book: like Vincenzio Borghini, he was very interested in the preservation of archaic forms in the speech of uneducated people.[8] Ten Kate's *Aenleidning* stimulated Dutch language studies for decades after its publication – such as those which were gathered in the periodical *Maendelijksche by-dragen*

ten opbouw van Neer-land's tael- en dicht-kunde (*Monthly Contributions towards the Study of Dutch Language and Literature*, reissued in volume form as *Tael- en dicht-kundige bydragen*), which ran for fifty issues from 1758 to 1762. A glance at the *index nominum* of the collected reissue of the *Bydragen* suggests Ten Kate's importance to its contributors' collective project.[9]

It is to this journal that we now turn. It was the organ of a student body at Leiden, the society 'Linguaque animoque fideles', which had been founded in 1757.[10] Not every member of this society was a student, and in September 1762, a contribution to the *Bydragen* was made by a minister of religion in his thirties, Josua van Iperen, who would in later life be a member of 'the first association for intellectual pursuits established in a tropical European settlement', the Batavian Academy of Arts and Sciences, and would make a pioneering discrimination between the Javanese and Sundanese languages.[11] Van Iperen had published a *Proeve van taalkunde als eene wetenschap behandeld* (*Specimen of the Study of Language Treated as a Science*) in 1755, with a dedication to the newly established Hollandsche Maatschappij der Wetenschappen ('Holland Society of Sciences') of Haarlem. This little book treats lexicography, but often at quite an abstract level, and the examples it discusses are taken from Hebrew and Greek, without commenting critically on existing Dutch dictionaries or calling for a new one.[12] There is, though, one speaking silence: when Van Iperen contrasts dictionaries of dead languages such as Greek and Syriac with those of living languages, the examples of the latter which he gives are English, French, and German, 'or similar dictionaries' – not Dutch.[13]

Van Iperen's paper in the *Bydragen* went beyond these beginnings. It was called 'An invitation to those who love our mother tongue and know it well to help with the compilation of a critical Dutch Dictionary'.[14] In the previous century, both Van Vliet and Junius were apparently 'advocates of the production of a new and exhaustive etymological dictionary … of Dutch', but neither went far towards making one or urging others to do so.[15] In the opinion of the first editor of the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal*, and of later scholarship, it is Van Iperen's appeal which marks the beginning of the movement towards a comprehensive, learned monolingual dictionary of Dutch.[16]

He began his appeal by looking back to a point in the *Proeve* at which he had identified the importance of good dictionaries in language study. Despite that importance, 'we have no good dictionaries': the revised edition of Kiliaan comes closest, but this is an etymological dictionary, which does not say enough about the everyday use of words. Nor, he added,

have Ten Kate and scholars like him rectified this situation.[17] Scholars had encouraged him to produce such a dictionary, following in the footsteps of Richelet's French dictionary – 'but this was not work for me'.[18] Nor was it work which anyone else was willing to undertake, hence Van Iperen's call for volunteers. The dictionary he imagined would be comprehensive, not merely literary, and above all, it was to be a descriptive (*omschryvend*) dictionary, founded on authentic usage.[19] In the following month's issue of the *Bydragen*, he gave two specimen entries, for *aard* 'kind, nature' and *aerde* (modern Dutch *aarde*) 'earth'. In each, a discursive paragraph handles the sense and form of the headword, and is followed by a series of subentries for compounds and derivatives. So, for instance, *aerde* is followed by forms like *boom-aerde* 'rotten leaves and humus gathered from hollow willow trees and used by gardeners to lighten a clay soil' and *aanaerden* 'earth up, cover the stem of a plant with earth'; in both of these cases, the non-literary and indeed technical register is noteworthy, and in the latter, it is flagged by the label 'Werkw[oord]' and the comment 'A word in use by husbandmen'.[20] Absent from these specimen entries were illustrative quotations, and this is understandable: neither word would have been very easy to track down in printed sources. In November's issue of the *Bydragen*, however, a Leiden student called Herman Tollius, who would soon become a youthful professor of history, eloquence, and Greek at the University of Harderwijk (and would give some of the first university lectures on the subject of the Dutch language), published a follow-up article agreeing that the absence of a good Dutch dictionary was inconvenient and indeed harmful, and sketching a possible treatment of function words; this was illustrated with quotations from various texts, notably a Dutch Bible of 1477.[21] This was not entirely a novelty in Dutch lexicography: as early as 1700, David van Hoogstraten's *Aenmerkingen over de geslachten der zelfstandige naemwoorden*, a list of Dutch nouns and their genders, illustrated every entry with an example of the headword being used with the correct gender in a canonical text, and this list was much reprinted. However, Tollius was extending the use of illustrative quotations to a projected work on a scale much more ample than that of these *Aenmerkingen*.

The *Bydragen* ceased publication with the issue of December 1762, and that might have been the end of Van Iperen's project. But a Leiden merchant, Frans van Lelyveld, who had, like Van Iperen, been a non-student member of the 'Linguaque animoque fideles', was able to bring its members, together with those of similar societies at Utrecht and Hoorn, together as the Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde ('Society for Netherlands

Literature'), founded in 1766.[22] This body is still in existence today, and its *Digitale bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse letteren* (*DBNL*) was very helpful in the writing of these pages. It was self-consciously a national academy, compared by its president in 1773 to those of Italy, France, England (i.e. the Royal Society: the list is not specifically one of language academies), Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and Russia.[23] As early as 1769, the proceedings of the Maatschappij reported a letter from the preacher and poet Ahasuerus van den Berg, in which Van Iperen's contribution to the *Bydragen* was cited and his project was invoked again. This, Van den Berg observed, would not be the work of a single day, or of a single man. It would call for reading, but also for the study of the vocabulary of craftsmen, of the regions of Dutch-speaking northern Europe, of town and country alike – even the language of the street must be examined.[24] This was of a piece with the descriptive and inclusive quality of Van Iperen's projected dictionary: Van den Berg used the word 'descriptive' (*omschryvend*) just as Van Iperen had done. His recognition that a comprehensive dictionary was not a one-man job, and his call to the members of a society more permanent than an undergraduate fellowship to take it up as a group, led to the beginning of years of lexicographical work by members of the Maatschappij.

In 1773, the presidential address to the Maatschappij by the jurist and historian Daniël van Alphen reminded its members that they should not yield to any of the other European academies in zeal for learning, and presented them with a first account of a new collaborative project: the making of a general, descriptive dictionary of the Dutch language.[25] A number of members of the Maatschappij, for instance Van Lelyveld, Tollius, and of course Van den Berg, had already set to work on this undertaking. It was evidently meant to be sensitive to regional usage: the proceedings of the Maatschappij record the offer of the historian and theologian Jona Willem te Water to read texts from Brabant and Flanders for the dictionary.[26] It would also cover archaic material: the same page of the proceedings records the offer of the lawyer and historian Diderik Frederik Johan van Halsema to read the Ommelander Landrecht of 1601, a legal code from the hinterland of Groningen. (A manuscript wordlist by Van Halsema of regionalisms from Groningen, dated 1776, is extant, and may be identical with, or based on, his gleanings from the Landrecht.)[27] But by no means would it be confined to the regional and archaic: the dictionary as Van Alphen imagined it would attend both to the usage of the best authors and to that of everyday speech.[28]

In his address of 1774, Van Alphen identified the dictionary project as the principal business of the Maatschappij.[29] He gave a powerful picture

of the place of the projected dictionary in the life of the nation, balancing this with the inevitable laboriousness of its making:

> Such a dictionary … will be of inestimable use to our common fatherland … the production of a dictionary that is complete in all respects, the worth of which will never be appreciated highly enough, is the most difficult, yet simultaneously the most admirable task of the human mind … In the meanwhile, our compatriots are sorely in need of such a dictionary; and it will be a treasure to all of us, the value of which we cannot realise enough now, but will get to know when once we have the incredible joy of owning it.[30]

These words strongly anticipate the terms in which great national dictionaries such as the *Oxford English Dictionary* would be appreciated in later centuries, and it is significant that they were quoted by Matthias de Vries, the first editor of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal*, in his introduction to that dictionary.[31] Likewise, Van Alphen's sense of the place of language in the life of a nation – he quoted Johann David Michaelis as saying that 'the language is a collection of the wisdom and genius of a whole people' – looks forward to the thinkers who learned from Michaelis, notably Johann Gottfried von Herder, and to the Romantic and nineteenth-century views of national languages which spring from them.[32] (The statement quoted by Van Alphen must be distinguished both from the topos of languages as the pedigrees of nations and from that of language as one of the glories of a nation: what matters in it is the notion that the 'whole people', peasantry and all, contribute 'wisdom and genius' to a language.) However, Van Alphen also looked back to the work of the Accademia della Crusca, the Académie française, and even the less productive Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft, comparing the work of the Maatschappij explicitly to that of 'other famous academies or societies of learned men founded in earlier times in Italy, France, and Germany towards the perfection of the languages of their countries'.[33]

Work on the Maatschappij's projected dictionary continued for a quarter of a century.[34] De Vries describes how contributors to the project 'made extracts from various writers, searched old records, law codes, charters, bylaws, etc., brought together regional and local words, folk sayings and technical terminology, and had lists printed to determine the spelling, conjugation, etc. of the words.'[35] A series of committees were formed to oversee the work. But, to quote De Vries again, 'From year to year, the iron grew colder.'[36] The project survived into the early 1790s, and then lapsed.[37] One reason for this may have been the decentralization of the Maatschappij: its members were spread across the Netherlands, and since decision-making was done by consensus, it tended to be a slow process – we have

seen a similar problem in the case of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft in Chapter 5 above.[38] If a single director had given the project focus and energy, more might have been achieved.

The project to make a great national dictionary of Dutch was revived in the middle of the next century and resulted in the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal*. But before the eighteenth century was over, the Maatschappij's dictionary project did have a successor. This was the *Nederduitsch taalkundig woordenboek* of the clergyman Petrus (formerly Pieter) Weiland, announced to the Maatschappij in 1796, and published in eleven handy octavo volumes – not in folio like the Tuscan, French, and Spanish academy dictionaries – from 1799 to 1811. The pace of publication, almost a volume a year, is striking, and does great credit to Weiland and his two assistants, Jan van Convent and Gerbrandt Bruining.[39] Weiland's foreword to the first volume began with some remarks on Dutch spelling, which was at the time perceived to be in need of reform.[40] But the list of works which he identified as having been designed to regulate variations in spelling includes Ten Kate's *Aenleidning*, and by the second page of his foreword, the Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde was identified as having been founded 'to achieve this salutary purpose': spelling was, in his mind, to some extent a proxy for the whole project of the regulation and cultivation of the Dutch language.[41]

Weiland's was indeed more than a spelling dictionary. We saw in Chapter 2 above that a representative entry for a word around the mid-point of the alphabet in Kiliaan's *Etymologicum* of 1599 was '*Lende*. Lumbus. *ger, lende: ang. loyne*'. The corresponding entry in the *Nederduitsch taalkundig woordenboek* is more than a page long. It defines the word, and remarks that it is most often used in the plural (in English likewise: one girds one's loins, not one's loin). There are illustrative quotations from Golden Age authors such as Pieter Corneliszoon Hooft, Joost van den Vondel, and Jeremias de Decker, and even from a Dutch translation of the *Legenda aurea*; a couple of these come from an expanded edition of Van Hoogstraten's *Aenmerkingen*.[42] An etymological paragraph follows, citing parallel forms in a number of European languages; there are more forms, but they are less clearly organized than in the treatment of German *lenden* by Johann Georg Wachter seventy years earlier, on which Weiland probably draws.[43] Weiland's treatment of his material was not consistent across the alphabet – there were fewer illustrative quotations in the first of his eleven volumes than at the mid-point of his alphabetical sequence – but it certainly went further than anything that had been done for Dutch before. His dictionary was re-edited in the nineteenth century.[44]

When Matthias de Vries came to discuss the *Nederduitsch taalkundig woordenboek* in the introduction to the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal* in 1882, he gave it due praise but remarked on shortcomings such as its obsolete coverage of Dutch literature, its dated etymologies, and its dependence on Adelung's *Grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der hochdeutschen Mundart*.[45] This last point had indeed been clearly flagged by Weiland himself.[46] Nor was his use of Adelung surprising or inappropriate. The *Grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch* had been noted with interest by students of the Dutch language as soon as it was published, but it had a special relevance for Weiland: both lexicographers had produced their own multi-volume dictionaries after the breakdown of a series of attempts to make an academy dictionary.[47] Weiland therefore follows Johnson and Adelung as the third individual maker of a publishable dictionary, in the academy tradition, of a Germanic language.

Peter Simon Pallas' *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa* (1786–1789) and the Russian Academy's *Slovar' Akademii Rossijskoj* (1789–1794)

The early history of east Slavonic lexicography begins with a medieval wordlist tradition from the thirteenth century onwards, some of the later sixteenth-century representatives of which register up to five thousand words.[48] The first printed dictionary of an east Slavonic vernacular (some sources call it Russian, and some Ruthenian) was the *Leksis siréč´ rečenija* of Lavrentij Zizanij, published at Vilnius in 1596 and defining only 1,061 hard words (some Church Slavonic and some borrowed words); it was followed by the *Leksikon Slaveno-rosskij* of Pamva Berynda, published at Kiev in 1627, which glossed 4,980 words of Church Slavonic in a first section, and 2,002 foreign words in a second.[49] These dictionaries are indexes not only of the development of a Russian reading public but also of the increasing remoteness of Church Slavonic from everyday language varieties.[50] They were followed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by a Church Slavonic–Greek–Latin dictionary of 1704, and by quite a lively bilingual dictionary tradition.[51]

In 1724, Peter the Great, inspired by the counsel of Leibniz, and perhaps remembering a tour of the Académie française which he had made in 1717 or reflecting on his contacts with members of the Royal Society, founded the Saint Petersburg Academy of Sciences.[52] In 1733, the newly appointed acting secretary of the academy, the poet Vasilii Trediakovsky, agreed to take part in the compilation of a dictionary of Russian. This was

doubtless his own idea: he had been powerfully influenced by his observations of the high culture of Paris, including the Académie française, during a two-year sojourn there in the late 1720s.[53] Nothing appears to have come of this project. However, the most substantial dictionary of Russian of the first half of the eighteenth century was undertaken in, and for the use of, the Imperial Academy of Arts and Sciences, as the Saint Petersburg Academy had become. This dictionary was the work of Ivan Taubert, sub-librarian and keeper of the Cabinet of Curiosities in the academy, and of three assistants. It was in existence by the end of the 1740s, and ran to seventeen manuscript volumes. It belonged to the bilingual tradition in so far as its Russian headwords were followed by Latin, French, and German equivalents.[54] After this unpublished work, two major learned dictionaries were published in Russia, one by an individual working under imperial protection and one by an academy.

The first of these could, like so many eighteenth-century dictionary projects, trace one line of its intellectual ancestry back to Leibniz, who had recommended a programme of collection of linguistic material from the peoples of the Russian empire to the vice-chancellor of the empire as early as 1716.[55] This dictionary was the *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa* compiled by the zoologist and palaeontologist Peter Simon Pallas.[56] The first volume was published in 1787 and the second in 1789.[57] The dictionary collected equivalents of the same 285-word Russian vocabulary in as many as possible of a set of 200 different European and Asian languages, presenting the results in two spaciously laid-out folio volumes.[58] The type, after a short introduction in Latin, was Cyrillic, although Pallas hoped that the work would also be used by scholars unfamiliar with that alphabet, providing a table of the Roman equivalents of the Cyrillic letters, and pointing out that anyone who knew the Greek alphabet would find them straightforward; in fact, they were an obstacle to readers accustomed to the Roman alphabet.[59] The introduction began with a statement of the vast size of the Russian empire and its linguistic diversity, and then turned to the role of the Empress Catherine II in supporting learning in Russia, in ordering Pallas to work on the dictionary, and in undertaking some of the research for it herself: 'Her Majesty having been pleased to place the task of editing this polyglot Vocabulary, the most perfect of all which have been made, upon my shoulders, I received part which had already been arranged by the hand of Her Most High Majesty with the utmost admiration, and took it as a standard for the whole work.'[60] Pallas was not flattering the empress: she really had done a lot of work on the dictionary, which she had taken up after a period reading Antoine Court

de Gébelin's *Monde primitif*, which claimed a common origin for all languages, and which referred in passing to a projected 'dictionnaire primitif' which would set out the roots in an ancient proto-language from which all the words in all the extant languages of the world are descended.[61] (Leibniz had likewise imagined a universal dictionary which would gather comparative lexical data, though this would not have entailed the reconstruction of roots.)[62] Catherine's own account in a letter of 1785 suggests that she drafted the basic vocabulary, arranged for its translation into more than 200 languages, and began collating the results, before handing over to Pallas; in an undated letter, she refers to what must be this dictionary as hers, 'mon grand dictionnaire'.[63] Her papers from the project survive, as 54 sheets, each of which records translations of a given word into some or all of 165 different languages.[64] The German bookseller Friedrich Nicolai compiled a 'Tableau general de toutes les langues du monde avec un catalogue préliminaire des principaux dictionnaires dans toutes les langues' in 1785 as a resource for the project, now preserved at Saint Petersburg as a manuscript of 346 pages.[65] Once Pallas took over, he added further material from different sources, including some which he had gathered in the course of scientific expeditions across the Russian empire, and collated all the raw materials of the dictionary into a single whole.[66] Catherine continued to use her rank to solicit translations into recherché languages: a letter of 4 November 1785 from a Spanish diplomat in Saint Petersburg asks the Prime Minister of Spain for help obtaining wordlists from the Americas and for material from Japan and the Philippines, and one of February 1786 from the marquis de Lafayette in Paris to George Washington in America asks for translations 'into the several idioms of the Nations on the Banks of the Oyho [i.e. the Ohio River]', adding that Lafayette had 'been so particularly applied to, that I cannot dispense with paying great attention to the business'.[67] (Gébelin had likewise used his contacts in the hunt for dictionaries of American languages a few years earlier.)[68]

The *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa* was not the work of an academy as such, but it was a project very close to the heart of the empress. Just as she was personally responsible for gathering materials for it, so she sent copies abroad herself: the English philologist William Marsden owed his copy 'to the gracious condescension of her Imperial Majesty'.[69] In fact, most of the print run of 500 copies was dispersed in this way, with the result that philologists who were not on the empress' gift list found it difficult to obtain copies.[70] Catherine commissioned a second edition, to include material which had not been available for the making of the first, including additions from American and African

languages, among them one translation of the basic wordlist which she executed herself – into Carib, probably from Raymond Breton's French–Carib dictionary of 1666.[71] The exoticism of Carib must have appealed to her, as the handiness of Breton's dictionary may have done. The editor of the new edition of the dictionary jumbled all of its contents into a single alphabetical order; this did not please Catherine, and the alphabetized dictionary was apparently suppressed.[72] In fact, neither edition was altogether successful: the material gathered by Catherine, Pallas, and their correspondents was of very uneven quality, and Pallas, who was a widely learned man but not a linguist, did not handle it expertly, as foreign reviewers were aware.[73]

One Russian contemporary remarked bitterly on Catherine's interest in the 'so-called dictionary' compiled by Pallas: 'a sort of glossary in ninety to a hundred languages, some of which were represented by no more than a score of words such as Earth, Sky, Water, Father, Mother etc. … useless and imperfect as this peculiar work was, it was pronounced to be an admirable dictionary'.[74] These were the words of the remarkable Princess Ekaterina Dashkova. In 1782, Catherine II had appointed Dashkova to the directorship of the Imperial Academy of Arts and Sciences.[75] In the following year, 1783, the two women were walking together in the empress' garden at Tsarskoe Selo:

> we spoke of the richness and beauty of the Russian language. I expressed my surprise to Her Majesty that, though herself a writer and fond of our language [this did not go without saying, for Catherine was a native speaker of German], she should not yet have established a Russian Academy. We needed, I said, rules of grammar and a good dictionary to do away with the absurdity of using foreign words and terms while having our own which were far more vivid.[76]

Catherine immediately commanded the princess to draw up a plan for such an academy. After remarking that an account of the organization of the Académie française and the Académie Royale des Sciences et Belles Lettres of Berlin would show the empress what she needed to know, Dashkova drew up the plan as she had been told to; Catherine promptly signed the academy into being as the Imperial Russian Academy and made Dashkova its president.[77] Whereas Sophia Charlotte of Hannover had been a major influence *behind* the foundation of the Societät der Wissenschaften in Berlin, Catherine was fully and personally responsible for the founding of this academy.

At the first meeting of the Imperial Russian Academy, on 21 October 1783, Dashkova called for a fourfold plan of publication like that in the

statutes of the Académie française, to comprise a grammar, a rhetoric, a poetics, and a dictionary for the Russian language. The dictionary was to be undertaken first. Work began at once: rules for its compilation were drawn up, wordlists were made and discussed, and teams responsible for definition, grammatical material, and revision were established. Forty-seven of the sixty academicians worked on the project, a fair proportion.[78] It was in 1784 that Catherine ordered the compilation of Pallas' polyglot dictionary, and this explains some of Dashkova's animus against this work and its editor: it was a rival to her own academy's dictionary project (she appears not to have realized the full extent of the empress' personal involvement with it).

However, the academy dictionary, the *Slovar' Akademii Rossijskoi*, did not suffer unduly from the division of Catherine's attention. It was in fact undertaken with remarkable speed, being published in six volumes from 1789 to 1794. It registered 43,257 words.[79] Some of the definitions – particularly for words having to do with morality, politics, and government – were by Dashkova herself, so that she was not only the first woman to direct a dictionary project but, together with her imperial patron, one of the first women lexicographers on record.[80] (There are a few earlier examples: for instance, the lost Huron dictionary of Marie de l'Incarnation was compiled a hundred years earlier, and Johnson's friend Anna Williams was planning a dictionary of chemistry in 1754.)[81] Illustrative material was taken from a wide range of written texts, and supplemented with examples made up by the compilers.[82] This produced an interesting hybrid between the modus operandi of the *Vocabolario della Crusca* and the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana* on the one hand, and that of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* on the other. Technical language which had not entered common usage was generally excluded, and of the technical terms which were registered, those of Russian origin were, in a puristic spirit, preferred to loanwords.[83] The macrostructure of the dictionary was semi-etymological, following the first edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* rather than those of 1718 onwards.[84] This was done in the face of opposition from persons who felt that this would make the new dictionary difficult to use (there was in fact an alphabetical index). In her memoirs, Dashkova remembered that 'Even her Majesty asked me several times why we had not listed the words in alphabetical order', to which she replied that this could be done in a second edition, but that a pioneering dictionary 'had to be etymological in order to show, and even find, the roots of words'.[85] Perhaps Catherine remembered Court de Gébelin's disapproval of semi-etymological dictionaries.[86]

The *Slovar' Akademii Rossijskoi* was meant to be normative, and was in this respect inspired by the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*; it was, in fact, further detached from the contemporary language than most academy dictionaries, registering an elevated and archaic literary variety of Russian.[87] This was doubtless partly a response to the heavy borrowings from western European languages which Dashkova had observed and stigmatized in her initial conversation with the empress.[88] In the summary of Tomasz Kamusella, the grammarian Mikhail Vasilevich Lomonosov had distinguished three registers, or 'styles', of Russian in the mid eighteenth century: 'The "high style" was characterized by the dominance of Church Slavonic words, the "middle style" was the vernacular usage with an admixture of Church Slavonicisms, while the "low style" meant the vernacular … The six-volume *Slovar' Akademii Rossijskoi* … largely reflected Lomonosov's high style with a few concessions to the middle style.'[89] B. O. Unbegaun adds in his *Bibliographical Guide to the Russian Language* that 'The dictionary sets out to record the entire Russian vocabulary, that is to say: literary Russian in the strict sense of the term, Church Slavonic, dialect Russian, and Old Russian. Lomonosov is its main source for literary Russian, and the Bible for Church Slavonic, great pains being taken to keep these two elements separate.'[90] The dictionary was not merely conservative. Although, as had been true of the Accademia della Crusca and the Académie française, the sixty members of the Imperial Russian Academy were not obviously qualified by philological expertise to make a dictionary, a number of them were natural scientists, and some were men of encyclopedic learning. They introduced new terminology into the dictionary, and helped to enrich it – in line with an earlier suggestion of Lomonosov's – with some useful dialect words.[91] Their readiness to do this recalls the interest in dialect expressed in the Royal Society of London a century before.

Overall, the *Slovar' Akademii Rossijskoi* was a great achievement. It was undertaken very rapidly, even more so than the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, and even though its makers did not have a significant tradition of earlier dictionaries on which to rely: they must have used Taubert's manuscript dictionary, but there had been no Russian Pergamino or Richelet or Covarrubias before them. The historian Nikolay Karamzin claimed in 1818 that it 'would bear comparison with the celebrated works of the academies of Florence and of Paris', and this does not seem far-fetched.[92]

The great importance of French as a prestige language variety in Russia led to the translation of the fourth edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* to make a French–Russian dictionary, the *Dictionnaire complet*

françois et russe. This project appears to have had a slightly shaky publication history: the letter A appeared by itself in 1773, but then the whole dictionary was published in 1786 with a foreword remarking on the delay, which had been occasioned not only by 'the nature of compositions of this sort' but also by 'certain disagreeable occurrences', and thanking the Empress Catherine for her support.[93] Its undertakers promised a Russian–French dictionary and German–Russian and Russian–German ones, to be adapted from the dictionary of J. C. Adelung.[94] These did not, as far as I know, appear. However, the *Slovar' Akademii Rossijskoj* was translated to make a Russian–French dictionary, published in three volumes from 1799 to 1802.[95]

The Academia Real das Ciências de Lisboa and the *Diccionario da lingua portugueza* (1793)

The lexicography of Portuguese had begun in the fourteenth century with a Latin–Portuguese glossary, and had continued with printed Latin–Portuguese and Portuguese–Latin dictionaries, of which the first, compiled by the teacher Jerónimo Cardoso, was published in 1551.[96] There appears to be no extant copy of the first edition of Cardoso's dictionary, but its extent was presumably similar to that of the edition of 1562, which is extant, and registers about 12,000 lemmata.[97] New editions of Cardoso continued to be published for over a century.[98]

By the early eighteenth century, the bilingual tradition founded by Cardoso had developed to the extent that the Theatine religious Rafael Bluteau, a son of French parents who had lived in Portugal for much of his life and was a member of the (non-official) Portuguese Academia dos Aplicados, produced a *Vocabulario Portuguez, e Latino* in eight volumes, published from 1712 to 1721, plus two volumes of supplement, published in 1727 and 1728.[99] The identification of Latin in the title of this dictionary should not mislead the reader: it was present as it had been in the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, as a tool for the treatment of vernacular words. The great wealth of Bluteau's dictionary was in its encyclopedic material (expressed in Portuguese); in the scope of the vocabulary registered; and in its examples from, as the title page put it, the 'melhores escritores' – this last a feature suggesting Bluteau's awareness of the academy tradition. Not only is the *Vocabulario* rich in technical terms, as is suggested by its title page, which advertises 'Vocabulario … Aulico, Anatomico, Architectonico, Bellico, Botanico', and so on, but also in regionalisms from the Portuguese empire, so that for instance the next word in the

list on the title page is 'Brasilico', and vocabulary from Angola and India is also registered. This dictionary had a European reputation for the rest of the century: the speech of 1794 in which, as we have seen in previous chapters, Charles Pougens compared the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* unfavourably to its European equivalents remarked that 'the Portuguese, who scarcely have a literature, nevertheless have a dictionary in ten volumes', and this must have been Bluteau's.[100]

The dedicatee of Bluteau's dictionary, King João V, founded an Academia Real da História Portuguesa in 1720, but this was, as its title suggests, not a language academy: its mandate was the writing of Portuguese history.[101] After the lapse of this academy in the middle of the century, a second official academy was founded in 1779, the Academia Real das Ciências de Lisboa. At its first public session, in 1780, 'a plan for a dictionary of the Portuguese language shared the stage with a paper on the movement of light through celestial space'. A first volume of the *Diccionario da lingoa portugueza* which was being planned in 1780 appeared in 1793.[102] The main hand in its preparation was that of the royal professor of rhetoric and poetry, Pedro José da Fonseca, who had produced a Portuguese–Latin dictionary in 1771.[103]

The immediate sense which the printed dictionary gives is one of grandeur. It presented an introduction, a plan for the dictionary, a list of extracts from authors who had written on the Portuguese language, and – belying the slur of Pougens – a splendid bio-bibliographical list of authorities, perhaps the most elaborate which has ever been prefixed to a major dictionary, in a total of more than two hundred tall folio pages of preliminaries. (The close connection between national bibliography and lexicography evident here recalls the extensive *index fontium* of the third edition of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, and can also be seen in the work of Samuel Gottlieb Linde, who compiled his six-volume Polish dictionary – in which over 760 sources of quotations were listed – simultaneously with a *Bibliotheca polona*, a national bibliography towards which he made twenty-two volumes of notes.)[104] It then proceeded to cover the range *A–azurrar* in more than five hundred further pages. An important point of reference for its makers was evidently the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, which is mentioned in the prelims before the *Vocabolario della Crusca* and the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. The Spanish dictionary is brought into a four-way comparison: just as Spanish had previously had the dictionary of Covarrubias and Portuguese had had that of Bluteau, so the decision of the Real Academia Española earlier in the eighteenth century to construct a new dictionary rather than revising that of Covarrubias

is to be paralleled by the making of a new Portuguese dictionary rather than the revision of that of Bluteau.[105]

The tenor of the *Diccionario da lingoa portugueza* was normative and puristic: the first principle of its plan was to give an account of 'those words which are purely Portuguese'.[106] Although its plan was basically synchronic, it had a retrospective flavour just as the *Vocabolario della Crusca* had done, for the authorities cited – about 150 authors and 500 works in all – were confined to the period from the middle of the fourteenth century to the end of the seventeenth, with a preference for those of the 'the most elegant age of the [era of] purity of our language', from 1540 to 1626.[107] Obsolete words from those authors were to be registered. So were words formed from proper nouns: *Africano* is to be found here, though even the capacious *Oxford English Dictionary* would exclude the English word *African* a century later.[108] Every word was treated with exceptional thoroughness: this was an ambitious dictionary, which, as one Portuguese scholar observed, could compete with the most elaborate dictionaries of other European languages.[109] It sought to give a full account of the senses of each word, in a logically ordered development, and of its morphological and syntactic behaviour, providing quotations from authorities, keyed to the editions identified in the bibliography. It was notably thorough in its treatment of collocations. So, epithets, i.e. adjectives which regularly collocated with a given noun, were provided generously, with precise references to their use in the authorities (but without quotations): *abelha*, the bee, might be *artificiosa*, a cunning builder – on the authority of João Franco Barreto's *Flos sanctorum* (cited by part, page, and column) – or it might be *astuta*, *cuidadosa*, *diligente*, *doce*, *engenhosa*, *industriosa*, *melífica*, *mimosa*, *proveitosa*, *prudente*, *pura*, *sábia*, or *solícita* (clever, meticulous, diligent, sweet, ingenious, industrious, honey-making, delicate, profitable, prudent, pure, wise, or careful). The entry for the word *affeição* 'affection' gave eighty-eight epithets and a further thirty-five verbs which collocated with it.[110] Encyclopedic information was provided generously, as it had been by Bluteau: the account of the bee, for instance, runs to the greater part of two columns. Proverbs were not overlooked: there are fourteen in which the bee is mentioned. Greatly interesting and impressive as the *Diccionario da lingoa portugueza* was, its scale was such that the Academia Real was unable to continue work on it after the first volume.

Instead, a dictionary claiming explicitly to be derived from Bluteau's became the standard dictionary of Portuguese: this was the *Diccionario da lingua portugueza* of the Brazilian Antonio de Moraes Silva (or Morais

Silva), published in 1789 with the claim on its title page that it was 'composto pelo Padre D. Rafael Bluteau' and only 'reformado e accrescentado' by Moraes Silva. The two volumes of this dictionary did indeed register words which were not in Bluteau's – there are 22,000 new entries – but this was achieved by the abridgement of Bluteau's expansive work: the Latin material was dropped, and the entries were significantly condensed (the preface of the academy dictionary would likewise criticize Bluteau for the 'redundancia da sua prolixa erudição').[111] Moraes Silva's reworking of Bluteau's dictionary, therefore, surpassed that of the Academia Real das Ciências on the grounds of concision and of comprehensiveness. A second edition, of 1813, appeared under the name of Moraes Silva alone, and further editions appeared in the course of the century: it is through this work that Bluteau's dictionary became 'the direct ancestor of all modern Portuguese dictionaries'.[112]

The Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab and the *Dansk ordbog* (1793–1905)

As we have seen, the first dictionary project on the scale of an academy dictionary to be undertaken in Denmark, that of Matthias Moth, was not sponsored by an academy. However, Moth was not the only learned lexicographer working in Denmark in the 1690s, and a contemporary of his began a dictionary project which, although less ambitious than Moth's, was, after long years and several transformations, to become a Danish academy dictionary. This was the court archivist Frederik Rostgaard, a learned man, and a great book collector: his library of more than seven thousand printed books and a thousand manuscripts was advertised for sale by auction in 1726. His specific interest in academies and their dictionaries is marked by his ownership of the *Doutes sur la langue françoise proposez a Messieurs de l'Academie françoise* of 1674 and the *Apotheose du Dictionnaire de l'Academie* of 1696.[113] He had a grounding in Germanic philology, and had made volumes of transcriptions from the manuscripts of Franciscus Junius when he was in Oxford in 1693 and 1694.[114] In the same period, he began work on a Danish–Latin dictionary; this soon led to correspondence with Syv, and to an experimental reprinting of four pages of material from Syv's proof at the Sheldonian Theatre in Oxford, using the types bequeathed to the university by Franciscus Junius.[115] Rostgaard's project, continued for many years with the help of amanuenses, produced a manuscript dictionary with Latin, and sometimes also French, translation equivalents in twenty spaciously laid-out volumes.[116] It was for his

own dictionary that, as we saw in Chapter 5, Rostgaard acquired Peder Syv's dictionary materials.

In 1737, Rostgaard was sixty-six years old, and could see that the dictionary was by no means finished: he was rather good at starting projects and not finishing them.[117] He engaged a young and penniless amateur historian, Jacob Langebek, to work on it, and two years later, he persuaded the king, Kristian VI, to pay for the printing of the dictionary. In 1740, Langebek drafted a plan for the dictionary. This document, almost contemporary with Johnson's *Plan*, was markedly puristic. The dictionary was to include good, pure Danish words which were in general use, providing equivalents for them in Latin, German, and French: these three foreign-language equivalents have their parallels in the almost exactly contemporary work of Johann Leonhard Frisch (see Chapter 7). It was, on the other hand, to exclude unnaturalized foreign words and 'all coarse, rude, and lecherous words and ways of speaking', the last on the grounds that 'those who do not like them do not need to know them; and those who wish to know them may surely learn them elsewhere'. These strongly exclusionary criteria probably represent a confluence of the exclusionary principles of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* and those of contemporary Danish linguistic purism. Langebek's plan was accepted, and in October 1741, he signed a contract by which he committed himself to deliver a regular tranche of edited material every week. The idea was clearly that his work would be a fairly mechanical redaction of Rostgaard's materials, but as Langebek found out, these were further than had been supposed from completion. After three years he wrote to the patron of learning, Count Johan Ludvig Holstein, that 'it is impossible for me and for anyone else in two or three years to complete a work that is so great and impressive and a labour that is so tedious, unless I may be so remunerated that I can leave everything else out of my hands'. As it was, his emoluments for the dictionary work were clearly so meagre that he had to supplement them by taking other paid work, which diverted him from lexicography.

By the time of Rostgaard's death in April 1745, Langebek had prepared the dictionary up to the letter K, although none of his finished work had been sent to the press. He was, by this time, finding himself as a scholar – he was thirty-five, and had, for instance, just founded his own learned society – and he was disinclined to continue with the poorly paid hackwork of bringing someone else's dictionary materials into publishable form. There was a brief flurry of activity in the upper circles of learned Copenhagen, and the academic grandee Hans Gram, who regarded Langebek as a protegé, wrote to Holstein that 'one poor student has achieved more for

our Danish language than a whole society of scholars in France with the Dictionnaire de l'Académie and in Florence with the Dictionario della Crusca; for in Germany nothing of this kind has been accomplished either by a society or by individual scholars'. Gram appears, as Johnson may have been, to have been unaware of the achievement of the Real Academia Española. Saying that Langebek's achievement was greater than those of any of the academies suggests rather a crude bibliometric assessment: he had processed ten volumes of manuscript dictionary materials, which Gram must have regarded as a more ample achievement than the six printed volumes of the fourth edition of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*. In 1748, Gram died and Langebek succeeded him as royal archivist, and began to devote himself to the editing of historical documents, which was to be his life's work. A letter of 7 March 1755 from Frederik V, the king to whom Moth's dictionary project archive was eventually bequeathed, told Langebek that 'in order to bring this lexicon to completion it is Our Most Gracious Will that you abandon the Diplomatic work [i.e. the editing of documents] and once again take charge of the lexicon, since We shall be Most Graciously pleased if the printing of it can begin before this present year is out.' Whether by coincidence or not, this was written just two weeks after the imminent publication of Johnson's *Dictionary* was advertised.[118] Langebek did not abandon his documents, and the dictionary project lapsed for twenty years.

Hans Gram had been instrumental in the founding in 1742 of Denmark's own royal academy, the Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab (the official English form of its name is now 'Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters').[119] The scope of its members' interests was wide: the first volume of a collection of academy papers published in 1745 includes contributions on the aurora borealis and on the history of the use of gunpowder, as well as on the variety of Danish spoken in the Duchy of Schleswig.[120] The author of this last paper argued, as a patriotic Dane would, that despite any appearances to the contrary, the 'most ancient, most authentic, and most familiar' language of Schleswig was most emphatically not German (which was spoken there: the situation was complicated), but fair-mindedly provided a wordlist of Danish regionalisms in which German borrowings occurred.[121] It was in the Videnskabernes Selskab that the dictionary project which had been dropped by Langebek was renewed.[122]

This took place in 1776, at a time when Danish national identity was being promoted by the government as a matter of policy after a serious crisis in the royal family. Langebek had just died; a six-year vacancy in the

presidency of the Selskab had been filled by the appointment of the rich and intelligent book collector Count Hielmstierne (who was, incidentally, a fellow of the Royal Society of London); and Hielmstierne saw that the time was right to reawaken the dictionary project.[123] His rhetoric as he addressed the Selskab was nationalistic and puristic: 'we have spent more time and energy learning foreign languages than on caring for and enriching our own', which would be the equal of the learned languages if it were 'cleansed of base, forced or foreign terms'.[124] Royal approbation was given to the project in April 1777.

Hielmstierne had, sensibly, called for Langebek's work to be completed and printed without any major reconceptualization of the project. Some changes were, however, called for. One was that the translation equivalents were to be abandoned. This was a royal mandate, or at least it was presented as such by the historian and Secretary of State, Ove Høegh-Guldberg: the dictionary was to be 'only in the country's own language', so that it would be 'loved alike by the educated and the uneducated'.[125] In the same spirit, foreign loanwords were to be excluded unless already widely current; technical vocabulary was likewise to be excluded. These were familiar themes in academy lexicography. Taboo words might be included if they were status-labelled. More strikingly, 'dialect words should be included if they enriched the ordinary language': this approaches Moth's principles, and echoes Adelung's willingness to accommodate regionalisms. More strikingly still, 'a number of beautiful and forceful old words that deserved to be reintroduced' to Danish should be registered, an idea which again has deep roots in Danish lexicographical tradition – it recalls Peder Syv's interest in the old words 'which could be burnished up like old bronze implements and brought into use' – and which again has a contemporary analogue, the proposal for a dictionary whose work would include the recovery of useful archaisms, made by Charles Pougens of 1794. Authorities were not to be quoted.

Hielmstierne proposed the appointment of two Norwegians as the editorial team: Ole Strøm, a secretary to the diocese of Roskilde, and Hans von Aphelen, a professor at the University of Copenhagen. Aphelen's nomination was rejected on the grounds that he was too fond of foreign words; Strøm did his best until his death in 1782, despite his unease with some of the editorial principles he was obliged to follow, and despite imperfections in his command of Danish.His assistant, the university librarian Nicolaj Elert, took over from him, and combined his editorial work with other undertakings, such as the catalogue of a major private library which had been donated to the university.

In 1793, the first volume of the *Dansk ordbog, udgiven under Videnskabernes Selskabs bestyrelse* was published, in 709 double-columned pages of large quarto, covering the range A–E in 10,350 entries.[126] Each entry gave brief grammatical information and status labelling such as 'obsolet.', and a brief etymology after the headword, then treated it in numbered senses, sometimes divided into lettered subsenses. The typography was by no means magnificent, and failed to discriminate parts of the entry as elegantly as had been done in the academy dictionaries of the Romance languages, or in Johnson's *Dictionary*. Curiously, the dictionary was published without preliminary matter of any sort: no statement of principles, no *index fontium*, not even a dedication. The contrast with the magnificent preliminaries of the exactly contemporary *Diccionario da lingoa portugueza* is very striking. The intention must have been to get the first volume into print without further delay, and to publish preliminaries separately or with a subsequent volume. But the delay had already been far too long. The century-long editorial process which the *Dansk ordbog* had undergone since Rostgaard's first work almost guaranteed that it would be, as indeed it was, outdated as soon as it was published. Despite unfavourable early reviews, Elert persevered courageously with his editorial work until, and beyond, the end of the century.

Svenska Akademien and its dictionary project

The learned lexicography of Swedish in the eighteenth century was primarily undertaken outside the academy tradition. Sweden did have learned academies, to be sure. There was an academy of antiquities, the Collegium antiquitatis, which was mentioned by Peder Syv in the same list as the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft and other language academies in 1685, but it did not have an important influence on language studies in the eighteenth century.[127] There was also an academy of the natural sciences, the Kungliga Svenska Vetenskaps-akademien, founded in 1739, whose secretary published a functional Swedish–Latin dictionary in editions of 1757 and 1773. But the towering figure in the Swedish lexicography of the period was the Uppsala professor Johan Ihre, whose *Glossarium suiogothicum* of 1769 was an etymological dictionary of modern and medieval Swedish alike, rich in material from other Germanic languages. This fine dictionary was not inspired by work in the academy dictionary tradition but by the German etymological dictionary of Johann Georg Wachter.[128] Ihre also produced a union dictionary of Swedish dialect words, the *Swenskt dialect lexikon* of 1766, and this of course was outside the academy tradition.

In 1786, a Swedish academy of letters, Svenska Akademien, was formally established by King Gustaf III. This finally realized the ambition of Queen Christina, expressed in 1652, to constitute a Swedish academy with a central interest in language.[129] The statutes of the new academy defined its most important and pressing task as being 'to work towards the purity, strength, and sublimity of the Swedish language', which was to be done by several means, including lexicography: the academy was 'to compile a Swedish Dictionary and Grammar Book, as well as such theses which can contribute to the statutes and furtherance of good taste'.[130] These statutes echoed those of the Académie française. Implicit in them was a double claim: that Swedish was indeed a language capable of strength and sublimity, and that it was in need of purification. In other words, Svenska Akademien was set up partly to provide a normative dictionary of Swedish. The need for purification, for the establishment of a norm, recurs in the inaugural speeches of early members of the academy: the philologist and translator of Racine, Johan Murberg, referred to his indignation at the language's 'bad maintenance and management in recent times'; the historian Anders af Botin compared Swedish to 'a badly cultivated field, full with overgrown weeds'; the poet Gustaf Fredrik Gyllenborg described it as being 'imperfect, neglected through self-indulgence and ignorant mismanagement'.[131] The specific faults identified in the language make familiar reading. Murberg, for instance, attacked learned neologisms 'which were seldom comprehensible', especially loanwords from French, proposing that good old Swedish should be brought to life again: in other words, that the vocabulary should be quite radically renativized.[132] The academicians began work on the dictionary for which the statutes called by taking one or more letters of the alphabet each to work on, and soon found that this method was impracticable. The project lapsed, and remained in suspended animation – 'in einer Art Dornröschenschlaf' as a recent account has charmingly put it – until the second half of the nineteenth century.[133]

The academy tradition at the end of the eighteenth century

By 1800, the strengths and limitations of the academy tradition of dictionary making were well established. Academy dictionaries were officially sponsored, collaborative, normative, and synchronic, and they were all these things both for better and for worse. Official sponsorship and collaborative compilation both gave them institutional continuity: academy dictionary projects did not depend on the health or longevity of an individual lexicographer or the stability of an unofficial academy, and they

did not need to be hurried into print to recoup the financial outlay of time and money of a private compiler or his backers. On the other hand, neither official support nor collaborative compilation fostered innovative conceptions of what a dictionary might be made to do, or individuality of style or judgement in the treatment of particular lexical items. Moreover, the unhurried pace at which an academy dictionary could be produced might lead to excessively slow publication, as in the case of the *Dansk ordbog*; or the lapse of a project, as in that of the *Diccionario da lingoa portugueza*; or both, as in the case of the fifth and last edition of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, which began to appear in 1863 and was brought to a halt in 1923 by the Minister of Public Education after reaching the letter O.[134] The academy lexicographers' mandate to produce a normative treatment of a vocabulary helped to clarify the scope and purpose of their work, but kept much of the life of the language out of the dictionary: the regional, the ephemeral, and the odd all tended to be excluded. The tradition had moved far from the gaiety and even quirkiness of the founders of the Accademia della Crusca.

CHAPTER 9

Afterword
The year 1800 as a turning point

This book has given an account of the dictionaries and dictionary projects in the academy tradition which were initiated before 1800. In roughly chronological order of their publication, these registered the vocabularies of Italian (1612), French (1694), Spanish (1726–39), English (1755), German (1774–86), Russian (1789–94), Portuguese (1793, unfinished), Danish (1793–1905), and Dutch (1799–1811), with a projected dictionary of Swedish dormant at the end of the century. These last pages will glance briefly at the subsequent development of these dictionaries and a few of the other projects which have been discussed beside them, before turning to the ways in which the last years of the eighteenth century and the first years of the nineteenth were a time of important transition for European lexicography.

Some continuing stories

With the fourth edition of the *Vocabolario della Crusca* (including two reprints with improvements in the 1740s, undertaken on the private initiatives of their editors), its eighteenth-century tradition came to an end. In 1783, the Accademia della Crusca was merged with the Accademia Fiorentina, and although it was refounded in 1811 and undertook the preparation of a fifth edition of the *Vocabolario*, this proceeded very slowly: a first volume appeared in 1863, and as we saw at the end of Chapter 8, publication ceased at the end of the letter O in 1923.[1]

After it was disbanded in 1793, the Académie française was not fully reconstituted until 1816, after the second restoration of Louis XVIII. As early as 1800, Lucien Bonaparte, who was at the time Minister of the Interior, was entertaining a plan to form a society of forty on the model of the disbanded academy, with the familiar task of undertaking a dictionary, a grammar, a rhetoric, and a poetics; and in the following year, the continuation of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* was being proposed in the

meetings of the Institut National.[2] In the end, it was the reconstituted academy which took over the revision of the dictionary. Sixth and seventh editions of the dictionary appeared in 1835 and 1879, and an eighth from 1932 to 1935; a ninth is in progress. The first volume of a so-called *Dictionnaire historique*, covering the range *a–actualité*, was published by the Académie in 1865, and the first fascicle of a second volume in 1878; a contemporary calculated that the whole would, at that rate, not be completed for 2,990 years.[3] The letter A was in fact completed in 1894, but the project was then abandoned.[4] Pougens reconceived his own historical dictionary project as two separate major projects: an etymological dictionary in six folio volumes and a *Dictionnaire grammatical raisonné* in four folio volumes. Specimens of both appeared in a volume of nearly five hundred pages, published by the Imprimerie royale, in 1819, but there was no further publication of either.[5] The material which he had hoped to present as the final volume of the major project was published in volumes of 1821 and 1825 under the title *Archéologie française; ou, Vocabulaire de mots anciens tombés en désuétude, et propres a être réstitués au langage moderne*.

A twenty-second edition of the *Diccionario de la lengua española* appeared in 2001; no other academy dictionary has gone through so many editions.[6] The rich documentation of the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana* of 1726–39, however, has never been restored.

After a number of posthumous editions, Johnson's *Dictionary* was revised in 1818 by the philologist Henry John Todd, and Todd's edition was revised in its turn by Robert Gordon Latham in an edition published between 1866 and 1870.[7] A number of eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century critics attacked Johnson's work, and some of them even proposed dictionaries of their own which would eclipse it, but none of these actually appeared.[8]

The story of the lexicography of German in the decades after 1800 is, in William Jervis Jones' formulation, that of 'the thorough-going puristic inventiveness of Joachim Heinrich Campe; and then the great historical revolution of the Grimms'.[9] Campe's *Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* was published in five volumes from 1807 to 1811, registering 141,277 'Wörter und Artikel' by the editor's own count, as opposed to Adelung's 55,181: the comparison makes it clear that Campe saw his work as a successor to Adelung's.[10] A last supplement to Adelung's dictionary was published in 1818.[11]

A second edition of the *Slovar' Akademii Rossijskoi* was published in 1806–22. The register of the first edition had, as we have seen, been archaic, and the second 'did not change much in this regard', though it was more

extensive, registering 51,388 words compared to its predecessor's 43,257, and it was in alphabetical rather than semi-etymological order.[12]

The *Diccionario da lingoa portugueza* project did not produce a second volume after its single splendid publication of the letter A in 1793; only in the twentieth century did work begin again on a publishable dictionary of Portuguese under the auspices of the Academia das Ciências de Lisboa, and this finally appeared in 2001.

The second volume of the *Dansk ordbog*, covering the range F–H, appeared in 1802, the delay being partly caused by the increasing cost of paper; the third, covering I–L, appeared in 1820, at last with an introduction which explained something of the principles and history of the project; the fourth and fifth, for the ranges M–O and P–R, appeared with encouraging promptness in 1826 and 1829; then the sixth, for the single letter S, which begins a high proportion of words in Danish as it does in English, was delayed until 1848; the seventh, for the range T–U, appeared in 1863; and the last, for the range V–Z, was delayed for half a century more, closing the project in 1905.[13] It says something for the determination of the Videnskabernes Selskab that it was still, in the twentieth century, sponsoring a project which had begun in the seventeenth and had been suffering obsolescence in the eighteenth: to map the project against the story of English lexicography, Samuel Johnson had not been born when Rostgaard began his work and had died before the first volume based on Rostgaard's work was published, and the *Oxford English Dictionary* was nearing completion by the date of the last volume. The methodology of the editors of the *Dansk ordbog* had of course changed over the years (for instance, they registered words from a wider range of Danish usage, and provided increasingly generous references to sources, including many of the nineteenth century), but the need for some consistency across the volumes of a single work naturally constrained them. An easy way to see this constraint is to note the typographical consistency across the eight volumes – it is actually rather impressive, particularly bearing in mind the changes of printers from volume to volume, but the final, twentieth-century editors of the *Ordbog* must have looked wistfully at the sophisticated *mise-en-page* of foreign dictionaries contemporary with theirs. And of course, the Danish language had been in a constant state of change: the editors of 1905 were not describing the same object as those of 1793. They ended their foreword with the reflection that it was now someone else's task to produce a new and more complete dictionary of the Danish mother tongue, in accordance with the philological demands of the present.[14]

In 1808, during his brief reign as king of Holland, Lucien Bonaparte's brother Louis founded a Koninglijk Instituut van Wetenschappen, Letterkunde, en Schoone Kunsten ('Royal Institute of Sciences, Letters, and Fine Arts'), and charged one of its divisions with the making of a Dutch dictionary.[15] This plan came to nothing after the end of Louis' reign two years later, but its proposal suggests that Louis' advisors had made it clear to him that Weiland's dictionary could not remain as the high point of Dutch lexicography. However, when the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal* was being sketched by Matthias de Vries in 1856, he recognized the *Nederduitsch taalkundig woordenboek* as one of the most important forerunners of his own project.

The kiss which would awake the dictionary project of the Swedish academy from the *Dornröschenschlaf* in which it lay at the end of the eighteenth century would be that of nineteenth-century philology; when a first volume appeared in 1898, it was under the influence of the historical dictionary projects of other European countries, to which we now turn.

A new story

The imaginary boundary between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is quite a useful one in the history of the language sciences, not excluding the history of lexicography, because it corresponds closely to the turning point in the development of a comparative philology based on grammar.

The comparison of languages was nothing new: for example, the so-called 'Scythian hypothesis' of language origins provided a model for much comparative work in the seventeenth century.[16] But a changing perspective on the origins of languages was to be seen in the work of several European writers at the end of the eighteenth century. It was most famously articulated in India in 1786 by the Anglo-Welsh jurist and orientalist Sir William Jones (who had earlier worked on a Persian–Arabic–English dictionary), whose most famous observation was that the Indian language Sanskrit showed an affinity to Greek and Latin 'both in the roots of verbs and in the forms of grammar'. The balance between continuity and change in Jones' work has been debated, but his emphasis on grammar in this passage places him on the side of change.[17] Indeed, it places him among the first of a group of scholars who were placing a newly forceful emphasis on the primacy of grammar over lexical data in the study of languages: the same point was made a year earlier in Italy by Lorenzo Hervás y Panduro and a year later in Prussia by Christian Jacob Kraus, in a review of Pallas'

Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa.[18] The words of Hervás are admirably full and precise:

> The diversity of single, dual, and plural numbers; that of the cases of nouns and of the various terminations of adjectives (as in Greek, Latin, Betoi, Kanarese, and other dialects of Hindustani); the use of preposed or postposed articles; that of auxiliary verbs, of active, passive, and negative verbs and so on; and to sum up, the different syntaxes give a foundation for the division of languages or of nations into classes.[19]

Hervás did not try to apply his theory as Jones did; nor did he think so much in terms of evolution as of taxonomy. But there is an affinity between his insight and Jones': at the end of a book full of wordlists, Hervás reflected that lexical comparison was not enough when languages were to be classified, and in his discourse of the following year, Jones made the same point.

In 1799, Sámuel Gyarmathi demonstrated the affinity of Hungarian and Finnish on grammatical, not lexical, grounds; in 1801, Joachim Severin Vater made the first recorded reference to 'Vergleichende Sprachlehre', the comparative study of languages, and in 1803, August Wilhelm Schlegel referred to 'vergleichende Grammatik'; in 1808, August Wilhelm's brother Friedrich Schlegel, acknowledging the influence of Jones, 'paved the way for a comparative linguistics based on grammatical structure rather than on lexical items or phonetic similarity' in his *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier*.[20] This development deprived lexicography of one of its eighteenth-century functions. No longer were parallel lists of words accepted as the most powerful demonstrations of the relationships and origins of languages, useful as they had sometimes been: now it was grammar which mattered.[21] This would, over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, tend to make lexicography a less central part of the language sciences than it had been in the eighteenth.

However, the development of a consensus that dictionaries are not good foundations for ambitious claims about prehistory helped their makers to focus on the treatment of historical material. It was only in the nineteenth century that dictionaries started to be made on the historical principles by which each entry is illustrated with quotations designed to tell the *whole history* of a word, from its earliest attestation in a datable text to its last attestation or to the present day. We have seen these principles developing from the vernacular philology of sixteenth-century Florence (noted in Chapter 2) onwards. In Chapter 3, we saw a document of 1690 in which Pierre Bayle imagined historical lexicography in the nineteenth-century

style; in Chapter 4, we saw both the extent to which the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* and a couple of later French dictionary projects were historical, and also the development of a historical lexicography in the writings of the medievalist Sainte-Palaye; in Chapter 7, we saw Samuel Johnson's interest in the idea of the chronological arrangement of quotations, and the further development of historical lexicographical principles in the work of J. C. Adelung in the 1770s.[22]

Historical principles had also been latent in some eighteenth-century dictionaries of Latin, where a policy of structuring entries with reference to sense-development can be seen in work undertaken by Egidio Forcellini in the 1750s and published in 1771, and a much more elaborate and precise entry structure, articulated by numbered and lettered senses, was offered by I. J. G. Scheller in dictionaries of the 1780s.[23]

In 1808, the first dictionary appeared in which the earliest known attestation of every word was quoted as a matter of policy. This was the two-volume *Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language* of the Scottish antiquary John Jamieson, who had, six years before its publication, already 'adopted the plan of giving the oldest written authority for every word' in it.[24] It was followed in 1812 by a working paper in which the German classicist Franz Passow published a formulation of historical principles in lexicography, made independently from Jamieson, and meant for application to dictionaries of classical Greek.[25] Passow proceeded to put these principles into practice in dictionaries which he edited from 1819 onwards.[26] At the heart of every entry in a dictionary on historical principles is a paragraph of quotations, often dated, which are arranged in chronological order. The first of these is the earliest instance of the word which has come to the hands of an editor, and the last is either the latest available instance of an obsolete word or an example of the recent or current usage of a word which is not obsolete. When an entry has multiple senses, these are likewise ordered chronologically, except in cases where a departure from strict chronological order is thought by an editor to bring out the sense-development of the word, as the case may be when senses develop in parallel: to return to Johnson's formulation, 'When the radical idea branches out into parallel ramifications, how can a consecutive series be formed of senses in their nature collateral?'

After Jamieson's, the first dictionary of a modern European vernacular on fundamentally historical principles was the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* of Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, undertaken in 1838, with a first fascicle in 1852. It was followed by the *New English Dictionary* of the Philological Society of London, edited by James Murray, with a first fascicle in 1884

(issued as the *Oxford English Dictionary* from 1933); by the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal*, undertaken on historical principles from 1892 onwards (earlier fascicles, from 1864 onwards, had offered a historically oriented description of contemporary Dutch); and by a number of others.[27] The academy tradition of lexicography continues today, in the work of the Académie française, the Real Academia Española, and the Academia das Ciências de Lisboa. But it is lexicography on historical principles which has produced the most learned and exciting dictionaries of the last century. Entries like those of the *Oxford English Dictionary* are rich in quoted material, and they have narrative power: even the shortest shows a word flashing briefly into existence, and the longer ones record centuries of cultural history with the utmost vividness.

However, there is a close historical bond between lexicography in the academy tradition and lexicography on historical principles. The quotations which are the core of dictionaries on historical principles first became part of vernacular lexicography in the academy tradition, and the possibility of their chronological ordering was first thought about by workers in that tradition. The typographical sophistication which is required to distinguish the parts of an entry on historical principles was developed in the academy tradition. So, indeed, was the fundamental idea of the vernacular dictionary as a grand multi-volume work: readers who bought the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* or the *New English Dictionary* fascicle by fascicle as they were released understood a convention which was developed in the release of the fascicles of the second edition of Johnson's *Dictionary* or the volumes (more than originally expected, and released more slowly than the editor would have liked) of Adelung's *Versuch*. The management of large vernacular dictionary projects with multiple collaborators was likewise worked out in the academy tradition.

For two centuries, dictionaries in the academy tradition provided the most powerful model, and the most powerful tool, for studying the vocabulary of the languages they documented. Any citizen of Europe during the period of the Enlightenment who wanted to think about a major living language of Europe was bound to turn to the extraordinary riches of the dictionaries which we have surveyed in this book.

Notes

1 Introduction

1 Leibniz, draft of a letter to Germain Brice, perhaps 21–4 March 1696, in *Sämtliche Schriften*, Vol. I.12, 488–9:

> Un ami estant dernierement chez moy, nous regardâmes ensemble le *Dictionnaire* joint à celuy de l'Academie. Nous nous étonnames, de voir l'Abada, et quelques autres animaux exotiques amplement decrits, quoyque ce soyent des choses qui n'entrent jamais dans la conversation. Si ce n'est que celuy qui les propose les explique en temps. Et de cette façon il faudroit faire entrer toutes les sciences.

2 *Ibid.*, 489: 'on serait bien aise souvent de sçavoir si un mot peut estre employé sans scrupule, ou s'il est vieux, bas, provincial'. *Canapé* is defined in the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1694) as 'Sorte de lit de repos'; Corneille's entry *Lutheriens* begins 'Heretiques qui suivent les erreurs de Martin Luther, Moine Augustin, qui en a infecté toute l'Allemagne, & qui s'estant couché aprés s'estant gorgé de vin & de viandes, fut trouvé mort dans son lit'; Corneille, *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*, s.v. *Lutheriens*.

3 Furetière, *Factum* (1684), in *Nouveau recueil des factums*, Vol. I, 4: 'Tous les Gens de Lettres sont d'accord qu'il n'y sçauroit avoir trop de Dictionnaires.'

4 Bayle, 'Preface' to Furetière, *Dictionaire universel*, Vol. I, sig. *3r: 'à peine pourroit-on compter tous les Dictionaires ou reimprimez, ou composez depuis quinze ou vingt ans'.

5 Quoted in Van Lieshout, 'Dictionnaires et diffusion du savoir', 131: 'un nombre innombrable de Dictionnaires' and 'Nous sommes dans le siècle des Dictionnaires.'

6 Frisch, *Teutsch–Lateinisches Wörter-Buch*, sig.)(4v: 'die Λεξικοφιλία, oder Liebe zum *Lexicon*-Schreiben so vieler gelehrten Leute, ja so gar die Λεξικομανία … dieses *Seculi*'.

7 Johnson, letter to Samuel Richardson, 28 March 1754, in *Letters*, Vol. I, 79.

8 For the drive to systematize knowledge, see Blair, *Too Much to Know*; for Hoffmann (briefly) and Moréri, see Van Lieshout, 'Dictionnaires et diffusion du savoir', 135–41.

9 Leibniz, letter to Daniel Georg Morhof, August(?) 1690, in *Sämtliche Schriften*, Vol. I.5, 661.

10 Dahlerup, 'Principer for ordbogsarbejde', 68: ' Principet er det, som har fået sit mest typiske udtryk i det franske akademis ordbog, nemlig: at ordbogen kun skal indeholde gode ord, det skal så at sigevære en ære for et ord at finde plads i ordbogen, ligesom det er en ære for et kunstværk at få plads i statens kunstsamlinger.'
11 Haugen, 'Introduction', 6; hence Considine, 'Matthias Moth', 263. The origins of Haugen's words go back to 1918: Jacobsen and Juul-Jensen, 'Inledning', xv: 'hvor fjernt Moth var fra det leksikografiske princip, man har kaldt akademi-princippet'.
12 Ravn, 'Christian Molbech', 239.
13 Korshin, 'Mythology of Johnson's *Dictionary*', 19.
14 Fleeman, *Bibliography*, Vol. I, 415.
15 Furetière, *Second factum* (1685), in *Nouveau recueil des factums*, Vol. II, 310; see Chapter 3 below.

2 The beginnings of the academy tradition: the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca*

1 Translations are taken, with minor adaptation, from Boccaccio, *The Decameron*, trans. Rigg; Dante, *The Divine Comedy*, trans. Longfellow; and Petrarch, *Lyric Poems*, ed. and trans. Durling.
2 Migliorini and Griffith, *Italian Language*, 215. See Richardson, *Print Culture in Renaissance Italy*, 182–8 for an overview of the story of printing and standardization in the Cinquecento, and cf. Burke, *Languages and Communities*, 106–8 for its wider context.
3 Fisher, *Emergence of Standard English*, 71–7; Burke, *Languages and Communities*, 89–110; Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 104–5.
4 Migliorini and Griffith, *Italian Language*, 197–210.
5 IJsewijn, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, Vol. I, 44; Migliorini and Griffith, *Italian Language*, 199.
6 Migliorini and Griffith, *Italian Language*, 215–25.
7 *Ibid.*, 225–8.
8 Cf. Hausmann, 'Die gesellschaftlichen Aufgaben der Lexikographie', 10.
9 Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 25–55. For his influence on the *Vocabolario*, see Parodi, *Quattro secoli di Crusca*, 29–31, esp. 29.
10 Breen, 'The *Observationes*', 50, 55.
11 *Ibid.*, *passim*; a count of 'nearly seventy' printings is reported from another source at 49, and Breen's own list of about fifty is given at 56n27.
12 These are reviewed in Tancke, *Die italienischen Wörterbücher*, 26–35; and in Migliorini and Griffith, *Italian Language*, 227.
13 One respect in which Pergamino's entry for *lento* is unrepresentative is in its very heavy use of Boccaccio. He drew on a wide variety of authors from the period 1249–1405 in the first edition of his dictionary, adding material from more recent authors in the second; see Tancke, *Die italienischen Wörterbücher*, 102–3.

14 Hausmann, 'Die gesellschaftlichen Aufgaben', 10: 'das erste auf exhaustive Erfassung des Wortschatzes angelegte alphabetische Definitionswörterbuch in Europa'.
15 Pevsner, *Academies of Art*, 7–10.
16 See Van Dixhoorn and Speakman Sutch, 'Introduction', 1–16.
17 Hankins, 'Myth of the Platonic Academy', 433–4.
18 Chambers, 'Earlier "academies" in Italy', 2.
19 *Ibid.*, 6; cf. Maylender, *Storia delle accademie d'Italia*, Vol. I, 443–8.
20 Chambers, 'Earlier "academies" in Italy', 7.
21 For Bessarion in his Byzantine context, see Runciman, *Last Byzantine Renaissance*, 80–4; cf. Yates, 'Italian academies', 8–9.
22 The status of the Aldine academy has been much discussed: see e.g. Lowry, 'Proving ground', 44–7; Davies, *Aldus Manutius*, 55–6; Chambers, 'Earlier "academies" in Italy', 12. See also Maylender, *Storia delle accademie d'Italia*, Vol. I, 125–30.
23 Pevsner, *Academies of Art*, 5.
24 Yates, 'Italian academies', 13–14; Maylender, *Storia delle accademie d'Italia*, Vol. III, 350–62.
25 The description of the ethos of the Intronati is from their 'Capitoli', written earlier than 1584, and quoted in Maylender, *Storia delle accademie d'Italia*, Vol. III, 355: 'esercizi delle lettere così volgari come greche e latine'.
26 *Ibid.*, Vol. III, 266–70; Lowry, 'Proving ground', 48–9; Chambers, 'Earlier "academies" in Italy', 9.
27 Chambers, 'Earlier "academies" in Italy', 13.
28 Yates, 'Italian academies', 11.
29 Brown, *Lionardo Salviati*, 53–9. For the Umidi, see also Maylender, *Storia delle accademie d'Italia*, Vol. V, 363–7; and for the Accademia Fiorentina, *ibid.*, Vol. III, 1–9.
30 Cochrane, 'Renaissance academies', 32: Accademia Fiorentina; 34: Leibniz's Societas.
31 For their acquaintance, see Woodhouse, 'Borghini and the foundation of the Accademia della Crusca', 167.
32 *Ibid.*, 170; for Borghini as editor, see also Richardson, *Print Culture in Renaissance Italy*, 155–66.
33 Richardson, *Print Culture in Renaissance Italy*, 161–5.
34 Borghini, *Annotazioni* (1857), 210n1 (the printed text corresponds to that of Borghini, *Annotationi* (1574), 106–7): 'Intervenne un bel caso mentre si scrivevano queste Annotazioni; che un medico avea rassettata la facciata della casa, e su fattivi certi fregi e liste di sgraffito di bianco e nero: onde, passato noi per una via, dove una vecchierella mandava a casa costui, et il mandato dicendo che non sapeva la casa: va, disse la vecchia, ch'ell'è casa *screziata*', translated and discussed in Woodhouse, 'Borghini and the foundation of the Accademia della Crusca', 170–1. The passage is in Day Eight, Story Two (Boccaccio, *Il decameron*, ed. Borghini, 405): 'la Belcolore uenne in iscretio col Sere'.

35 Woodhouse, 'Borghini and the foundation of the Accademia della Crusca', 171.
36 Brown, *Lionardo Salviati*, 24; cf. 101 for a later instance of 'that lack of a sense of proportion which characterized Salviati as an orator'.
37 *Ibid.*, 61n11 (date of admission) and 60: 'Orazione nella quale si dimostra esser la fiorentina favella e i fiorentini autori superiori a tutte le altre lingue, sì dell'antichità che moderne, e a tutti gli altri autori'.
38 *Ibid.*, 70.
39 Woodhouse, 'Borghini and the foundation of the Accademia della Crusca', 172.
40 *Ibid.*, 173; Brown, *Lionardo Salviati*, 160–76, 185–95, 238.
41 Brown, *Lionardo Salviati*, 172.
42 Salviati, *Degli avvertimenti*, Vol. I, sigs. a4r–b3v: 'Tavola degli scrittori Toscani del miglior secolo'.
43 *Ibid.*, 129–30: 'nostro uocabolario della Toscana lingua, che con l'aiuto della diuina grazia, fra breue spazio di publicare intendiamo. Nel qual uolume si son raccolti, e dichiarati tutti i vocaboli, e modi di fauellare, i quali abbiam trouati nelle buone scritture, che fatte furono innanzi all'anno del 1400.' The dictionary is also mentioned *ibid.*, 66 and 212.
44 Brown, *Lionardo Salviati*, 194, 240; for his eyesight, see 205.
45 For Coleridge's and Furnivall's contributions to the project, see Benzie, *Dr. F. J. Furnivall*, 84–113.
46 Woodhouse, 'Borghini and the foundation of the Accademia della Crusca', 167; Pevsner, *Academies of Art*, 15; Migliorini and Griffith, *Italian Language*, 228. Maylender's treatment of the Accademia della Crusca is in *Storia delle accademie d'Italia*, Vol. II, 122–46.
47 Document of 9 August 1589 in Parodi, *Quattro secoli di Crusca*, 17: '1) In quale delle tre lingue – greca, latina o toscana – si possa, scrivendo, arrivare alla sovrana eccellenza; 2) Se la lingua toscana sia capace di ricevere in sé le scienze … 11) Se una lingua vivente si possa ristrigner sotto regola'.
48 Parodi, *Atti del primo Vocabolario*, 34; *Quattro secoli di Crusca*, 22: 'Si discorse del modo del fare il vocabolario e si scompartirono le parti da leggere agli accademici, cioè una carta per settimana del Decamerone, di Dante e del Patrarca.'
49 This point is made by Parodi, *Atti del primo Vocabolario*, 34.
50 *Ibid.*, 7, 15–29.
51 *Ibid.*, 45; Parodi, *Quattro secoli di Crusca*, 25.
52 Parodi, *Atti del primo Vocabolario*, 77–293. Giraldi's report of 22 April 1592 on the range *accendere–acquistare* (*acceffare* had actually been the last word of his previous range) is at 93–108; and Filippo de' Bardi's of (late?) April, 10 June, and 6 and 20 July on *acquisto–addotrinevole* are at 108–15.
53 For induction from material on slips, see e.g. Silva, 'Time and meaning', 81.
54 Richardson, *Print Culture in Renaissance Italy*, 173–4.
55 Landau, *Dictionaries*, 353; Parodi, *Quattro secoli di Crusca*, 31–2. With Parodi's point that the Accademici were 'eruditi, senza alcuna precisa competenza

lessicografica o linguistica' (32; cf. *Atti del primo Vocabolario*, 44), cf. Landau, *Dictionaries*, 354: 'knowledge of linguistics is of no particular help in dictionary defining'.

56 Parodi, *Quattro secoli di Crusca*, 36; *Atti del primo Vocabolario*, 49, 70–2.

57 Parodi, *Quattro secoli di Crusca*, 32–4; *Atti del primo Vocabolario*, 298–301.

58 Parodi, *Atti del primo Vocabolario*, 278–95.

59 Entry count from Schweickard, 'Vocabolario', 57.

60 For etymological dictionaries in which words are ordered thematically, or in very large families, or in groups of loanwords from different donor languages, see Malkiel, *Etymological Dictionaries*, 35–41.

61 For the semi-etymological arrangement of these dictionaries, see Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 46–7 and 85.

62 Parodi, *Quattro secoli di Crusca*, 34 (*Atti del primo Vocabolario*, 299): 'L'etimologie si mettan quelle che si truovino che abbiano gentilezza e sieno a proposito.' Cf. Zgusta, *Lexicography Then and Now*, 10–11.

63 Other similar definitions (if *definition* is the right word: see Béjoint, *Lexicography of English*, 319) are given by Beltrami and Fornara, 'Italian historical dictionaries', 361; and Schweickard, 'Vocabolario', 59.

64 Beltrami and Fornara, 'Italian historical dictionaries', 360.

65 For the names of recent authors, see *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* (1612), sig. a7v.

66 Nencioni, 'The Accademia della Crusca: New perspectives', 346; cf. Schweickard, 'Vocabolario', 57–8.

67 Woodhouse, 'Borghini and the foundation of the Accademia della Crusca', 173.

68 Brown, *Lionardo Salviati*, 193 ('natural corollary'), 241.

69 Parodi, *Quattro secoli di Crusca*, 40–4.

70 Entry count from O'Connor, *History of Italian and English Bilingual Dictionaries*, 37.

71 *Ibid.*, 24–5, 42.

72 Migliorini and Griffith, *Italian Language*, 272. The relationship of Politi's dictionary to the *Vocabolario* has been dismissed as nominal – see e.g. Grazzini, *Di Crusca in Crusca*, 22, item 52 – but it is clear enough from a comparison of entries: for *lento*, for example, Politi has 'lento. tardo, agiato. l. *lentus*, *tardus*. lento, per contrario di tirato. a fuoco lento, s'intende che il fuoco non habbia molta forza'.

73 Migliorini and Griffith, *Italian Language*, 271.

74 Bayle, 'Preface' to Furetière, *Dictionaire universel*, sig. **2v (see Chapter 3 below); Johnson, 'Preface', 112 (see Chapter 7 below).

75 Migliorini and Griffith, *Italian Language*, 271–2; an entry count of 26,980 is given in Schweickard, 'Vocabolario', 58.

76 *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* (1623), sig. **1v.

77 Schweickard, 'Vocabolario', 58.

78 Overview at Beltrami and Fornara, 'Italian historical dictionaries', 361–2. The dates of 1640 and 1665 are from Parodi, *Quattro secoli di Crusca*, 57, 71.

79 Migliorini and Griffith, *Italian Language*, 270; and Schweickard, 'Vocabolario', 58. For Galileo in the *Vocabolario*, see Parodi, *Quattro secoli di Crusca*, 67.
80 Leibniz, *Collectanea etymologica*, Part I, 265 ('Unvorgreiffliche Gedancken', §18): 'viel Worte zur Hinterthur einzulassen, die man vorhero ausgeschlossen'.
81 Carlo Dati, letter to Ottavio Falconieri, January 1666, in Parodi, *Quattro seculi di Crusca*, 71.
82 For the printing of the *Origini*, see Leroy-Turcan, 'Les *Origini della lingua italiana*'.
83 Cochrane, *Tradition and Enlightenment*, 89–90; there is an interesting discussion of the *Vocabolario* in Tylus, *Reclaiming Catherine of Siena*, 1–17; for Gigli's devotion to Saint Catherine, see Parsons, *Cult of Saint Catherine*, 40–1.
84 Pietro Giannone, letter of 8 January 1731, quoted in Ricuperati, 'Linguaggio e mestiere', 20: 'fa' veramente compassione di vedere gli ingegni fiorentini, in altri tempi avvezzi a specular con tanto acume e sodezza le cose piú alte e riposte … caduti in tali puerilità e seccaggini'; translated and discussed in Cochrane, 'Renaissance academies', 21.
85 Schweickard, 'Vocabolario', 59.
86 Cochrane, *Tradition and Enlightenment*, 79–87 and 91 discusses the philological work which went into the fourth edition; for Manni's press, see *ibid.*, 82, and for the Early English Text Society, see Benzie, *Dr. F. J. Furnivall*, 117–26.
87 Beltrami and Fornara, 'Italian historical dictionaries', 363.
88 Baldinucci, *Vocabolario*, title page: 'agli illustrissimi e virtuosissimi signori Accademici della Crusca'.
89 Cochrane, *Tradition and Enlightenment*, 94n76.
90 Leibniz, letter to Claude Nicaise, 1696, in *Otium hanoueranum*, 61 (not yet edited in his *Sämtliche Schriften*): 'Peutêtre que Messieurs les Italiens suivront l'exemple de l'Academie Françoise, & joindront aussi les termes des Arts à leur Crusca.'
91 Brief discussion in Beltrami and Fornara, 'Italian historical dictionaries', 364; and Migliorini and Griffith, *Italian Language*, 311.
92 See Garofalo, 'Pivati's *Nuovo dizionario*', 197–219.
93 Darnton, *Business of Enlightenment*, 34–5, 313–18.
94 Beltrami and Fornara, 'Italian historical dictionaries', 364; Migliorini and Griffith, *Italian Language*, 312; Cochrane, *Tradition and Enlightenment*, 95.
95 Migliorini and Griffith, *Italian Language*, 270; Morhof, *Polyhistor*, Lib. I, cap. xix (143): '*Vocabularium Italicum della Crusca*, cui simile hactenus nulla vulgarium linguarum habet'.

3 The making of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*, and its seventeenth-century rivals

1 See Shaw, 'Contributions', Chapter 2 (medieval dictionaries which circulated in manuscript); and Chapters 4–6 (early printed dictionaries). There is an overview in Bray, 'La lexicographie française des origines à Littré', 1788–90.
2 Lodge, *French: From Dialect to Standard*, 126–7; Wooldridge, 'Birth of French lexicography', 178.

3 The colophon is dated 'M. D. XL. XII. CAL. MART.', i.e. 18 February 1540.
4 Estienne, *Dictionaire francoislatin*, s.vv.; see Wooldridge, 'Birth of French lexicography', 178.
5 Estienne, *Dictionaire francoislatin* (1564), title page: 'les mots Francois, auec les manieres d'vser d'iceulx', and dedicatory epistle by Jacques Dupuys, sig. *3v: 'vne vtilité grande à tous desirants entendre la proprieté de la langue Francoyse'.
6 For the origins of the *Dictionaire francoislatin*, see Wooldridge, *Débuts de la lexicographie française*, 17–27; and Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 41–5.
7 Stemma in Wooldridge, *Débuts de la lexicographie française*, 18; and discussion in Wooldridge, 'Birth of French lexicography', 179–80; for the *Grand dictionaire*, see Wooldridge, *Le Grand Dictionaire françois-latin*.
8 See esp. Wooldridge, *Débuts de la lexicographie française*, 145–9.
9 Entry count from Wooldridge, 'Birth of French lexicography', 179.
10 Lodge, *French: From Dialect to Standard*, 172–3.
11 Pellisson, *Relation contenant l'histoire de l Académe françoise*, 6–23, esp. 10: 'toute sortes de choses, d'affaires, de nouvelles, de belles lettres', and 16: 'sous vne autorité publique'; cf. T. Murray, 'Académie française', 267.
12 Pellisson, *Relation contenant l'histoire de l'Académie françoise*, 29–32; on academic names, see Cochrane, 'Renaissance academies', 35–6.
13 For *honnêteté*, see Revel, 'Uses of civility', 193–4; and Goldgar, *Impolite Learning*, 237–8. For the salon of Madame de Rambouillet, see DeJean, 'The salons', 298–301.
14 Pellisson, *Relation contenant l'histoire de l'Académie françoise*, 37: 'Qu'il sembloit ne manquer plus rien à la felicité du Royaume, que de tirer du nombre des Langues barbares, cette Langue que nous parlons, et que tous nos voisins parleroient bien-tost, si nos conquestes continuoient comme elles avoient commencé'.
15 Schama, *Patriots and Liberators*, 479.
16 Pellisson, *Relation contenant l'histoire de l'Académie françoise*, 40: 'nettoyer la Langue des ordures qu'elle avoit contractées, ou dans la bouche du peuple, ou dans la foule du Palais'; 41–2: 'Qu'vn des moyens dont les Academiciens se serviroient pour parvenir à la perfection, seroit l'examen, et la correction de leurs propres ouvrages.'
17 *Ibid.*, 53: 'que pour cét effect il falloit premierement en regler les termes et les phrases, par un ample Dictionnaire, et une Grammaire fort exacte'.
18 Lettres patentes of January 1635, in *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. IV, 21–3, esp. 22: 'pour rendre le langage françois non seulement élégant, mais capable de traitter tous les Arts, et toutes les Sciences'.
19 'Statuts et règlemens de l'Academie françoise' of early 1635, *ibid.*, Vol. IV, 23–8, no. 24: 'La principale fonction de l'Académie sera de travailler … à donner des régles certaines à nostre langue, et à la rendre pure, éloquente, et capable de traitter les Arts, et les Sciences'; no. 25: 'Les meilleurs autheurs de la langue françoise seront distribuëz aux Académoiciens, pour observer tant les dictions,

que les phrases qui peuvent servir de régles générales'; no. 26: 'Il sera composé vn Dictionnaire, vne Grammaire, vne Rhéthorique, et vne Poëtique.'

20 Pellisson, *Relation contenant l'histoire de l'Académie françoise*, 169–70.

21 See François, 'Origines italiennes', 162–5; and cf. Quemada, 'L'Académie française et ses dictionnaires', 73–4.

22 Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 14–16.

23 Pellisson, *Relation contenant l'histoire de l'Académie françoise*, 229: 'vn Dictionnaire, qui fust comme le tresor, et le magazin des termes simples, et des phrases recuës'.

24 *Ibid.*, 229–30:

> il falloit faire vn choix de tous les Autheurs morts, qui avoient écrit le plus purement en nostre Langue, et les distribuër à tous les Academiciens, afin que chacun leût attentiuement ceux que luy seroient écheus en partage, et que sur des feüilles differentes, il remarquast par ordre alphabetique, les dictions, et les phrases qu'il croiroit Françoises, cottant le passage d'où il les auroit tirées.

A partial list of suitable authors can be found *ibid.*, 237–8.

25 *Ibid.*, 231: 'lesquelles elle desaprouveroit tacitement si le Dictionnaire ne les contenoit'.

26 *Ibid.*: 'parce qu'il pourroit avoir des phrases et des mots en vsage, dont on ne trouveroit point d'exemple dans les bons Autheurs, qu'en cas que l'Academie les approuvast, on les marqueroit avec quelque notte qui témoigneroit que l'vsage les authorise'.

27 The example is from *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 165.

28 Pellisson, *Relation contenant l'histoire de l'Académie françoise*, 231–4.

29 *Ibid.*, 234–5.

30 *Ibid.*, 235: 'on exclurroit … tous les termes propres qui n'entrent point dans le commerce commun, et ne sont inventez que pour la necessité des arts, et des professions'.

31 *Ibid.*, 239: 'l'Academie commença d'apprehender la travail, et la longueur des citations, et … elle resolut … qu'on ne marqueroit point les authoritez dans le Dictionnaire: si ce n'est qu'en y travaillant on trouvast bon de citer sur les phrases qui seroient douteuses, quelque Autheur celebre, qui en auroit vsé'.

32 Cf. Quemada, 'L'Académie française et ses dictionnaires', 75.

33 Pellisson, *Relation contenant l'histoire de l'Académie françoise*, 241–3.

34 Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 16–17.

35 Pellisson, *Relation contenant l'histoire de l'Académie françoise*, 244–5: 'on dit que le Cardinal le voyant entrer dans sa chambre, s'avança avec cette majesté douce et riante, qui l'accompagnoit presque toûjours, et s'addressant à luy, *Et bien, Monsieur*, (luy dit-il) *vous n'oubliez pas du moins dans le Dictionnaire le mot de Pension*: surquoy Monsieur de Vaugelas … répondit, *Non Monseigneur, et moins encore celuy de reconnoissance*'.

36 Chapelain, letter to Jean-Louis Guez de Balzac, 26 June 1639, in Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 17: 'Nous sommes desja bien avant dans l'A.'

37 Boisrobert, verse letter to Balzac, 1646, *ibid.*, 18: 'Et le Destin m'auroit fort obligé | S'il m'avait dit: Tu vivras jusqu'au G.'

38 Cf. Landau, *Dictionaries*, 353–5.
39 D'Olivet[?], memorandum of 24 January 1727, *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire de France* (1853–4), 27: 'Ces définitions se font à la haste et sur-le-champ, quoyque ce soit la chose du monde qui demande le plus d'attention. Les phrases ou les exemples se font de même, aussi sont-ils pour la pluspart si ridicules et si impertinents que nous en avons honte, quand on les relit de sang-froid.'
40 Pellisson, *Relation contenant l'histoire de l'Académie françoise*, 246; no acute accent in original.
41 Cf. the sympathetic remarks of Quemada, 'L'Académie française et ses dictionnaires', 76.
42 Ménage, *Le Parnasse alarmé*, 14: 'Auec vostre vocabulaire | Vous n'en estes qu'à l'A. B. C. | Depuis plus d'vn lustre passé'; 14–15: 'O! nos chers Maistres du langage | Vous scavez qu'on ne fixe point | Les langues en vn mesme point: | Tel mot qui fut hier à la mode, | Qui ce iourd'huy n'est pas commode … C'est apres tout Monsieur l'usage, | Qui fait et deffait le langage.'
43 *Ibid.*, 16: 'Laissez vostre Vocabulaire | Abandonnez vostre Grammaire, | N'innouez ny ne faites rien, | En la langue, et vous ferez bien.'
44 See Leroy-Turcan, 'Gilles Ménage et l'Académie française', Section 2.
45 For the *Origines* as a hasty sketch, see Ménage, *Origines* (1650), sigs. ē2r–ē4r. An index of its early recognition is that it is cited at least 110 times in Pierre Borel's *Tresor de recherches et antiquitez gauloises et françoises* of 1655; see Amatuzzi, 'L'apport de Nicot et Ménage', 48.
46 Pellisson, *Relation contenant l'histoire de l'Académie françoise*, 250.
47 *Ibid.*, 249; *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 42n1.
48 Pellisson, *Relation contenant l'histoire de l'Académie françoise*, 251: 'Pour moi je ne defendray point l'ACADEMIE FRANÇOISE, par l'exemple vulgaire de celle *della Crusca*, qui employa prés de quarante ans à son Vocabulaire'; 262–3: 'quand ce Dictionnaire ne s'acheveroit jamais … qui peut douter que cet exercice de considerer exactement les mots en leur fource, d'en remarquer les diverses vsages, d'observer toutes les phrases qu'on en peut former, ne fust tres-propre à vn Corps, qui se propose pour but l'embellissement de la Langue …?'
49 Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 20.
50 D'Olivet, *Histoire*, 9.
51 *Ibid.*, 13–17; *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 13–16, 49, 71n1; the rooms and some of the books are identified in Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 54–5.
52 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 42: 'le Dictionnaire, si fort desiré et si longtemps attendu de toute l'Europe'.
53 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, 42–3.
54 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, 241–2.
55 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, 43: 'six cahiers in folio manuscripts, contenant presque tous les mots de la lettre A'. For Perrault and the dictionary, see Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 43–4.
56 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 46: 'les cahyers de la lettre C estant transcripts (on a commencé par cete lettre d'autant qu'elle estoit la moins imparfaite)';

for James Murray and the damaged dictionary slips, see K. Murray, *Caught in the Web of Words*, 174–7.

57 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 54–5; Colbert remarked 'Qu'il aprenoît avec bien de la joye, avec quelle assiduité et quelle chaleur elle [l'Académie] travailloit au dictionnaire' (55).

58 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, 49n2.

59 For the *jetonniers*, see Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 22–35, esp. 24 (the word *jettonier*) and 28 (exchange rate of 32 sols per *jeton*); for the coachman's pay, and more on the value of money, see Thompson, *Sun King's Garden*, x.

60 Furetière, *Second factum*, 310:

> Chacun pointille sur chaque article, et le juge bon ou mauvais selon sa connoissance ou son caprice; tres-souvent on le reforme au pis, ou on ne fait que changer peu de chose dans l'expression. Mais cela se fait avec tant de bruit ou de confusion, que les plus sages se taisent, et que l'avis des plus violents l'emporte. Celui qui crie le plus haut, c'est celui qui a raison, chacun fait une longue harangue sur la moindre bagatelle. Le second repete comme un Echo tout ce que le premier a dit, et le plus souvent ils parlent trois ou quatre ensemble. Quand un Bureau est composé de cinq ou six personnes, il y en a un qui lit, un qui opine, deux qui causent, un qui dort, et un qui s'amuse à lire quelque Dictionaire qui est sur la table … Voilà le moyen d'avencer l'ouvrage.

61 *Ibid.*, 334.

62 Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 22–35: 'avidité des jetonniers … vanité des jetonniers … susceptibilité et platitude des jetonniers … jalousie des jetonniers … violence et grossièreté des jetonniers', and 'ignorance des jetonniers'; cf. *ibid.*, 56–60.

63 DeMaria, *Life of Samuel Johnson*, 105 (and see Korshin, 'Mythology of Johnson's *Dictionary*', 14); Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 55n3.

64 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 235–6; the text is *ibid.*, Vol. IV, 100–2.

65 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, 104: 'qui est attendu depuis si longtemps par le public'.

66 *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1694), sig. ē4r.

67 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 159 (February 1677): 'pour satisfaire à l'attente publique et aux desirs du Roy'; 161–2 (April 1676).

68 See Mugglestone, *Lost for Words*, 39–48.

69 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 165:

> I, La premiere institution de la Compagnie qui a toujours fait son Dictionnaire par Racines … ce qu'on ne pouvoit pas changer aprés trente sept ans de travail uniforme sans une marque de légereté et d'inconstance et sans blesser l'honneur et le jugement de tant de sages et sçavants hommes qui nous ont précedez … II, Que cet ordre faisoit voir la richesse de la langue … III, Que cet ordre épargne beaucoup de peine et de Définitions qu'il faudroit répeter aux composés et dérivés … IV, Que si on vouloit prendre un autre ordre il faudroit recommencer tout de nouveau, et qu'ainsy nostre ouvrage seroit la toile de Pénelope qui ne s'acheveroit jamais. V, Qu'une si célebre Compagnie faisant un nouveau Dictionnaire devoit prendre une route nouvelle … ce qui distingueroit son ouvrage de tant de petits Dictionnaires qui sortent tous les jours …

70 Furetière, *Second factum*, 314: 'cet Ouvrage est une vraye toile de Penelopé, dont on défait en un jour ce qu'on a fait en un autre'; cf. Furetière, *Factum*, 25, citing Martial, *Epig.* 7.83.

71 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 206n.
72 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, 267: 'ce qui a esté representé qu'on ne pouvoit apporter trop de soin et trop d'exactitude à la révision des feuilles déja imprimées du Dictionnaire'; cf. *ibid.*, Vol. I, 278–9, 305.
73 Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 75–6; Courtat, *Monographie*, 34.
74 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 161–2 and 269–70; Courtat, *Monographie*, 34–5. For Ménage's use of his copy, see Leroy-Turcan, 'Gilles Ménage et l'Académie française', Section 3.1; and Ménage, *Dictionnaire* (1694), s.vv. *acariastre*, *angleux*, *atifer*, *basse-conte*, etc.
75 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 278.
76 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, 308.
77 Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 81–2. For comparison of some specimen entries, see Mazière, 'Le *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*', 189–92.
78 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 341, 368, 585–6.
79 Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 82–4.
80 *Ibid.*, 39–41.
81 *Ibid.*, 36–7. For his attendance record, see Brévot-Dromzée, 'Remarque', 223.
82 Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 37–9; for the *canevas*, see 56.
83 Pruvost, *Dictionnaires de langue française*, 29.
84 Bray, *César-Pierre Richelet*, 12–32; for the apparent use of Miège's wordlist, see 18n29.
85 The title page actually appears in two states: uncorrected, without cedillas, and corrected, with cedillas; see *ibid.*, 73. For Pierre, rather than César-Pierre, as the preferable form of Richelet's Christian name, see Petrequin, *Le Dictionnaire françois de P. Richelet*, 5n3.
86 Bray, *César-Pierre Richelet*, 235–7; Petrequin, *Dictionnaire françois de P. Richelet*, 25–30.
87 Bray, *César-Pierre Richelet*, 239; Domson, 'Nicolas Fatio de Duillier', 3–5.
88 The question of dating is complicated by the existence of a state of the volume *M–Z* with the date 'M. DC. LXXXIIX', not an uncommon form for 1688, but here possibly an error for 'M. DC. LXXIIX' (1678) or even 'M. DC. LXXIX' (1679); see Bray, *César-Pierre Richelet*, 70–2.
89 For instance, a copy listed for sale in June 2011 by Librairie Bonnefoi of Paris unites the two volumes in a contemporary armorial binding.
90 Pattison, 'Classical learning', 349.
91 Richelet, *Dictionnaire françois*, Part I, sig. **1r: 'En faveur des Etrangers, on a ajouté … le genre de chaque nom avec la terminaison féminine des adjectifs.'
92 All three topics are discussed at length in Petrequin, *Dictionnaire françois de P. Richelet*: pronunciation in Chapter 6 (324–92); status labelling at many points (see the index, s.vv. *marquage*, *marque*); etymology in Chapter 10 (804–911).
93 Bray, *César-Pierre Richelet*, 46–62.
94 For Richelet and Perrot d'Ablancourt, see Pitou, 'Art of gentle lexicography'; Bray, *César-Pierre Richelet*, 222–3; and Petrequin, *Dictionnaire françois de P. Richelet*, 1015–18; for Richelet's examples more generally, see Petrequin,

Dictionnaire françois de P. Richelet, Chapters 11 ('Exemplification', 912–94) and 12 ('Référencement', 995–1048).

95 Richelet, *Dictionnaire françois*, Part I, sigs. **3v–4v.

96 Quemada, 'L'Académie française et ses dictionnaires', 77: 'il peut tenu pour le véritable imitateur français de la Crusca au XVII[e] siècle'; Bray, *César-Pierre Richelet*, 32–3.

97 Patru, letter to François de Maucroix, 4 April 1677, in Bray, *César-Pierre Richelet*, 275: 'Nous ne ferons que crayonner les passages. Un petit copiste à six deniers portera le tout sur du papier qui ne sera écrit que d'un côté, tellement qu'il ne faudra que découper ce papier et rapporter chaque morceau en son lieu et place, où il sera collé. Tu sais que les *Indices* ne se font pas autrement.'

98 Petrequin, *Dictionnaire françois de P. Richelet*, 29: 'véritable stakhanoviste anonyme et héros oublié de la lexicographie française'.

99 *Ibid.*, 123: 'une sorte de *compendium* des connaissances qu'un Français doit maîtriser pour comprendre le monde et la nature'.

100 Bray, *César-Pierre Richelet*, 36; cf. Petrequin, *Dictionnaire françois de P. Richelet*, 679–84.

101 Bray, *César-Pierre Richelet*, 37: 'l'idéal de l'honnête homme du dix-septième fait progressivement place à celui de l'universalisme du dix-huitième siècle et Richelet, toutes proportions gardées, documente déjà cette évolution des idées'.

102 For other encyclopedic sources, see *ibid.*, 34–5; and for other exotic animals, Petrequin, *Dictionnaire françois de P. Richelet*, 116–19, remarking at 116, in neat contrast to Leibniz, that 'On ne s'étonnera donc pas de croiser, au fil des pages du *Dictionnaire*, des *aspic*, *autruche* … *rinocérot*.'

103 Richelet, *Dictionnaire françois*, s.v. *feu*: 'Feu d'Ablancour [*sic*] avoit l'ame noble et l'esprit excélent.'

104 *Ibid.*, s.v. *compliment*: 'Harangue courte et pleine de cajolerie … Il a fait de fort bonne grace son compliment à l'Academie.'

105 Richelet, *Dictionnaire françois*, s.v. *vocabulaire*: 'Laissez vostre Vocabulaire | Abandonnez vostre Grammaire'; cf. Richelet's comments on this entry in Bray, *César-Pierre Richelet*, 276.

106 Richelet, *Dictionnaire françois*, Part I, sig. **2r: 'Un homme seul ne sauroit tout voir … Des personnes illustres dans les lettres travaillent depuis prés de 43 ans à un Ouvrage de cette nature, et toutefois ils n'en sont pas encore venus à bout. En attendant que leur travail paroisse, et vienne heureusement remplir les vœux du public, on met en lumiere ce Dictionnaire qui est une espece d'aventurier.' He defines *Avanturier* (*sic*) as 'Qui cherche quelque avanture'.

107 *Ibid.*, Part I, 27: 'Je renvoie à ce qu'en diront un jour, qui ne viendra pas si tôt, Messieurs de l'Academie dans leur Dictionnaire.'

108 Sauvy, *Livres saisis à Paris*, 178–9, no. 312; Bray, *César-Pierre Richelet*, 239–43.

109 For the *Dictionnaire françois* as source, see Bray, *César-Pierre Richelet*, 39–44, supplemented by Petrequin, *Dictionnaire françois de P. Richelet*, 46–4; for its

successive editions, Bray, *César-Pierre Richelet*, 63–139 (with helpful tables at 67, 68).

110 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 233: 'que M^r^ l'abbé de Furetière avoit obtenu un privileige pour l'impression d'un Dictionnaire universel de tous les mots de la langue et qu'il le faisoit actuellement imprimer au préjudice du travail ordinaire de la Compagnie et au préjudice du privileige par elle obtenu pour l'impression de son Dictionnaire'. For the *affaire Furetière*, see also Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 44–5.

111 The entries for each letter or pair of letters are separately paginated 1–8, which suggests the possibility of their independent circulation, as does a reference to the specimen as 'essays ou feuilles volantes' in *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 238. No publisher or place of publication is given, but Pierre Bayle refers to it as 'l'Essay que l'Auteur … distribua à Paris' (in 'Preface' to Furetière, *Dictionaire universel*, Vol. I, sig. *3r).

112 The 'avertissement' is in Furetière, *Essais d'un dictionaire*, sig. ã4v.

113 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 234–8.

114 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, 241: 'il avoit employé les définitions, les phrases, et enfin les propres termes du Dictionnaire de l'Académie, ou sans aucun changement, ou avec un changement si léger que cela ne servoit qu'à faire paroistre l'affectation du déguisement'.

115 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, 206n.

116 Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 46.

117 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 245–6 (and cf. 288), 254–5.

118 Furetière, *Factum*, 4–5.

119 *Ibid.*, 9. The title page of Rochefort, *Dictionaire general et curieux, contenant les principaux mots, et […] enrichies d'eloquens discours* is dated 1685, but the prelims state that its printing was concluded on 4 November 1684 (sig. ã6v).

120 Furetière, *Factum*, 19: 'Il est fait principalement pour donner l'intelligence des sciences et des arts, et non pas seulement des mots, et pour expliquer tous les livres François vieux et modernes tant aux étrangers qu'à la posterité.'

121 *Ibid.*, 22: 'Les definitions de l'Academie sont grammaticales … Celles de l'Universel sont philosophiques.'

122 *Ibid.*, 24–5.

123 The second *factum* was first noticed in the *Régistres de l'Académie* on 22 March 1685 (Vol. I, 256).

124 For Cowell, see Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 174–8; for Blount, see his own *World of errors discovered*.

125 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 277.

126 For the date of printing, see *ibid.*, Vol. I, 298 (28 November 1689): 'La Compagnie ayant esté avertie de bonne part que le dictionaire de Furetiere estoit achevé d'imprimer en Holande'.

127 Bayle, 'Preface' to Furetière, *Dictionaire universel*, Vol. I, sig. ***1v: 'Grand exemple de la vanité des occupations des Savans'.

128 Entry count from Pruvost, *Dictionnaires de la langue française*, 33.

129 Zgusta, *Lexicography Then and Now*, 7 discusses the very occasional provision of etymologies.

130 For an overview, see Ross, 'Furetière's *Dictionnaire universel*', 60–3.

131 Bayle, 'Preface' to Furetière, *Dictionaire universel*, Vol. I, sig. *3v: 'la secheresse qui accompagne ordinairement les Dictionnaires n'est pas à craindre dans celuy-cy'. Cf. J. Grimm, 'Vorrede' to Grimm and Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Vol. I, xxi: 'das erste wahrhafte deutsche wörterbuch … die trockenheit des teutonista und DASYPODIUS verlassend'.

132 D'Olivet[?], memorandum of 24 January 1727, 28: 'Le Dictionnaire de Furetière ne vaut rien … cependant parce qu'il y a des exemples et des citations on ne sauroit y lire un mot qu'on ne soit tenté de lire la page entière, au lieu que dès qu'on a ouvert le nostre on le referme avec empressement, tant on est rebuté de la triste et affreuse sécheresse qui règne partout.'

133 The references to the Estiennes and du Cange are in Bayle, 'Preface' to Furetière, *Dictionaire universel*, Vol. I, sigs. *4r–v.

134 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, sigs. **2r–***1r.

135 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, sig. **2v: 's'il s'élevoit un nouveau Paul Beni qui eût la temerité de luitter tout seul contre l'Academie Françoise, nous souhaittons que le public le châtiât de son audace'.

136 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, sig. ***2r: 'l'on pourra avec le temps faire porter à ce Dictionaire le titre d'Universel en toute rigeur. Il faudroit pour cela y enfermer tous les mots qui étoient en usage du temps de Ville-Hardouin, de Froissard … et de nos vieux Romanciers.'

137 *Ibid.*: 'Mais peut-être seroit-il plus à propos d'en faire un Volume à part, que l'on intituleroit *l'Archeologue*, ou *le Glossaire de la langue Françoise*.' Bayle had in mind Henry Spelman's *Archaeologus*, a substantial dictionary of medieval Latin from English sources, and du Cange's *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae latinitatis*, for which see Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 179–88 and 261–83 respectively.

138 Bayle, 'Preface' to Furetière, *Dictionaire universel*, Vol. I, sig. ***2r:

> On y pourroit inserer l'Histoire des mots, c'est à dire, le temps de leur regne et celuy de leur decadence, avec les changemens de leur signification. Il faudroit observer à l'égard de ces vieux termes ce qu'on pratique dans les Dictionaires des langues mortes, c'est de cotter les passages de quelque Auteur qui les auroit employez. On ne feroit pas mal non plus de se répandre sur les Ouvrages des anciens Poëtes Provençaux; et rien ne serviroit plus à perfectionner la science etymologique, qu'une recherche exacte des mots particuliers aux diverses Provinces du Royaume.

139 Henri Basnage de Beauval, 'Preface' to Furetière, *Dictionnaire universel* (1701–2), Vol. I, sig. *1v: 'On ne sera pas fâché … d'apprendre la naissance des mots, leur destinée, et les revolutions par lesquelles ils ont passé; ce sont des bagatelles, il est vrai, mais ce sont des bagatelles curieuses, et qu'on est bien aise de trouver chemin faisant.'

140 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, sigs. *3r ('zêle fulminant et insultant'); *1v–2r (quotations); *2r (Regis).

141 For a preliminary list of the editions, see Ross, 'Furetière's *Dictionnaire universel*', 66.

142 Miller, 'Last edition of the *Dictionnaire de Trévoux*', esp. 44–8.
143 See Quemada, 'L'Académie française et ses dictionnaires', 77 ('dictionnaire grammatical'), 78 ('le premier exemple de ce qu'on appellerait aujourd'hui un dictionnaire *linguistique* et *didactique* du français').

4 The *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* from its publication to the end of the eighteenth century

1 Régnier-Desmarais, 'Preface pour le Grand Dictionnaire de l'Académie', 628: 'Il est tres-aisé de faire un Dictionnaire, quand on ne se propose que de rassembler dans un certain ordre tous les mots d'une Langue; mais il n'en est pas de même, lors qu'on a des vuës moins bornées.'
2 *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1694), title page: 'imprimeur ordinaire du Roy, et de l'Académie françoise'.
3 Prévost, 'Le dictionnaire', 118: 'somptueuse, inoubliable, digne d'une apogée française'.
4 The identification of the allegorical figures is *ibid.*, 116.
5 *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1694), sig. ā2v: 'les mots de valeur, de courage et de l'intrepidité nous ont paru trop foibles … les mots de prévoyance, de prudence et de sagesse mesme ne respondoient qu'imparfaitement à nos idées'.
6 *Ibid.*, sig. ā3r–v:

> Que s'il on a jamais deu se promettre qu'une Langue vivante peust parvenir à estre fixée, et à ne dépendre plus du caprice et de la tyrannie de l'Usage, nous avons lieu de croire que la nostre est parvenuë de nos jours à ce glorieux point d'immutabilité, puisque les livres et les autres monumens qui parleront de VOSTRE MAJESTE, seront tousjours regardez comme faits dans le beau siecle de la France, et feront à jamais les delices de tous les Peuples, et l'estude de tous les Rois.

7 Rey, 'Linguistic absolutism', 373.
8 For Charpentier's authorship of the preface, see Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 37; and *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 331n1. For a discourse of 1689 in which he was evidently bringing together ideas which he would use in the preface, see *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 293n4.
9 *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1694), sig. ā4r: 'Nous n'avons point de Dictionnaires du siecle de Ciceron ni du siecle de Demosthene.'
10 *Ibid.*, sig. ā4r: 'Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie est de ce genre. Il a esté commencé et achevé dans le siecle le plus florissant de la Langue Françoise.'
11 *Ibid.*, sig. ā4v: 'l'Académie a jugé qu'elle ne devoit pas y mettre les vieux mots qui sont entierement hors d'usage, ni les termes des Arts et des Sciences qui entrent rarement dans le Discours; Elle s'est retranchée à la Langue commune, telle qu'elle est dans le commerce ordinaire des honnestes gens, et telle que les Orateurs et les Poëtes l'employent'. For Malherbe and prescriptivism, see Lodge, *French: From Dialect to Standard*, 173–4; and Lyons, 'The age of the technician', 262–7.
12 *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*, sig. ē1v: 'Quant aux termes d'emportement ou qui blessent la Pudeur, on ne les a point admis dans le Dictionnaire, parce

que les honestes gens évitent de les employer dans leurs discours.' Richelet appears to have had fewer qualms, though some of his definitions of taboo words are masked in the decent obscurity of Latin: see Petrequin, *Dictionnaire françois de P. Richelet*, 113–15, 509–11. For the *Vocabolario*, see Schweickard, 'Vocabolario', 58.

13 *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*, sig. é1r: 'on a jugé qu'il seroit agreable et instructif de disposer le Dictionnaire par Racines'.

14 *Ibid.*, sig. é1r: 'parce qu'on voit s'il faut ainsi dire l'Histoire du mot, et qu'on en remarque la Naissance et le Progrez'.

15 Cf. Zgusta, *Lexicography Then and Now*, 8–10, 17–19.

16 *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1694), sig. é2r: 'avilis dans la bouche du menu Peuple'.

17 Entry count from Wooldridge, 'Nomenclature du *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* 1694', in *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française: Base échantillon analytique*.

18 *Le Mercure galant*, August 1694, 300: 'voicy un Ouvrage attendu depuis longtemps. Puis que tant d'habiles gens y ont travaillé, je ne doute point qu'il ne soit tres beau et fort utile pour la Langue. Je le reçois agreabelement [*sic*]; je le liray à mes heures de loisir, et je tâcheray d'en profiter.'

19 *Ibid.*: 'Des paroles si obligeantes furent un prix glorieux de leur travail.' Cf. Rey, 'Linguistic absolutism', 375 (quoted); Quemada, 'L'Académie française et ses dictionnaires', 76; and Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 83; and also *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 333n2.

20 See Stroup, 'Louis XIV as patron', 226–7.

21 Racine, letter to Nicolas Boileau, 28 September 1694, in *Oeuvres complètes*, Vol. II, 548: 'Cela a paru un assez bizarre contre-temps pour le *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, qui me paraît n'avoir pas tant de partisans que l'autre'; translation from Rey, 'Linguistic absolutism', 375.

22 Rey, 'Linguistic absolutism', 378.

23 Quemada, 'L'Académie française et ses dictionnaires', 76–8.

24 See Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 60–7.

25 Besnier, 'Discours sur les etymologies', sig. ũ2v: 'l'Ordre Alphabetique est devenu tellement à la mode, que l'on met tout en Dictionnaires'. Cf. Petrequin, *Dictionnaire françois de P. Richelet*, 58–9.

26 *L'Apothéose du Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, 13: 'ôter sa chemise, chauffer une chemise, chemise sale, manche de chemise. Voila t'il pas de belles phrases? mais on a oublié par malheur, de mettre celle-cy, chier dans sa chemise.'

27 *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1694), s.v. *amour*: 'sentiment de celuy qui aime'; *L'Apothéose du Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, 42: 'Quelle pitoyable definition!'.

28 For definitions of derivatives and roots, see Mazière, 'Le *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*', 187–8. Of course, *amour* is not derived from *aime*, but its etymon, Latin *amor*, is derived from the etymon of *aime*, Latin *amare*: the structure of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* did not distinguish between derivation within French and derivation within Latin of the etyma of sets of French words.

29 *Ibid.*, 43: 'Le Chevalier de F… se divertissant avec ses amis, disoit quelquefois qu'il avoit donné son Breviaire à son Suisse pour le reciter en sa place. Je croirois volontiers que Messieurs les Academiciens donnoient aussi leurs cayers au Portier de leur Bureau pour y faire des definitions' (the three dots which abbreviate the name of F— are original, not an ellipsis of mine); *ibid.*, 43–4: 'il a une amourette, c'est-à-dire, une petite inclination cachée pour quelque personne qui n'est pas de sa qualité'.

30 *L'Enterrement du Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, sig. ¶3r ('infinité d'obmissions'), and 3–4.

31 *Dictionnaire des Halles*, sig. ã3r: 'On ne trouve point tant de gentillesses dans le Dictionaire de Robert Estienne, ny dans celuy della Crusca.'

32 Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 35: 'expressions stercoraires'; cf. *ibid.*, 37 and 66n1.

33 Baker, *Reflections upon Learning*, 17; Johnson, 'Preface', 105.

34 Boyer, *Royal dictionary*, title page; see also Hausmann, 'Réception de la première édition', 137.

35 Facsimile in Bray, *Matthias Kramer*, 135: 'Enrichi | De tout ce qu'il y a de plus beau, de plus poli, et de mieux établi | dans le fameux | DICTIONNAIRE ROIAL | *de Messieurs* | DE L'ACADEMIE FRANÇOISE, | dans ceux | d'ANTOINE FURETIERE, DE PIERRE RICHELET, et autres'. Cf. *ibid.*, 183–214 for an analysis of Kramer's actual use of these sources.

36 For the German translation, see Hausmann, 'Réception de la première édition', 135.

37 Racine, letter to Nicolas Boileau, 28 September 1694, in *Oeuvres complètes*, Vol. II, 548.

38 'Malherbian reductionist aesthetic' is from Lyons, 'Age of the technician', 266.

39 *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*, sig. ẽ4r: 'termes particulierement attachez aux Sciences et aux Arts'.

40 Preface to Furetière, *Nouveau recueil des factums*, Vol. I, sig. ã4v.

41 For the month of publication, see *Le Mercure galant*, September 1694, 239–40.

42 For his work on the proofs of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, see *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 305.

43 *Le Mercure galant*, August 1694, 300: 'les Curieux qui acheteront ces quatre Volumes, pourront s'assurer d'avoir le plus ample Dictionnaire qui ait paru jusqu'icy'. For Corneille and this journal, see Ross, 'Corneille's *Dictionnaire*', 70.

44 Corneille, *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*, sig. ã2r.

45 Cf. Furetière, *Dictionnaire universel*, s.v. *coeur*:

> Sa figure est pyramidale, et ressemble à une pomme de pin, qui est large par sa partie superieure qu'on appelle sa *base*, ou la *teste du cœur*; et il aboutit à une pointe qui s'appelle le *fond.* Il y a une veine et une artere qui environnent toute la base du cœur comme une couronne, qui s'appellent *coronales*, avec quelques nerfs fort menus qui sont de la sixiéme conjugaison.

and Corneille, *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*, s.v. *coeur*: 'Sa figure est pyramidale et ressemble à une pomme de pin. Toute la base du Cœur, qui est

sa partie superieure, laquelle estant large aboutit à une pointe, est environnée d'une veine et d'une artere avec quelques nerfs fort menus qui sont de la sixiéme conjugaison.' See also Gemmingen, 'Le "Dictionnaire à part"', 160.

46 Leibniz, *Collectanea etymologica*, Part I, 275 ('Unvorgreiffliche Gedancken', §35): 'die so genandte Frantzösische Academie nicht allein ihr lang versprochenes Haupt-Buch [the word means "ledger"] der läuffigen Worte heraus gegeben, sondern auch was vor die Künste gehöret, vom Furetiere angefangen, und von einem andern Glied der Academie fortgesetzet worden'. See also his letter to Claude Nicaise, 1696, in *Otium hanoueranum*, 61: 'Sans Mr. l'*Abbé Furetiere* on n'auroit point songé chez vous au termes des Arts.'

47 Bray, *César-Pierre Richelet*, 42–3.

48 Corneille, *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*, s.v. *phenix*: 'les yeux étincelans comme des étoiles'; Ross, 'Corneille's *Dictionnaire*', 73.

49 See Gemmingen, 'Le "Dictionnaire à part"', 156–9 and in the primary sources, as well as Corneille's preface in *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*, sigs. ã3r–v. See *Le Mercure galant*, September 1694, 243–4.

50 Harris, *Lexicon technicum*, sig. a2r. Cf. Leibniz, letter to Nicaise, 1696, in *Otium hanoueranum*, 61: 'ces termes nous apprennent bien des realites, au lieu que les dictionaires ordinaires ne servent qu'à parler'.

51 Ross, 'Corneille's *Dictionnaire*', 79–80. The edition of 1720 cited *ibid*., 81 appears to be a ghost.

52 Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 83–5.

53 *Grand dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*, sig. *6v: 'en curieus Boek, geintituleert, *Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, voor dezen in Vrankryk gedrukt'.

54 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 335–6: 'travail principal et ordinaire'; cf. *ibid*., Vol. I, 339–40, 348–9.

55 *Ibid*., Vol. I, 356.

56 Johnson, 'Preface', 112.

57 *Nouveau dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*, sig. ẽ2r: 'On en a changé toute la forme, on y a adjousté beaucoup de mots, on a retouché et esclairci presque toutes les Définitions.' For *idéal*, see Prévost, 'Le dictionnaire', 126; and for the work of adding 'des mots oubliez dans le Dictionnaire', see *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. I, 363–5, 370.

58 *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1694): 'Celuy, celle qui a de l'affection pour quelque personne et se porte à lui rendre toutes sortes de bons offices'; *Nouveau dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*: 'Celui ou celle avec qui on est lié d'une affection réciproque'. The example is from Prévost, 'Le dictionnaire', 129. For the debate, see *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1694), sig. ẽ4r.

59 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. IV, 149–50.

60 *Ibid*., Vol. I, 357.

61 *Ibid*., Vol. IV, 149.

62 *Ibid*., Vol. I, 564: 'Si en corrigeant les feuilles le sec[retai]re a en mains des exemples tirés des meilleurs auteurs de la langue, et qui puissent enrichir le travail, il luy sera permis de les adjouter sans attendre l'avis de la Compagnie.'

63 *Ibid*., Vol. I, 586; Vol. II, 56.

64 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, 75:

> d'autres ont représenté qu'il falloit avoir égard au génie de nostre nation, qui estant inconstante et avide de nouveautés … seroit blessée de voir l'Académie tousjours occupée à un Dictionnaire; Que l'exemple de l'Académie de la Crusca, qui ne s'applique depuis tant d'années qu'à cet unique travail, ne nous mettroit pas à couvert de la censure et des railleries du public.

See also *ibid.*, Vol. II, 79–80.

65 D'Olivet[?], letter to Jean-Paul Bignon, 24 January 1727, *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire de France* (1853–4), 26:

> Il faudroit commencer par faire brusler nostre Dictionnaire en l'estat qu'il est, car il donne lieu à une espèce d'idolâtrie qui n'est pas moins dangereuse que celle de la Chine. Nous avons fait, en quatre-vingts ans, un amas de mots expliqués par des définitions et par des phrases qui n'ont ni rime ni raison … les petits enfants s'en mocquent, comme font aussi ceux d'entre nous qui ont un peu de sens; cependant dès que nous sommes embarrassez sur un mot ou sur une phrase, nous allons à genoux consulter ce magot.

66 D'Olivet[?], memorandum of 24 January 1727, 27: 'On ne fera donc jamais rien qui vaille pour le Dictionnaire si l'on n'y met des citations et des exemples. Nous avons pour cela de bons modèles à suivre.'

67 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. II, 230.

68 D'Olivet, letter to Jean Bouhier, 1 January 1736, in *Lettres*, Vol. II, 207: 'Nos déliberations depuis six mois n'ont servi qu'a faire voir qu'il était impossible que rien de systématique partît d'une compagnie. Enfin, comme il est temps de se mettre à imprimer, l'Académie se détermina hier à me nommer seul plénipotaire à cet égard.'

69 D'Olivet, letter to Bouhier, 17 January 1736, *ibid.*, Vol. II, 209: 'ennuyeuse occupation'; for the scandal, see Duranton, 'Introduction', 6–7.

70 *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1740), sig. ē2r: 'La profession que l'Académie a toûjours faite de se conformer a l'usage universellement reçû' (and see the note in d'Olivet, *Lettres*, Vol. II, 208n2: 'on ne pouvait attendre de notre abbé une bien profonde révolution'); Quemada, 'L'Académie française et ses dictionnaires', 79.

71 *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1740), sig. ĩ1r.

72 Corneille, *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*, s.v. *lenticulaire*: 'approche de la figure d'une lentille'.

73 D'Olivet, letters to Bouhier, 25 October 1736 and 24 June 1737, in *Lettres*, Vol. II, 224 and 245. Cf. his letters to Bouhier of 16 May and 15 September 1738, in *ibid.*, 274 and 291, for the unsatisfactory help which he eventually received.

74 For the stupid Coignard, see d'Olivet, letter to Bouhier, 11 July 1729, *ibid.*, Vol. I, 130: 'C'est le plus sot des imprimeurs qu'il y ait au monde'; for the accented letters, see d'Olivet to Bouhier, 8 April 1736, *ibid.*, Vol. II, 215.

75 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. II, 469; cf. *ibid.*, Vol. II, 475, 479.

76 For the proposed *Dictionnaire orthographique*, see *Régistres de l'Académie*., Vol. II, 564–5; for the presentation of the fourth edition at Versailles, see *ibid.*, Vol. III, 155.

77 *Ibid.*, Vol. III, 153, 314.

78 *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1762), sig. a2r: 'Nous avons donc cru devoir admettre dans cette nouvelle Edition, les termes élémentaires des sciences, des arts, et même ceux des métiers, qu'un homme de lettres est dans le cas de trouver dans des ouvrages ou l'on ne traite pas expressément des matières auxquelles ces termes appartiennent.' Cf. Quemada, 'L'Académie française et ses dictionnaires', 79.
79 *Ibid.*, sig. a3v: 'On ne doit point en matière de Langue, prévenir le Public; mais il convient de le suivre, en se soumettant, non pas à l'usage qui commence, mais à l'usage généralement établi.'
80 Courtat, *Monographie*, 44–9.
81 For Voltaire and the fourth edition, see Vercruysse, 'Œuvres alphabétiques de Voltaire', 94; and *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. III, 133n1.
82 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. III, 432: 'exemples tirés des auteurs les plus approuvés'.
83 *Ibid.*: 'un ouvrage aussi agréable que nécessaire, ce seroit à la fois une grammaire, une rhétorique, une poëtique'.
84 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, 75.
85 See Sainte-Palaye, *Dictionnaire historique*, Vol. I, iii; Pougens, 'Plan', 96.
86 Sainte-Palaye, *Projet d'un glossaire*, 16: 'Les différents degrés par lesquels le même mot a passé, en recevant plusieurs changements successifs dans sa prononciation, dans son orthographe, etc. sont autant de chaînons qui nous conduisent de proche en proche à l'origine du mot dont nous nous servons aujourd'hui.'
87 Johnson, 'Preface', 94.
88 For the *Dictionnaire philosophique*, see Vercruysse, 'Œuvres alphabétiques de Voltaire', 93.
89 See *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. III, 433.
90 *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, 174: 'avec lui tomba l'effervescence momentanée qu'il avait communiquée à l'académie'.
91 For the fact that his blindness was total, see Pougens, *Mémoires et souvenirs*, 100, emphasizing that 'Le malheureux oculiste … finit par l'aveugler entièrement' and that Pougens 'resta depuis lors tout-à-fait privé de la vue'; for the number of quotations, see *ibid.*, 32: 'j'ai réuni plus de cinq cent mille citations ou exemples tirés des principaux écrivains français'.
92 Pougens, 'Plan', 95: 'Depuis longtemps les gens de lettres et les Philosophes demandaient un Dictionnaire complet de la langue. Tous regardaient comme insuffisant celui que nous a donné l'Académie. Tous se plaignaient du despotisme avec lequel les sociétaires avaient circonscrit les différentes acceptions des mots, dans des phrases de pure invention.'
93 *Ibid.*: 'Aussi Voltaire insistait toujours sur la nécessité d'un Vocabulaire moins aride et plus complet.'
94 *Ibid.*: 'les circonstances pénibles de ma vie'.
95 *Ibid.*: 'autant qu'il m'a été possible de la démêler à travers l'irrégularité et l'indécision de notre idiome à l'époque où il sortait encore informe du sein de la langue romance'.

96 *Ibid.*, 97: 'après chaque acception … j'ai placé les phrases ou pensées tirées des classiques français morts ou vivants'.

97 Pougens, *Vocabulaire de nouveaux privatifs français*, I, probably citing Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad* (as revised in 1729), II.139: 'Earless on high, stood un-abash'd Defoe'; *inabaissé* is still not registered in the *Trésor de la langue française*.

98 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. IV, 174 ('médiocre, incomplet, insuffisant'); the judgement of Johnson begins 'Il existe un dictionnaire Anglais, le meilleur de tous, c'est le travail du célèbre Johnson.' For a response to Chamfort's account of Voltaire and the dictionary, see *ibid.*, Vol. IV, 196–7.

99 *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, 198: 'Il faut redire, pour la vingtième fois, que le Dictionnaire de l'Académie est un témoin de l'usage qui gouverne la langue françoise, de celui qui est le plus général parmi les personnes qui parlent correctement et purement. Que témoigner de l'usage n'est pas l'affaire d'un seul homme, ni même de deux ou trois', but of 'une compagnie d'hommes instruits.'

100 *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, 227, 235–6.

101 The legal instrument, of the *premier jour complémentaire* of the third year of the Republic (17 September 1795), is published in *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1798), Vol. I, xi.

102 *Ibid.*, title page: 'revu, corrigé et augmenté par l'Académie elle-même'; Pougens' judgement is in his *Archéologie française*, Vol. I, 15.

103 *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1798), Vol. I, iii: 'là, le nom de *Roi* étoit rarement prononcé; le nom odieux de *Sujet*, n'étoit jamais'.

104 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, iv: 'Une Langue, comme l'esprit du Peuple qui la parle, est dans une mobilité continuelle'; Vol. I, v: 'tout le Peuple apprendra, dans un tel Dictionnaire, à fixer sa Langue sans la borner; à la fixer, dis-je … dans les routes où elle pourra toujours s'avancer'.

105 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, v: 'la cause la plus générale et la plus dangereuse de nos erreurs, de nos mauvais raisonnements, est dans l'abus continuel que nous faisons des mots … Il faut que chaque mot d'une Langue … soit frappé d'une empreinte particulière, qui marque son titre et sa valeur.'

106 Wilkins, *Essay*, sig. b1r; see the discussion in Lewis, *Language, Mind, and Nature*, 174.

107 Estienne, *Dictionaire francoislatin* (1549), s.v. *lente*: 'Lentilleux, Plein de lentilles au uisage, *Varius*, *Lentiginosus*'; cf. Estienne, *Dictionaire francoislatin* (1539–40), s.v. *lente, ou lentille*: 'Plein de lentilles au uisaige, *Varius*'.

108 ARTFL Project, '*Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*: Cinquième édition'.

109 *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1798): 'Les mots nouveaux en usage depuis la révolution', s.vv. *acclamation*: 'Proposition votée par acclamation', and *aristocratie*: 'Ce mot désigne, depuis la Révolution, la caste des ci-devant Nobles et Privilégiés, et en général, les ennemis du nouveau Gouvernement.'

110 For Saint-Pierre's proposal, see *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. IV, 150–1; for the presentation of Court de Gébelin's *Dictionnaire étymologique* to the Académie, see *ibid.*, Vol. III, 427; for the state of English etymological

lexicography in 1800, see Liberman, 'Growth of the English etymological dictionary', 169.

111 This is the date of the last edition of the *Dictionnaire portatif*: see Bray, *César-Pierre Richelet*, 138–9.

112 De Sanctis, *Storia della letteratura italiana*, Vol. II, 190: 'la lingua, segregata dall'uso vivente, divenne un cadavere, notomizzato, studiato, riprodotto artificialmente, e gl'italiani si avvezzarono a imparare e scrivere la loro lingua, come si fa il latino o il greco'; translated and discussed in Cochrane, 'Renaissance academies', 22.

113 Cf. Cochrane, 'Renaissance academies', 23–6.

114 Burke, *Languages and Communities*, 61–8.

5 The Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft and its offshoots in Germany and Denmark from the 1640s to the mid eighteenth century

1 Bircher, 'The Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft and Italy', 121–2.

2 Quoted and translated from Carl Gustav von Hille, *Der teutsche Palmbaum* (1647), in Bircher, 'The Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft and Italy', 123: the foundation began with an account 'von den Italienischen Gesellschaften/ welche … zu nutzlicher Ausübung jedes Volkes Landsprache/ rühmlich aufgerichtet werden'.

3 Ball, 'Alles zu nutzen', 400. For a short bio-bibliographical overview of the Gesellschaft in English see Faber du Faur, *German Baroque Literature*, 46–55.

4 Quoted and translated from Ludwig of Anhalt, *Kurtzer Vorbericht von der Fruchtbringenden Gesellschaft Zwecke und Vorhaben* (1622), in Bircher, 'The Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft and Italy', 124: 'Soll auch den Gesellschaftern vor allen Dingen obliegen/ unsere hochgeehrte Muttersprache/ in ihrem grundlichen Wesen/ und rechten Verstande/ ohn Einmischung fremder ausländischer Flikkwörter.'

5 For the sixteenth-century dictionaries, see Claes, *Bibliographisches Verzeichnis*; and Jones, 'Lingua teutonum victrix?', 133–7. For Henisch, see Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 135–8; Schneider, *Einfluß von Schottelius*, 92–7; and references in Jones, *German Lexicography*, 409–10, item 707.

6 Stammerjohann, 'The *Vocabolario* and German lexicography', 57–8.

7 Christian Gueintz, letter to Prince Ludwig of Anhalt, 1 March 1640, in Krause, *Ertzschrein*, 245: 'ein wörterbuch (*Lexicon*) wie auch *phrases* oder Redensartbuch mit ehesten aus den besten Schrifften man verfertiget'; discussed in Schneider, *Einfluß von Schottelius*, 98; and Stammerjohann, 'The *Vocabolario* and German lexicography', 58. For Gueintz, see Faber du Faur, *German Baroque Literature*, 54; Kyes, 'Grammar and grammars'; and Moulin, '[Einleitung]', vii–lxvi.

8 Gueintz, *Deutscher Sprachlehre Entwurf*, 10: 'Und ist dieses ein sonderbarer ruhm der Deütschen sprache: Dan da die andere mit frembden wörtern dermassen vermischet … die Deütsche alleine kan sich als eine reine Jungfrau von frembden sprachen enthalten.'

9 For the German word, see Grimm and Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, s.v. (if it first appears in the 1638 German *Janua*, it is perhaps to be attributed to Johannes Docemius, whose additions appear in this edition: see Jones, *German Lexicography*, 189–90, item 320); for Dutch *woordboek* and *woordenboek*, see Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*, 358.

10 Gueintz, *Deutsche Rechtschreibung*, 26–176, discussed in Moulin, '[Einleitung]', xxix–xxxvi.

11 Stammerjohann, 'The *Vocabolario* and German lexicography', 58–9. For Schottelius as founder of a lexicographical tradition, see Schneider, *Einfluß von Schottelius*, 71–143.

12 Schottelius, *Teutsche Sprachkunst*, 9; Jones, 'Lingua teutonum victrix?', 136–7.

13 Schottelius, *Teutsche Sprachkunst*, 9: 'ein jedes Wort zu seinem Stamme oder Wurzel gebracht … würde'.

14 For Schottelius, Stevin, and *Stammwörter*, see McLelland, *Schottelius's 'Ausführliche Arbeit'*, 49–54, 107–14.

15 The list is in Stevin, *Beghinselen der weeghconst*, sigs. Bb3r–Cc4r. For Stevin and Goropius, see Van Hal, *'Moedertalen en taalmoeders'*, 133; and for Becanus more generally, *ibid.*, 77–139 (English summary 584–5), and Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 141–5.

16 Schottelius, *Teutsche Sprachkunst*, 483–513; for other wordlists in this text, see Jones, *German Lexicography*, 617, item 1009.

17 Schottelius, *Teutsche Sprachkunst*, 9: 'ein jedes Wort … mit beygefügten guten Exempeln auß allerhand Authoren erklärt würde'.

18 *Ibid.*: 'nun einen ziemlichen Vorraht vieler tausend *vocabulorum*, *phrasium*, und *sententiarum* auß mancherley Authoren ich gesamlet'.

19 Quoted and discussed in Stammerjohann, 'The *Vocabolario* and German lexicography', 58–9.

20 Schneider, *Einfluß von Schottelius*, 101; Stammerjohann, 'The *Vocabolario* and German lexicography', 59–60. For Harsdörffer, see Faber du Faur, *German Baroque Literature*, 135–41.

21 Harsdörffer, *Specimen philologiae Germanicae*, 167 (in a list of initiatives for the 'cultus vernaculae'): 'IV. Ut Dictionarium conficiatur, in quo omnes Linguae nostrae radices, composita, derivata, phrases, proverbia &c. in Ordinem alphabeticum redigantur V. Ut omnes termini Juridici, Feudales, Medici, Chirurgici, Technici, & omnium Mechanicorum modi loquendi, in opus absolutum colligantur'.

22 Harsdörffer, 'Unvergreiffliches wolgemeintes Bedencken, wie ein Teutsches Dictionarium oder wortbuch zuverabfassen', in Krause, *Ertzschrein*, 387–92; reference to the Accademici della Crusca at 388: 'allermassen die *Cruscani* in der Italienischen Sprache auch gethan'.

23 *Ibid.*, 392: 'solten sich wol 20 unter der Gesellschaft finden, deren ein ieder einen Buchstaben übernehmen, und noch dieses Jahr bey dem Ertzschrein einschicken solte'.

24 *Ibid.*, 390–1.

25 Schottelius, *Teutsche Sprach Kunst*, 293–313. Principle 1 (297) calls for 'die unmangelbare Zahl aller Teutschen Stammwörter'; principle 7 (299) for

the explanation 'aus dem Grunde Teutscher Deutung'; principle 8 (299) for the inclusion of vocabulary from 'Bergwerken/ Handwerken/ Mühlwerke/ schiffahrten/ Fischereien/ Waidwerken/ Buchdrukkereien/ Kräuterkunst/ Philosophei/ Künsten/ Wissenschaften/ und andern Facultäten'. For the wordlists in this edition, see Jones, *German Lexicography*, 618, item 1010.

26 Schottelius, *Teutsche Sprach Kunst*, 300–4.

27 Schottelius, *Ausführliche Arbeit*, 1269–1450 (lib. v, tractatus vi): 'Radices seu primitiva linguae germanicae'; discussed in McLelland, *Schottelius's 'Ausführliche Arbeit'*, 137–41. See also Schneider, *Einfluß von Schottelius*, 106–11; Jones, 'Lingua teutonum victrix?', 138–40; and Jones, *German Lexicography*, 618–21, item 1011.

28 Bircher, 'The Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft and Italy', 128.

29 Schottelius, letter to Ludwig of Anhalt, 7 October 1645, in Krause, *Ertzschrein*, 296–7 (296): 'Es würde die gantze Teutsche welt dem Nährenden [i.e. Ludwig] … verbunden sein, wan durch dessen Wolmögende und Hochbeliebte anordnung, ein … volständiges Wörterbuch Teutscher Sprache verfertiget … werden künte'; cf. Ball, 'Alles zu nutzen', 390–1, 404–6.

30 Schneider, *Einfluß von Schottelius*, 111–17. For Stieler, see Faber du Faur, *German Baroque Literature*, 91–4; and for his lexicographical work, see the overview in Haß-Zumkehr, *Deutsche Wörterbücher*, 76–81, and the bibliography in Jones, *German Lexicography*, 657–67, items 1066–73.

31 Sarron and his tree are identified and discussed in [Stieler], *Der Teutschen Sprache Stammbaum und Fortwachs*, sigs.)()(3r–4v. For the image, see also McLelland, *Schottelius's 'Ausführliche Arbeit'*, 52; and for Sarron, see Jones, 'Lingua teutonum victrix?', 141–2, and Owen, *Famous Druids*, 37–8 and 95.

32 Count of headwords in Jones, 'Lingua teutonum victrix?', 140; of roots in Haß-Zumkehr, *Deutsche Wörterbücher*, 83.

33 The index is to be found in 'many copies' but not all: see Jones, *German Lexicography*, 663.

34 Stieler, *Teutschen Sprache Stammbaum*, col. 111.

35 *Ibid.*, col. 693: 'Suspicor *Gran* esse a *Korn*, unde etiam Latinorum granum.'

36 Jones, 'Lingua teutonum victrix?', 142. Jones, *German Lexicography*, 663 notes that the supplement is only 'occasionally provided'. Its title, 'Nachschuß etlicher fremden und zurückgebliebenen Wörter' ('Supplement of various foreign words and words which were not inserted in their place'), should not of course be taken to imply the modern distinction between *Fremdwörter* and *Lehnwörter* sketched by Durkin, *Oxford Guide to Etymology*, 139–40.

37 Jones, *German Lexicography*, 665, item 1071.

38 For weak etymologies, see the balanced remarks of Jones, 'Early dialectology, etymology, and language history', 1112. For alleged spurious forms, see McLelland, *Schottelius's 'Ausführliche Arbeit'*, 239; and cf. Nagy, 'Defining English', 442–3.

39 Faber du Faur, *German Baroque Literature*, 94; cf. Stammerjohann, 'The *Vocabolario* and German lexicography', 61.

40 An earlier version of some of the material in the following section appeared as Considine, 'Matthias Moth'.

41 For this dictionary and its predecessors, Molbech, 'Historisk udsigt', 241–4 is still useful; more accessible is Adams and Zeeberg, 'Dictionary database', 46–9.
42 Ostersen, *Glossarium*, s.v. *Aabod*: 'gammel danske Ord'.
43 *Bibliotheca Rostgardiana*, 44, item 741: 'Minshaei Ductor in Lingvas. Lond. 1625. cum interpretatione Danica manu adscripta per totum opus'.
44 Bjerrum, 'Peder Syvs danske ordbog', 53; Hovdhaugen *et al.*, *History of Linguistics in the Nordic Countries*, Section 3.4.1.1.
45 'De studio linguae danicae' is in Bartholin, *De naturae mirabilibus quaestiones academicae*, 146–70, between 'De natura' and 'De iudicio et memoria'; for Bartholin and England, see e.g. Andersen, 'Impression of mathematics in Denmark', 320.
46 For an overview of his career, see Lundgreen-Nielsen, 'Nordic language history: Humanism', 361.
47 Bjerrum, 'Peder Syvs danske ordbog', 53; McLelland, *Schottelius's 'Ausführliche Arbeit'*, 249–50.
48 Syv, *Nogle betenkninger*, 112: 'Dernest skulde i en good orden efter A B D henstilles alde udsprings oord/ og de som af dennen komme; Saa og de som have deris brug i loven/ lægekunsten/ videnskaber/ handverker og andensteds.'
49 *Ibid.*: 'de mange fremmede/ ny/ ufornødne oord bortkastes', discussed in Bjerrum, 'Peder Syvs danske ordbog', 55–6.
50 Syv, *Nogle betenkninger*, 112–13; discussed in Bjerrum, 'Peder Syvs danske ordbog', 57.
51 Syv, *Danske sprog-kunst*, 242.
52 Syv, *Nogle betenkninger*, 149; discussed in Bjerrum, 'Peder Syvs danske ordbog', 55n7.
53 Syv, *Nogle betenkninger*, 149–50: 'da skal det ikke have mangel paa fornødne oord. Hvilke kunne en stoor deel opledes i gamle skrivter/ naar mand ikke elders haver dennem … Og dersom mand/ lige som ved malm/ gnier rusten og skimelen vel af/ og fører dem i brug/ hielpe de meget til Sprogets siirlighed …'.
54 *Ibid.*, 156–8, 159–65.
55 See Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 235–43.
56 See e.g. Worm, *Museum Wormianum*, 354.
57 Bjerrum, 'Peder Syvs danske ordbog', 57.
58 *Ibid.*, 58.
59 Syv, *Nogle betenkninger*, 101: 'Danmark/ Norrig/ Sverige/ Flanderen/ Engeland havde eet sprog'; *ibid.*, 107–8: 'Vi kunne jo saa længe forandre oordene med bogstavenes tilsættelse/ fratagelse/ forvexling at endogsaa Hebraisk/ Grædsk/ og Latin kunne henføres af Laplændsk/ det Danske af Tyrkesk/ fordi *Karga* og *Krage*.' Turkish *karga* and Danish *krage* both mean 'crow'.
60 For Syv's use of the *Glossarium juridico-danicum*, see Bjerrum, 'Peder Syvs danske ordbog', 61; for the *Interpreter* and the antiquaries, see Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 178.
61 Bjerrum, 'Peder Syvs danske ordbog', 59, 64.

62 *Ibid.*, 66.
63 *Ibid.*, 60.
64 *Ibid.*, 60–2, 67.
65 Grüner-Nielsen, 'Matthias Moths landsindsamling', 111–13, reproducing a page from the specimen at 112; Bjerrum, 'Peder Syvs danske ordbog', 67.
66 Bjerrum, 'Peder Syvs danske ordbog', 69.
67 For Harsdörffer's thoughts on dialect as expressed in other texts, see Faber du Faur, *German Baroque Literature*, 138 for his *Poetischer Trichter* of 1650; and Born, 'Evolution of modern standard German', 117 for his *Teutsche Sekretarius* of 1655–9.
68 They are Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek (KB), MSS GkS 769 2°–775 2°; see the bibliography for fuller details.
69 For Jón Ólafsson, see Liberman, 'Icelandic part in Pallas's dictionary', 392.
70 For Guðmundur Ólafsson, see *ibid.*, 391–2; for Croft, see Read, 'Projected English dictionaries', 198; for Sainte-Palaye, see his own *Dictionnaire historique*, Vol. I, iii.
71 For him, see Benedikz, 'Árni Magnússon', esp. 90–1.
72 Geddes, 'Three Scottish poems', 439.
73 Grüner-Nielsen, 'Den ældste landsindsamling', 38; Klindt-Jensen, *History of Scandinavian Archaeology*, 19; context for these surveys is in Fox, 'Printed questionnaires', 594–5.
74 Matthias Moth, letter to the bishops of Denmark, 30 November 1697, in Grüner-Nielsen, 'Matthias Moths landsindsamling', 117:

> Velædle højærværdige Hr. Biskop. Som man til Fædernelandets Reputation sindet er efterhaanden at samle og en Gang til Trykken at befordre et *dansk Lexicon*, saa fuldkommet som det haves kunde, saa er min venligste Begiering. Hr. Biskop udi hans Stift vilde se sig om nogen visse Personer (*Præster* paa Landet, *Skolers Betjente* eller andre vor danske Sprogs Elskere og derudi vel forfarne), som til samme Værk noget kunde contribuere.

75 *Ibid.*: 'Bemeldte Personer ville være saa mange i Tallet, at *paa hver ens Part* ikke kom uden to eller *i det højeste tre Bogstaver* af Alfabetet at forfærdige.'
76 *Ibid.*: 'Methoden, anlangende *Glosernes Orden, skal være alfabetisk* (mens ikke Derivata og Composita at sættes under sine Radicibus).'
77 *Ibid.*: 'Og ville forskrevne Personer erindres, at de med muligste Flid antegne ikke alenests Gloserne i sig selv … med deres Significationibus, Genuina og Translatis, mens endog de *Phrases* og *Loqvendi-formulas*.'
78 *Ibid.*: 'ikke alenests Gloserne i sig selv (baade de brugelige og de, som ikke bruges uden af gemene Folk)'.
79 *Ibid.*: 'Især vilde de lade dennem være angelegen flitteligen at sanke alle de *Navne*, som Skibsfolk, Handværksfolk, Bønder etc. bruge til deres Redskab, saa vel som Nomina Avium, Piscium, Herbarum etc. in Summa Nomenclaturas omnium rerum.'
80 *Ibid.*: 'saa ville hver de af ovenbemeldte Personer slige *ubrugelige Bønderord* med Flid samle, ikke alene de som begynde af de hannem deputerede Bogstaver, men endog *paa det ganske Alfabet*'.

81 *Ibid.*: 'De, som nu dette Værk dennem paatage, vilde derpaa flittig arbejde, at det om et halvt Aars Tid, eller i det højeste om et Aar, kunde være færdigt.'
82 KB, MS GkS 773 2°, Vol. I, fos. 5r–9r; see Grüner-Nielsen, 'Matthias Moths landsindsamling', 130–1; cf. Grüner-Nielsen, 'Ældste landsindsamling', 54–62.
83 KB, MS GkS 773 2°, Vol. II, fo. 1r–v; see Grüner-Nielsen, 'Matthias Moths landsindsamling', 118–19.
84 KB, MS GkS 773 2°, Vol. I, fos. 127r–128v; see Grüner-Nielsen, 'Matthias Moths landsindsamling', 128.
85 KB, MS GkS 773 2°, Vol. II, fo. 104r: 'Atque haec sunt pauca illa et leuia, quae in chartas conjeci, non ut vellem, sed ut licuit per otium, quod mihi certe adeo fuit angustum, ut statuissem huic labori me plane subducere.'
86 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, fos. 98–126; and Vol. II, fos. 262–325; see Grüner-Nielsen, 'Ældste landsindsamling', 62–76.
87 Grüner-Nielsen, 'Ældste landsindsamling', 99–100.
88 KB, MS GkS 773 2°, Vol. III; see Grüner-Nielsen, 'Matthias Moths landsindsamling', 121–2. Syv had apparently borrowed Kok's materials for A–D before the latter's death: see Bjerrum, 'Peder Syvs danske ordbog', 67.
89 KB, MS GkS 773 2°, Vol. II, fos. 2–3. Cf. *OED*, s.v. *last* n², sense 2a.
90 KB, MS GkS 773 2°, Vol. II, fos. 7–12 and 222–40.
91 *Ibid.*, Vol. II, fos. 13–16.
92 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, fo. 4; Vol. II, fos. 77–84.
93 See e.g. *ibid.*, Vol. I, fo. 26; and Grüner-Nielsen, 'Matthias Moths landsindsamling', 122.
94 The date is given in KB, MS GkS 769 2°, Vol. I, fo. 3r.
95 They share the KB shelfmark GkS 769 2°.
96 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, fo. 143r.
97 For the word *agnete*, see Kalkar, *Ordbog til det ældre danske sprog*, s.v.
98 KB, MS GkS 774 2°.
99 Molbech, 'Historisk udsigt', 265.
100 *Ibid.*, 248–9.
101 See Birgegård, *Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeld*, 103.
102 Molbech, 'Historisk udsigt', 266.
103 Grüner-Nielsen, 'Ældste landsindsamling', 81.
104 Cf. Mugglestone, *Lost for Words*, 107–8.
105 Jespersen, *History of Denmark*, 195.
106 For the legal code, see *ibid.*, 45–8.
107 The works of Pontoppidan and Gerner are in Bertelsen, *Danske grammatikere*, Vols. II (entire volume); and III, 11–146 and 251–317 respectively.
108 Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, 282; for *Volkslied* and similar forms, see *ibid.*, 3.
109 *Ibid.*, 282–3.
110 For Addison, see Broadus, 'Addison's influence'.
111 Michaelis, *Dissertation*, 12.

112 See Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, 3–22.
113 The following section is based on Considine, 'Leibniz as lexicographer?'.
114 Leibniz, letter to Baron von Göritz, 9 January 1697, quoted by Schneider, *Einfluß von Schottelius*, 65: 'nous dressons une *Antifruchtbringende Gesellschaft* … et nous donnerons droit de bourgeoisie aux mots que les *Fruchtbringende* avoient bannis de l'Allemande.' See esp. the classic Schulenburg, *Leibniz als Sprachforscher*; and De Mauro and Formigari, *Leibniz, Humboldt, and the Origins of Comparativism*, 3–132; the bibliography by Dutz, *Zeichentheorie und Sprachwissenschaft bei G. W. Leibniz*, is supplemented to 1990 by Müller and Heinekamp, *Leibniz-Bibliographie*, 26–9.
115 See Considine, 'Leibniz and lexicography'.
116 Schulenburg, *Leibniz als Sprachforscher*, 116n6.
117 Leibniz, letter to Hiob Ludolf, 18 April 1692, in *Sämtliche Schriften*, Vol. I.8, 229 (trans. John T. Waterman in Leibniz and Ludolf, *Leibniz and Ludolf on Things Linguistic*, 25–6); Ludolf's reply is in his letter of 14 June 1692 to Leibniz, in Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften* I.8, 316 (trans. Waterman in Leibniz and Ludolf, *Leibniz and Ludolf on Things Linguistic*, 28). For the importance of dialect study to Leibniz, see e.g. his *Collectanea etymologica*, 272f. ('Unvorgreiffliche Gedancken', §32); and Aarsleff, 'Study and use of etymology', 186.
118 Leibniz, *Collectanea etymologica*, 284 ('Unvorgreiffliche Gedancken', §51).
119 Meier, letter to Leibniz, 22 April 1699, in Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften*, Vol. I.17, 137–8.
120 Leibniz, *Nouveaux essais sur l'entendement humain*, in *Sämtliche Schriften*, Vol. VI.6, 286; Schulenburg, *Leibniz als Sprachforscher*, 224n40; Johann Georg Eckhardt, 'Praefatio', in Leibniz, *Collectanea etymologica*, 52–3.
121 Leibniz, *Collectanea etymologica*, Part II, 238–315 ('Excerpta Meieriana'); and Part I, 253–314 ('Unvorgreiffliche Gedanken').
122 *Ibid.*, Part I, 274 ('Unvorgreiffliche Gedancken', §33): 'ein eigen Buch vor durchgehende Worte, ein anders vor Kunst-Worte, und letzlich eines vor alte und Land Worte'.
123 *Ibid.*, Part I, 274 ('Unvorgreiffliche Gedancken', §33): '*Sprachbrauch*, auff Lateinisch Lexicon … *Sprach-Schatz*, oder *cornu copiae* … Glossarium, oder *Sprachquell*'; 275–6 ('Unvorgreiffliche Gedancken', §36).
124 *Ibid.*, Part I, 276–7 ('Unvorgreiffliche Gedancken', §§37–8).
125 This was a practical binding for a large working manuscript: the four folio volumes of J. G. Sparwenfeld's *Lexicon slavonicum*, completed before 1722, are similarly bound in grey-blue pasteboard, but with leather spine and corners, as is the single large volume of the draft version of this dictionary; Birgegård, *Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeld*, 5, 12.
126 LeibnizCentral, 'Zettelsammlung von Martin Fogel'. I am very grateful to Dr Friedrich Hülsmann of the G. W. Leibniz Bibliothek for introducing me to this collection.
127 Cevolini, *De arte excerpendi*, 82–3, 113–14 (I am grateful to Ann Blair for my copy of this book).

128 Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 270–1.
129 For instance Hannover, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, MS IV, 470 is a folder in which fos. 4–14 and 21–3 are loose slips; see also Schulenburg, *Leibniz als Sprachforscher*, 225–6.
130 Cf. Malcolm, 'Thomas Harrison', 217.
131 Scheel, 'Leibniz' Pläne', 151.
132 'Ex literis meis ad cl. Mejerus Theologus Bremensem 4° Novemb. 1695'. The text, though not the endorsement, is transcribed in Schulenburg, *Leibniz als Sprachforscher*, 279n323.
133 Cf. Considine, 'Stephen Skinner's *Etymologicon*', 127.
134 For Junius on Willeram, see Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 223–4; for the glossary of Lindenbrog, see *ibid.*, 257–8.
135 For Kiliaan, see *ibid.*, 145–52; Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*, 359–63; and Van Rossem, *Portret van een woordenaar* (I am grateful to Toon Van Hal for my copy of the last).
136 For Meric Casaubon, Junius, and Greek origins see Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 204–6, 220–6.
137 For Spelman, see *ibid.*, 179–88.

6 The academy tradition from the seventeenth century to 1750: England, Brandenburg/Prussia, and Spain

1 Sharpe, *Sir Robert Cotton*, 27f.
2 Cf. Kanthak, *Akademiegedanke*, esp. Chapter 10 (64–6): 'Die absolutistische Institutionalisierung der Akademiebewegung und die Eliminierung ihrer generalreformatorischen Zweckbestimmung'; and Goldgar, *Impolite Learning*, 232–3.
3 Cant, 'David Steuart Erskine', 12–19; Rennie, *Jamieson's Dictionary*, 38.
4 Quin, 'Irish studies', 169; McDowell, 'Main narrative', 45–6.
5 For a lexicographical perspective on the early English academy projects, see Osselton, *Branded Words*, 121–31. For an overview of the early modern study of the English language in the context of the European academies, see *inter alios* Woodhouse, 'Reluctant academicals'; and cf. Grayson, 'Growth of linguistic national consciousness'.
6 Concise overviews of the two societies are DeCoursey, 'Society of Antiquaries'; and Hunter, 'Founder members of the Royal Society'.
7 R. H., *New Atlantis*, 43. Sir Geoffrey Keynes pointed out in an argument for Hooke's authorship (*Bibliography of Dr. Robert Hooke*, 4) that R. H. refers in his *New Atlantis* to microscopic observations corresponding exactly with unpublished ones made by Hooke, which he is unlikely to have communicated to anyone but a member of the group who became the first fellows of the Royal Society – and since none of them shared his initials, the only R. H. who could have known about those observations was Hooke himself. This argument seems quite convincing to me, though the historian of science Marie Boas Hall saw the attribution as 'highly suppositious' (review of Keynes, *Bibliography of Dr. Robert Hooke*, 420).

8 I quote from the text as given in Evelyn, *Memoirs*, Vol. IV, 146.
9 *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, 146–7.
10 Sprat, *History*, 39–40 ('Modern Academies for Language'), 40–5 ('A proposal for erecting an English Academy'; quotation at 42); discussed in Osselton, *Branded Words*, 124–5.
11 I discuss it in Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 297–306.
12 Wilkins, *Essay*, sig. a2r.
13 For Petty's wordlist, see Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 297.
14 Pellisson: Hooke, *Diary* 307–8 (20 August 1677); and cf. other material bearing on Continental academies and societies in Rostenberg, *Library of Robert Hooke*, 131–3; Schottelius: now London, British Library, 628 a. 7, not in the list of Hooke's surviving books in Keynes, *Bibliography of Dr. Robert Hooke*, xiv–xv (nor the supplementary material in Rostenberg, *Library of Robert Hooke*, 120).
15 Runs of such books are in *Bibliotheca Hookiana* (reproduced in Rostenberg, *Library of Robert Hooke*, 141–221), e.g. 4–5, nos. 160–9; 15, nos. 307–28.
16 Marsden, 'Remarks on the *Sumatran* languages'; and 'Observations on the language of the people commonly called *Gypsies*'.
17 See Osselton, *Branded Words*, 127–9.
18 Knightly Chetwood, manuscript biography of Roscommon, quoted in Niemeyer, 'Earl of Roscommon's academy', 434.
19 Thomas Burnett of Kemney, letter to Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibniz, 14 June 1696, in the latter's *Sämtliche Schriften*, Vol. I.12, 650:

> On travaille sur l'impressione d'un dictionaire nouvau et ample en Englois pour les mots de commune usage, et pour les termes des sciences et des arts al imitatione de celui del accademie fransoise: qui sera quelque chose (aparament) curieuse: la proprieté des môts et des phrases sont demontrés par les plus habils ecrivains Englois dont on a tiré des exemples. Il sera en folio et sera achevé d'imprimer pour October qui vient, on a travaillé longtemp sur la compilatione.

A note identifies the dictionary as Harris' *Lexicon technicum* of 1704, but quite apart from the date, this does not fit the description at all, unless Burnett has in mind first a general dictionary and second a separate one 'pour les termes des sciences et des arts al imitatione de celui del accademie fransoise', i.e. in imitation of that of Thomas Corneille. The fifth edition of Phillips' dictionary was advertised in June or July 1696 (*Present State of Europe* 7.6 ('for the month of June 1696'): 174).
20 Leibniz, letter to Claude Nicaise, 1696, in *Otium hanoueranum*, 61:

> Les *Anglois* ont entrepris de donner un *grand dictionaire de leur langve*, qu'ils prétendent de voir faire la nique à celuy de vôtre Academie. J'ay écrit à un amy, qui m'en a donné part, pour luy marquer, qu'ils doivent aussi joindre les termes techniques des sciences, des arts & des professions: & que s'ils auront de la peine à égaler le veritable dictionaire de l'Academie Françoise, ils pourront surpasser celuy qu'on y a joint ces sortes de termes.

21 Phillips, *New World of Words* (1696), title page: 'with Large Additions and Improvements from the best *English* and Foreign Authors, viz. Lord *Bacon*, *Spelman*, *Blunt*, *Furettiere*, *Chauvin*, *Ozanam*, &c.' As noted by Starnes and

Noyes, *English Dictionary*, 56, *Chauvin* refers to Etienne Chauvin, *Lexicon rationale* (1692), a philosophical dictionary in Latin, and *Ozanam* to Jacques Ozanam, *Dictionnaire mathématique* (1691).

22 *History of the Works of the Learned* 1.5 (May 1699): 316.

23 For them, see e.g. Osselton, *Branded Words*, 128–31.

24 [Defoe], *Essay upon Projects*, 233.

25 Rostenberg, *Library of Robert Hooke*, 96, 89.

26 The collection is London, British Library, MS Lansdowne 845: Salvino's 'Discorsi' are fos. 1r–4r and 5r–8v respectively, and other items are Lorenzo Magalotti's 'Paradiso perduto', a partial translation of Milton's *Paradise Lost* (fos. 14r–24v), and Oxford and Westminster orations from the 1670s onwards. Magalotti's translation can be no later than 1712, the year of his death, and no dated item in the collection is later than that year. Yates' discussion is in 'Italian academies', 20.

27 E.g. Molyneux, *Dioptrica nova* (1692), 255 (citing the entry *occhiale*); Bohun, *Geographical Dictionary* (1693), s.n. *Florence* on the part of the *Vocabolario* in establishing the status of Tuscan; Wotton, *Reflections* (1694), 27 on the *Vocabolario* as evidence for the stability of Italian since the time of Boccaccio. Earlier than these, I note only Stubbe, *Clamor* (1657), 48, asserting that Italian words beginning *inp-* in Florio 'are not to be confuted in this case by *della Crusca*' (where they are spelt *imp-*); the passage from Wilkins mentioned above; and Lassells, *Voyage of Italy* (1670), 224: 'The rich *Dictionary* made by this famous company, and called from them, the *Crusca*, was forty yeares in compileing, but it will be in *vogue* as long as men shall speak *Italian*.'

28 Read, 'American projects', 1141–8.

29 Several of these calls are quoted in Sledd and Kolb, *Dr. Johnson's Dictionary*, 6.

30 For Addison as lexicographer, see Segar, 'Dictionary making', 210; and Reddick, *Making of Johnson's Dictionary*, 14–15. The quotation is from a letter of Thomas Birch to Lord Orrery, 13 August 1747, in Boyle, *Orrery Papers*, Vol. II, 6.

31 For the spurious letter, attributed to Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, see Montagu, *Complete Letters*, Vol. I, xviii, 371; for the quotations, see Johnson's life of Addison, in his *Lives of the Poets*, Vol. III, 16.

32 Quoted in Segar, 'Dictionary making', 210–11.

33 It is reproduced as the frontispiece of Philips, *Poems* (1937); with discussion in Segar, 'Dictionary making', 211–13. The sole copy, in the collection of T. G. Jardine-Binnie when Segar wrote, is now at the National Library of Wales. For the date, see Robert Knight, letter to John Molesworth, 10 November 1724, in Philips, *Poems* (1937), xliv (and Segar, 'Dictionary making', 212), which refers to 'proposals … for printing the [*sic*] Mr. Philips' *English Dictionary*' as recently received.

34 *The Critick* 7 (17 February 1718): 2.

35 Spence, *Observations*, Vol. I, 170–1, items 389–90. For the authority for the date, see *ibid.*, Vol. II, 716–17; and Vol. I, lxi–lxii. For Pope's projected edition of his own works, see *ibid.*, Vol. I, 258, item 622.

36 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, 170, item 388.
37 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, 374, item 953.
38 *Ibid.*, item 954.
39 Yeo, *Encyclopaedic Visions*, 40 (and cf. references to the *Lexicon technicum* as a 'dictionary' at 122); Boswell, *Life*, Vol. I (1994), 161 (Boswell, *Life* (1934), Vol. I, 218–19).
40 Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, Vol. I, xxi–xxvi.
41 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, i.
42 Chambers, *Some considerations*, quoted in DeMaria, *Johnson's Dictionary and the Language of Learning*, 6.
43 Chambers, *Some considerations*, quoted in Johnson, *English Language*, xxvi–xxvii.
44 For the price, see Yeo, *Encyclopaedic Visions*, 38, 53–4; for the publishing history, and Chambers' life, *ibid.*, *passim*.
45 For borrowings by Nathan Bailey, and by Thomas Dyche and William Pardon, see Starnes and Noyes, *English Dictionary*, 119, 132–3. For plagiarism in *A New and Complete Dictionary of Arts and Sciences* (1754), see Yeo, *Encyclopaedic Visions*, 52; and for Chambers and the *Encyclopédie*, see *ibid.*, 125–8. For Johnson's use of the *Cyclopaedia*, see Lynch, 'Johnson's encyclopedia', 137–41.
46 Texts in Harnack, *Geschichte*, Vol. II, 4–39; overview in Zeydel, 'German language in the Prussian Academy of Sciences', 126–9.
47 Leibniz, 'Brevis designatio', 1: 'Cum remotae *Gentium Origines* Historiam transcendant, *Linguae* nobis praestant veterum monumentorum vicem.' For this text, see e.g. Droixhe, *La Linguistique et l'appel de l'histoire*, 37–8, 86, and 133; and Borst, *Turmbau von Babel*, 1475–8.
48 'Generalinstruction', appended to the founding charter of the society of 11 July 1700 and quoted in Harnack, *Geschichte*, Vol. I, 98: 'Damit auch die uralte teutsche Hauptsprache in ihrer natürlichen, abständigen Reinigkeit und Selbststand erhalten werde …'; an earlier statement is Daniel Ernst Jablonski, letter to Leibniz, 23 March 1700, *ibid.*, Vol. II, 71: 'dass man auch auf die Cultur der Teutschen Sprache bey dieser Fundation gedencken möchte'. Cf. Stammerjohann, 'The *Vocabolario* and German lexicography', 64.
49 'Generalinstruction', quoted in Harnack, *Geschichte*, Vol. I, 98. For a more ambitious dictionary project which may have been presented to Friedrich, see Stammerjohann, 'The *Vocabolario* and German lexicography', 63.
50 Leibniz, memorandum to Friedrich I, king in Prussia, early 1702, quoted in Harnack, *Geschichte*, Vol. II, 148: 'Man hat in dem Alterthum der teutschen Sprache nicht wenig endecket … und hoffet, dermahleins zu einem rechtschaffenen teutschen Wörter-Schaz gelangen zu können.'
51 Cf. *ibid.*, Vol. I, 105–6.
52 For the date of his membership, see *ibid.*, Vol. I, 115; and for commentary, see Zeydel, 'German language in the Prussian Academy', 132.
53 Bray, *Matthias Kramer*, 45–53.

54 J. T. Jablonski, letter to Leibniz, 7 February 1711, quoted in Zeydel, 'German language in the Prussian Academy', 132: 'die Verfertigung eines "vollständigen", wie der König sich ausdrucket, Wörterbuchs'.
55 D. E. Jablonski, 'Entwurf eines deutschen, von der Preussischen Societät der Wissenschaften herauszugebenden Wörterbuchs', in Harnack, *Geschichte*, Vol. II, 223: 'die Ausarbeitung eines dreifachen Lexici oder teutschen Wortbuchs, nemlich Etymologici, Technici und Usualis'.
56 Jablonski, 'Entwurf eines deutschen Wörterbuchs', *ibid.*, 224: 'Die Auslegund Erklärung der Wörter, soll nicht durch eine fremde, etwa die latein- oder französische Sprache, sondern mit andern teutschen gleichdeutigen Worten … geschehen … Es wäre dann dass man lieber dem Exempel des italienischen Dictionarii della Crusca folgen wolte.' Cf. Stammerjohann, 'The *Vocabolario* and German lexicography', 65.
57 Harnack, *Geschichte*, Vol. I, 189; cf. Goldgar, *Impolite Learning*, 232.
58 Zeydel, 'German language in the Prussian Academy', 134–42.
59 Stammerjohann, 'The *Vocabolario* and German lexicography', 65–6.
60 Hertzberg, memorandum to Friedrich II, 4 January 1792, in Harnack, *Geschichte*, Vol. II, 322: 'pour composer et publier … un Dictionnaire de la langue allemande … et d'imiter ainsi les académies de France, d'Espagne, de Russie et de Toscane'.
61 Hertzberg, memorandum to Friedrich II, *ibid.*, 323–4: 'd'executer le grand projet philosophique de Leibniz … et de préparer … un Dictionnaire encore plus parfait que celui de Sr. Adelung, et en même tems une histoire complette de la langue allemande'.
62 Zeydel, 'German language in the Prussian Academy', 143–6.
63 Entry counts from Gemmingen, 'Los inicios', 167, 169; the same counts are offered by Alvar Ezquerra, *De antiguos y nuevos diccionarios del español*, 59.
64 Gemmingen, 'Los inicios', 167–8; Smith-Stark, 'Lexicography in New Spain', 15–16.
65 See Pountain, *History of the Spanish Language*, 122–4; and, for the quotation, Rojinsky, *Companion to Empire*, 93–9.
66 See Tavoni, 'Renaissance linguistics: Western Europe', 7.
67 Cf. Pountain, *History of the Spanish Language*, 128–9, 141–2.
68 Entry count from Carriazo Ruiz and Mancho Duque, 'Los comienzos', 222; the same count is offered by Alvar Ezquerra, *De antiguos y nuevos diccionarios del español*, 80.
69 Carriazo Ruiz and Mancho Duque, 'Los comienzos', 221; Covarrubias, *Tesoro*, 187 (end of entry *candela*): 'Y porque mi instituto no es tratar las materias ad longum, sino tan solamente las etymologias de los vocablos'. Cf. Osselton, 'Alphabet fatigue', 81–90.
70 Skinner, *Etymologicon linguae anglicanae*, sig. C4r: 'si longas ex Authoribus periodos, et, exemplo *Covarruviae Etymologi Hispani*, quicquid vel Poetae, vel Historici, vel Jurisconsulti de singulis vocibus dixerunt, liberaliter congessissem, adeo intumuisset iste, utcunque nimis magnus liber, ut quodvis vel maximum plaustrum implevisset, imo Elephantis dorso impositum ipsum elisisset'.

71 See Covarrubias, *Tesoro*, sig. ¶8r (dedication), citing 'las obras del glorioso San Isidoro Doctor de las Españas'.
72 Malkiel, *Etymology*, 6; 'Hispano-Arabic "marrano"', 181.
73 For Covarrubias' print run, see Terry, 'Spanish lexicography', 958. To put the figure of 1,000 in perspective, the *maximum* print run normally permitted for any book in England was 1,500 (the King's Printers were allowed more): see Rees and Wakely, *Publishing, Politics, and Culture*, 66–7.
74 Carriazo Ruiz and Mancho Duque, 'Los comienzos', 231.
75 For the early history of the academy, see Zamora Vicente, *La Real Academia Española*, 23–33; *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, Vol. I, ix–xli.
76 See Alvarez de Miranda, 'La Real Academia Española', 404.
77 *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, Vol. I, i: 'El principal fin, que tuvo el Real Académia Española para su formación, fué hacer un Diccionario copioso y exacto, en que se viesse la grandéza y poder de la Léngua.' For the context of the dictionary in the early history of the academy, see *ibid*., Vol. I, x–xi.
78 Zamora Vicente, *La Real Academia Española*, 26 dates the first meeting; see also *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, Vol. I, xiv (charter of 1713), xxiii (statutes).
79 *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, Vol. I, xi: 'un Diccionario al exemplo de las dos celebradissimas Académias de París y Florencia'.
80 Quotation from *ibid*. For the motto and the badge, see Zamora Vicente, *La Real Academia Española*, 27.
81 *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, Vol. I, xi.
82 *Ibid*., Vol. I, i–ii.
83 *Ibid*., Vol. I, xii.
84 For him, see Carlyon, *Andrés González de Barcia*, 5–7 (and, for the *Planta, y methodo*, *ibid*., 136); and Zamora Vicente, *La Real Academia Española*, 28 and 67.
85 Barcia, *Planta, y methodo*, 3: 'Lo primero se han de ponér todas, y solas las Vozes appelatívas Españólas … Y por consiguiente quedarán excluídas del Diccionário todas las Vozes, y Nombres próprios de Persónas, y Lugáres … Y tambien se excusarán todas las Palabras, que significan desnudamente objéto indecente.'
86 *Ibid*.: 'observando rigurosamente el Orden Alphabético', but 'Ponér las vozes primitívas con su Definición … y después las derivádas, compuestas, y sinónymas; los Epithétos mas usádos, y los Refránes.'
87 *Ibid*., 3–4: 'En cada Voz, expressár su qualidád: conviéne á sabér, si es antiquáda, ò usáda; si es baxa, ò rústica [etc.] … Annotár, si la Voz fuére de Lengua estraña, Francésa, Italiána, Africána, &c. Quando se halláre venír la Voz de otra Lengua; no averiguarle de mas arríba su Etymología.' For the provision of etymologies in the *Diccionario*, see also Zgusta, *Lexicography Then and Now*, 8.
88 Barcia, *Planta, y methodo*, 4: 'Annotár las variedádes, que se halláren en el escribír algúnas Vozes, aprobando la mejór, y desechando las demás'.
89 *Ibid*., 5: 'Desterrár las Vozes nuévas, inventádas sin prudente elección; y restituír las antíguas … como … por *Pontificár*, *Presidír en la Iglésia Universál*'. The form *pontificar* in this sense appears to have been rare: the Real Academica Española's CORDE database gives an example of *ante* 1598 and three from the same text of *c*. 1619, but then nothing until 1789.

90 *Ibid.*, 7–8.
91 *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, Vol. I, xxxiii (division of letters E, F, G, H and L, I and J, K, and O).
92 For the early academicians and the duties which kept some of them from lexicography, see Zamora Vicente, *La Real Academia Española*, 27–31 and 63–97; for the 'despreocupado e irresponsable aristócrata' Jaime de Solis y Gante, *ibid.*, 90 and 106n71; for his kinsman the duque de Montellano, *ibid.*, 75.
93 See Beaulieux, 'Gestation', 48–50.
94 D'Olivet[?], memorandum of 24 January 1727, 27: among dictionaries which might be models for the revision of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* was 'à notre grand honte celui de l'Académie de Madrid'.
95 *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, Vol. I, xxxviii (division of prelims).
96 Both *Aprobacion* and *Licencia*, of 14 and 25 September 1724 respectively, are *ibid.*, Vol. I, sig. ¶3r.
97 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, ii: 'Como basa y fundamento de este Diccionario, se han puesto los Autóres que ha parecido à la Académia han tratado la Léngua Española con la mayor propriedád y elegáncia'; translation from Pountain, *History of the Spanish Language*, 168–9. For Faxardo, see Zamora Vicente, *La Real Academia Española*, 74.
98 Alvarez de Miranda, 'La Real Academia Española', 406–7.
99 Alvar Ezquerra, *De antiguos y nuevos diccionarios del español*, 43–4; quotation from *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, Vol. I, v.
100 Alvarez de Miranda, 'La Real Academia Española', 405–6; entry count of regionalisms from Alvar Ezquerra, *De antiguos y nuevos diccionarios del español*, 41.
101 *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, Vol. I, xlii–xlvii ('Discurso proemial sobre el origen de la lengua Castellana'); xlviii–lx ('Discurso proemial sobre las etymologias'); lxi–lxxxiv ('Discurso proemial de la orthographia de la lengua Castellana'); lxxxv–lxxxxvi (lists of authors and abbreviations).
102 Entry count from Alvar Ezquerra, *De antiguos y nuevos diccionarios del español*, 263n55; for a lower count ('Plus de 37,600'), see Alvarez de Miranda, 'La Real Academia Española', 407n10.
103 Alvarez de Miranda, 'La Real Academia Española', 408.
104 D'Olivet[?], memorandum of 24 January 1727, 27: 'celui de l'Académie de Madrid … que l'on peut regarder comme un modèle parfait de dictionnaire'.
105 *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, Vol. I, viii: 'ardiente zelo por la glória de la Nación'.
106 Rodríguez Ortiz and Garriga Escribano, 'La teoría lexicográfica', 35–7.
107 Alvarez de Miranda, 'La Real Academia Española', 408–9.
108 *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. III, 331; for Hertzberg, see above, p. 110; Pougens, 'Plan', 95.
109 Quotation from the title page of *Diccionario de la lengua castellana* (1780): 'reducido á un tomo para su mas fácil uso'. Entry count from Alvar Ezquerra, *De antiguos y nuevos diccionarios del español*, 263.

110 See Terry, 'Spanish lexicography', 960.
111 See Fabre, *Stanislas-Auguste Poniatowski*, 491; and Butterwick, *Poland's Last King and English Culture*, 232 and 241.
112 See Brock, *Nationalism and Populism*, 13; and Adamska Sałaciak, 'Linde's dictionary', 69–70.
113 See Gencer, 'İbrahim Müteferrika', 155, 175 for an Arabic–Turkish dictionary from this press. For a Persian–Turkish dictionary, see Floor, 'Čāp' (1990).

7 Samuel Johnson and Johann Christoph Adelung

1 Entry count from Schäfer, *Early Modern English Lexicography*, Vol. I, 51. Starnes and Noyes, *English Dictionary*, 13–83 takes the story from Cawdrey to the beginning of the eighteenth century.
2 Starnes and Noyes, *English Dictionary*, 84–9, 117.
3 *Ibid.*, 117–25.
4 DeMaria, *Life of Samuel Johnson*, 110–11.
5 Hawkins, *Life of Samuel Johnson*, 170.
6 For Hawkins and the contract, see *ibid.*, 344; and Boswell, *Life*, Vol. I (1994), 135n4.
7 Johnson, 'Scheme', 379 (transcription simplified); corresponding to Johnson, *Plan*, 57. *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* (1694), sig. ā3r: 'qu'une Langue vivante peust parvenir à estre fixée'.
8 Johnson, 'Scheme', 423, 427 (transcription simplified); corresponding to Johnson, *Plan*, 57.
9 Johnson, 'Scheme', 421; corresponding to Johnson, *Plan*, 54. Cf. Osselton, *Branded Words*, 135.
10 D'Olivet, *Histoire*, 102–3: 'Je voudrois que la France pût avoir ses auteurs classiques, aussi-bien que l'Italie. Pour cela il nous faudroit un certain nombre de livres, qui fussent déclarez exempts de fautes, quant au style.'
11 Boileau was arguing that the Académie should think ambitiously about the establishment of a canon of stylistically faultless great works, rather than being 'toujours bornée a son Dictionnaire': *ibid.*, 102. The passage in d'Olivet appears in Boileau, *Oeuvres*, Vol. I (1740), lxiii.
12 Johnson, 'Scheme', 423; corresponding to Johnson, *Plan*, 56.
13 Johnson, 'Scheme', 393 (transcription simplified).
14 Annotations on the 'Scheme', in Johnson, *English Language*, 395; the same annotator referred again to Faber's *Thesaurus* in *ibid.*, 409.
15 See Johnson, *Plan*, 40.
16 Johnson, 'Scheme', 407, 411; discussed in Reddick, *Making of Johnson's Dictionary*, 45–54.
17 Johnson, 'Scheme', 419.
18 For Locke and Johnson's sense-ordering, see Reddick, *Making of Johnson's Dictionary*, 39.
19 Johnson, *Plan*, 55; see also 56n8.

20 Thomas Birch, letter to Philip Yorke, earl of Hardwicke, 1748, quoted in Fleeman, *Bibliography*, Vol. I, 142.
21 Johnson, *Plan*, 27.
22 *Ibid.*, 30–1.
23 *Ibid.*, 58.
24 *Bibliothèque raisonée des ouvrages des savans de l'Europe* 39 (July–September 1747): 233–4: 'La tâche est aussi pénible que peu brillante, et convient mieux à une Société qu'à un particulier', but the *Plan* is 'écrite avec une pureté et une élégance peu communes. Si l'Ouvrage est dans le mème goût, les Anglois n'auront pas à se plaindre de l'avoir longtemps attendu.'
25 On the question of whether Johnson knew the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, see Gwin Kolb and Robert DeMaria, Jr.'s introduction to Johnson, *English Language*, xxi.
26 Boswell, *Life*, Vol. I (1994), 137 (transcription simplified; Boswell, *Life* (1934), Vol. I, 186).
27 Philip, earl of Chesterfield, untitled essay, *The World*, 100 (28 November 1754).
28 Hawkins, *Life of Samuel Johnson*, 175. Cf. Sledd and Kolb, *Dr. Johnson's Dictionary*, 4; and Reddick, *Making of Johnson's Dictionary*, 27–31.
29 Johnson, 'Preface', 74.
30 Reddick, *Making of Johnson's Dictionary*, 33–7, reproducing a marked-up page facing 139; another is reproduced in DeMaria, *Johnson's Dictionary and the Language of Learning*, facing 3, and all the extant books marked for the *Dictionary* are listed in Reddick, *Making of Johnson's Dictionary*, 204n35.
31 Reddick, *Making of Johnson's Dictionary*, 37–43.
32 *Ibid.*, 43–5, 51.
33 Johnson, 'Preface', 91; cf. Boswell, *Life*, Vol. I (1994), 211 (Boswell, *Life* (1934), Vol. I, 291).
34 Reddick, *Making of Johnson's Dictionary*, 51–4.
35 *Ibid.*, 44, 57; cf. Johnson, 'Preface', 93–4.
36 Reddick, *Making of Johnson's Dictionary*, 55–9.
37 *Ibid.*, 54. Cf. Johnson, 'Preface', 97–8; and DeMaria, *Johnson's Dictionary and the Language of Learning*, 7.
38 Reddick, *Making of Johnson's Dictionary*, 59–83 (for the advance, see 82); Fleeman, *Bibliography*, Vol. I, 415.
39 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, 420; Yeo, *Encyclopaedic Visions*, 52.
40 For the entry count of the 1736 *Dictionarium Britannicum*, see Starnes and Noyes, *English Dictionary*, 122.
41 Boswell, journal entry, 6 October 1764, in *Boswell on the Grand Tour: Germany and Switzerland*, 125.
42 Boswell, *Life*, Vol. I (1994), 211n7; cf. the cautious statement of exclusionary principles in Johnson, 'Preface', 84–8; and the admissions that some words had been missed inadvertently, *ibid.*, 99, 102–3.
43 Considine, 'Lexicographer as hero'; cf. the independent treatment of the subject by Kolb and DeMaria in Johnson, *English Language*, xxiii–xxv.

44 Hottinger, *Bibliothecarius*, 120: 'tres Praefationes, *Calvini* in Institutiones, *Thuani* in Historiam, *Casauboni* in Polybium, omnem ferme exhaurire Latinitatem, et formandi styli, exemplum praebere'.
45 Johnson, 'Preface', 112.
46 *Ibid.*, 105.
47 *Ibid.*, 108.
48 Phillips, *New World of English Words*, sigs. b3r–c4r; see Sledd and Kolb, *Dr. Johnson's Dictionary*, 11.
49 For the originality of the history, and for Johnson's use of Warton, see Kolb and DeMaria in Johnson, *English Language*, 115–20; and see also DeMaria, 'Johnson's extempore history', esp. 79–81.
50 See Kolb and DeMaria in Johnson, *English Language*, 265–8; and DeMaria, 'Johnson's extempore history', 88.
51 Johnson, Grammar, 360.
52 DeMaria, *Johnson's Dictionary and the Language of Learning*, 36.
53 *Ibid.*, 6–7.
54 Johnson, 'Preface', 95.
55 Maxwell, *Letter from a friend*, 4.
56 See Luna, 'Typographic design', 175–86.
57 Boswell, *Life*, Vol. I (1994), 137–8 (Boswell, *Life* (1934), Vol. I, 186).
58 Quotation from Johnson, 'Preface', 100.
59 *Ibid.*, 81–2; cf. Considine, 'Stephen Skinner's *Etymologicon*', 143.
60 Boswell, *Life*, Vol. I (1994), 214 (Boswell, *Life* (1934), Vol. I, 298); some details are in Sledd and Kolb, *Dr. Johnson's Dictionary*, 146–7.
61 Letter of 15 September 1755, in Parodi, *Quattro secoli della Crusca*, 110, thanking Johnson for 'il pregiatissimo dono dei due magnifici volumi del Vocabolario della Lingua Inglese' and remarking that 'Avvezza già di lunga mano a riguardare come oggetto principale delle sue occupazioni lo studio della Lingua Toscana, per mezzo delle replicate impressioni del suo Vocabolario, ha dovuto necessariamente ricevere con gran piacere un'Opera così conforme al medesimo e con sì gran diligenza e fatica condotta alla perfezione da un dotto ed illustre letterato.'
62 Woronzoff-Dashkoff, 'Books make the woman', 73.
63 Pougens, 'Plan', 95: 'l'illustre Johnson … eut la gloire d'enrichir sa patrie d'un Dictionnaire où l'on trouve à la fois les étymologies des mots, leurs définitions et les citations tirées des meilleurs écrivains de l'Angleterre'.
64 Boswell, *Life*, Vol. I (1994), 211 (Boswell, *Life* (1934), Vol. I, 291).
65 *Public Advertiser*, 22 April 1755, 2; see discussion in Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 2.
66 Piozzi, *Anecdotes*, 54.
67 Campbell, *Lexiphanes*, 175–80.
68 For language, see Mercier Faivre, 'La nation par la langue', 172–4; more generally, see e.g. Colley, *Britons*, index, s.v. *France: Francophobia as unifying factor*.
69 Fleeman, *Bibliography*, Vol. I, 421–9; for the revision process, see Reddick, *Making of Johnson's Dictionary*, 89–120.

70 Fleeman, *Bibliography*, Vol. I, 486–7 (first edition of abridgement); 487–512 (further eighteenth-century editions); 512–657 (subsequent editions, adaptations, and editions of the *Miniature Dictionary*).

71 Preface to the abridged edition in Johnson, *English Language*, 367; proposal in Fleeman, *Bibliography*, Vol. I, 439.

72 For an overview of Kramer's lexicographic work, see Haß-Zumkehr, *Deutsche Wörterbücher*, 81–8; for the *Nuovo dizzionario* in particular, see Bray, *Matthias Kramer*, 88–92.

73 Kramer, *Nuovo dizzionario*, sigs.):(3v and):(5r respectively. He remarks at the latter on 'diese blutsaure Frohn-Arbeit' (the translation in my text is from Jones, 'Lingua teutonum victrix?', 132) and notes that 'ein gantzes Collegium (wie ehedessen die *Accademici della Crusca* … waren)' has been unable to make a perfect dictionary.

74 Kramer, *Nuovo dizzionario*, sig.):(5r: 'Erstlich … nicht allein die Wort und dero schlecht- und rechte Bedeutungen nachzuschlagen/ sondern auch dero *Construction* und völligen Gebrauch/ so in den *Phrasibus* oder Redarten begriffen … Zweytens/ die Ordnung betreffend/ laufft dieselbige in den *Primitivis* (Stammwörtern)'; discussion in McLelland, *Schottelius's 'Ausführliche Arbeit'*, 239–40.

75 Bray, *Matthias Kramer*, 92–3, quoting Leibniz, letter of 28 August 1678: 'le dictionnaire de Cramer Allemand–Italien me paroit peu de chose'.

76 Bray, *Matthias Kramer*, 107–10.

77 *Ibid.*, 123–5.

78 Kramer, *Herrlich grosse Teutsch–Italiänische Dictionarium*, sig. (e)3r: 'mein Zweck … ist … ein vollständiges Teutsch–Italiänisch Wörter-Buch zu schreiben'.

79 *Ibid.*, 9–68 (first sequence of pagination): 'Dittionario delle radici o voci radicali della lingua Tedesca'.

80 *Ibid.*, sigs. (a)4r–(b)1r; reference to 'dem unvergleichlichen Schottelio' at sig. (b)1r.

81 Jones, 'Lingua teutonum victrix?', 144.

82 Kramer, *Herrlich grosse Teutsch–Italiänische Dictionarium*, 5 (main sequence of pagination):

> In questo mio Gran Dittionario puramente Tedesco non mescolaremo Vocaboli Latini, Francesi, Italiani, che l'Abuso hà introdotto nella nostra Lingua, senza ch'ella ne habbia il minimo bisogno; per essempio: *Academi*/ *Acception* [etc.] … haverò però cura di farne un Dittionaretto a parte, di quelli massime che vi paiono essere come naturalizzati, e d'havervisi preso il dritto di Cittadinanza per fas et nefas; il che serva per governo.

The equivalent German text which follows refers to 'unteutschen/ das ist … halb-Lateinisch-/ Französisch- und andern dergleichen frembden Wörtern', and to the 'Burgerrecht' of naturalized words. A note at sig. (Ddddddddd)3r, i.e. between the main alphabetical sequence and the errata, explains the fate of this plan.

83 Stammerjohann, 'The *Vocabolario* and German lexicography', 62.

84 For his etymology, see e.g. Jones, 'Early dialectology', 1108; there is an overview of Frisch's lexicography in Haß-Zumkehr, *Deutsche Wörterbücher*, 100–5.

85 Schneider, *Einfluß von Schottelius*, 135.
86 For Schilter and the *Thesaurus*, see Kössinger, 'Anfänge der Mittelalterphilologie', 41–5.
87 Frisch, *Teutsch-Lateinisches Wörter-Buch*, title page: 'Darinnen Nicht nur die ursprünglichen, nebst denen davon hergeleiteten und zusammengesetzten allgemein gebräuchlichen Wörter; Sondern auch die bey den meisten Künsten und Handwerken, bey Berg- und Saltz-werken, Fischereyen, Jagd- Forst- und Hauß-Wesen, u.a.' Discussed in Schneider, *Einfluß von Schottelius*, 134.
88 See McLelland, *Schottelius's 'Ausführliche Arbeit'*, 240.
89 Frisch, *Teutsch-Lateinisches Wörter-Buch*, s.v. *Academist*: 'qui sequitur disciplinas equestres'.
90 The example is from Haß-Zumkehr, *Deutsche Wörterbücher*, 102.
91 For Zedler, see Carels and Flory, 'Zedler's *Universal Lexicon*', 165–96.
92 Boswell, journal entry, 6 October 1764, in *Boswell on the Grand Tour*, 127. For Boswell's dictionary, see Caudle, 'James Boswell'; and, more dramatically, Rennie, 'Boswell's Scottish dictionary rediscovered'.
93 A specimen of Gottsched's materials is in Adelung, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches*, Vol. I, iii–v, together with Adelung's account of their place in the origins of his own project. The description of Breitkopf's actuation is in *ibid.*, Vol. I, v: 'ein seltener Patriotismus für die Ehre und Reinigkeit der deutschen Sprache'.
94 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, v.
95 *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, sig. *2r: 'man sich nach einer zwölfjährigen, auf bloße Wörter gemachten Jagd endlich wohl nach dem Ende einer so trocken, mühsamen und nur zu oft undankbaren Arbeit sehnet'.
96 Entry count from Schrader, 'Adelung', 170.
97 Adelung, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches*, Vol. I, iii:

> Vermuthlich wird die Erscheinung dieses Wörterbuches bey niemanden Verwunderung erwecken, da es vielmehr zu bewundern ist, daß diese Lücke in unserer Gelehrsamkeit nicht eher und mit mehrerm Glücke aus gefüllet worden, als bisher wirklich geschehen ist. Alle jetzt noch übliche Sprachen Europens haben weitläufige Wörterbücher aufzuweisen, worin ihr Reichthum und ihr Wesen mehr oder weniger erschöpfet worden; nur die deutsche, eine ihrer ältesten Schwestern, hat ihnen in diesem Stücke bisher nachstehen müssen.

98 For the proportion of old material, see Haß-Zumkehr, *Deutsche Wörterbücher*, 108.
99 Friedrich II, king of Prussia, *De la littérature Allemande* (1780), in *Œuvres*, Vol. VII, 103–40 (138): 'Vous savez qu'il n'y a pas longtemps qu'a paru le premier dictionnaire de la langue allemande qu'on ait connu; je rougis de ce qu'un ouvrage aussi utile ne m'ait pas devancé d'un siècle.'
100 Haß-Zumkehr, *Deutsche Wörterbücher*, 110–11.
101 Adelung, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches*, Vol. I, xiv:

> Die Bedeutungen, welche in den meisten Wörterbüchern nur auf gut Glück durch einander geworfen zu werden pflegen, sind der Sache gemäss geordnet, das ist, wie sie vermuthlich aus und auf einander gefolget sind. Freylich wollte sich dieses Gesetz nicht

überall befolgen lassen, weil die erste Bedeutung eines Wortes, welche gemeiniglich individuell war, nicht mehr vorhanden ist, oder weil manche Sprossen aus der Leiter der Bedeutungen verloren gegangen sind, oder in den Mundarten verborgen liegen. In diesem Falle konnte die Bedeutungen freylich nicht anders als muthmasslich geordnet werden.

102 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, xv: 'Um die Leiter der Bedeutungen so vollständig als möglich zu liefern, habe ich veraltete, wenigstens im Hochdeutschen veraltete, Bedeutungen mit eingeschaltet.'

103 *Ibid.*, xiv–xv: 'Vielleicht wird die getroffene Classification in manchen Fallen Linnäisch scheinen.'

104 For Herder and organicism, see Aarsleff, *Study of Language in England*, 152–3; and for the composition of the essay, see *ibid.*, 148. For Jones and Linnaeus, see Sir John Shore, discourse of 22 May 1794 in memory of Jones, in Jones *et al.*, *Dissertations*, Vol. IV, 198; and cf. Aarsleff, *Study of Language*, 124.

105 Translation from Stammerjohann, 'The *Vocabolario* and German lexicography', 67.

106 Adelung, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches*, Vol. I, vi; for the controversial status of Upper Saxon at the time, see Schrader, 'Adelung', 163, 166–7.

107 Adelung, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches*, Vol. I, xii.

108 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, xiii.

109 *Ibid.*: 'Gar zu niedrige und pöbelhafte Wörter darf man hier nicht suchen. Ist in einem oder dem andern Falle eine Ausnahme gemacht worden, so wird ein scharfsinniger Leser sogleich selbst sehen.' For a machine count of stigmatized words, see Schrader, 'Adelung', 173. See also Adelung, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches*, Vol. I, xiv; and Haß-Zumkehr, *Deutsche Wörterbücher*, 108.

110 The entry *scheissen* would receive a stigmatizing dagger in the new edition: Adelung, *Grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der hochdeutschen Mundart*, s.v.

111 Adelung, 'Merits and demerits', clxxxiii; Adelung, 'Vorrede', xi, perhaps alluding to a dictionary such as Choffin, *Nouveau dictionnaire*, col. 809: '*Säumagen*, un gourmand, *helluo*'.

112 Adelung, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches*, Vol. I, xiii: 'Besonders habe ich mir angelegen seyn lassen, die Kunstwörter … zu sammeln, weil viele derselben selbst eingebohrnen Deutschen unverständlich und fremd sind.'

113 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, xiii: 'Vielleicht haben deren schon zu viele hier Platz gefunden.'

114 Johnson, 'Preface', 86; J. A. H. Murray, letter to William Craigie, 3 December 1902, in K. Murray, *Caught in the Web of Words*, 288.

115 Adelung, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches*, Vol. I, xiv: 'Die Sprüchwörter gehören grössentheils in die niedrige und pöbelhafte Sprache.'

116 *Ibid.*, xv: 'Weil Luthers deutsche Bibel in jedermanns Händen ist … so habe ich die Beyspiele lieber aus diesen genommen.'

117 It had been promised as early as 1774: *ibid.*, Vol. I, xvi.

118 Campe, *Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, Vol. V, iv.

119 Cf. Landau, *Dictionaries*, 357.

120 Adamska Sałaciak, 'Linde's dictionary', 75; Haß-Zumkehr, *Deutsche Wörterbücher*, 106; Schrader, 'Adelung', 163 ('bis heute').

121 Joseph Bosworth, letter to J. H. Halbertsma, 17 March 1838, quoted in Stanley, 'J. Bosworth's interest in "Friesic"', 450.
122 Some of the dictionaries are surveyed in Sledd and Kolb, *Dr. Johnson's Dictionary*, 156–63; to the praise from German sources *ibid.*, 157–8 can be added that of Gottsched, as reported by Boswell, journal entry, 4 October 1764, in *Boswell on the Grand Tour*, 122.
123 Adelung, 'Merits and demerits', clxxi, clxxx–clxxxi; 'Vorrede', iv ('Kunst- und Handwerksprache'), x.
124 Adelung, 'Merits and demerits', clxxiii; 'Vorrede', v: 'niedrig, und für die anständigere Schrift- und Gesellschaftssprache zu unedel'.
125 Adelung, 'Merits and demerits', clxxiii–clxxv; 'Vorrede', vi–vii.
126 Adelung, 'Merits and demerits', clxxv; 'Vorrede', vii: 'Hier zeigt sich sein Wörterbuch freylich nicht von der glänzendsten Seite.'
127 Adelung, 'Merits and demerits', clxxvi–clxxvii; 'Vorrede', vii–viii.
128 Adelung, 'Merits and demerits', clxxvii–clxxx; 'Vorrede', viii–ix.
129 Adelung, 'Merits and demerits', clxxvii; 'Vorrede', viii: 'Die erste und eigentliche Bedeutung des Wortes, von welcher die übrigen, wenn es anders mehr als eine hat, hergeleitet werden müssen … diese ganze Kenntniss auf eine hinlängliche Anzahl vorhandener Schriften aus allen Jahrhunderten gründen muss.'
130 Adelung, 'Merits and demerits', clxxxii; 'Vorrede', x–xi.
131 Adelung, 'Merits and demerits', clxxxii; 'Vorrede', xi.

8 The continuing academy tradition from 1751 to 1800: the United Provinces, Russia, Portugal, Denmark, and Sweden

1 Burke, *Toward a Social History of Early Modern Dutch*, 13 (see also the discussion of Spieghel's purism, 24); for Stevin, see Chapter 5 above.
2 Van Dixhoorn, 'Chambers of rhetoric'; Van Miert, *Humanism in an Age of Science*, 36–9 and 108.
3 See Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 147–52 (where I use the form *Kiel*; the best contemporary Dutch-speaking scholars appear to prefer *Kiliaan*, and I now think it best to follow their lead); for Kiliaan's influence in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*, 362; for a much fuller treatment of Kiliaan's life and context, unknown to me in 2008, see Van Rossem, *Portret van een woordenaar*.
4 For Schrevel's dictionary, see Considine, 'Ancient Greek among the eighteenth-century languages of science', 335; and for his work on Hesychius, see Doucette, *Emery Bigot*, 140–2 (both of these are very brief treatments of a figure who would repay further study). For Van Vliet's work on Germanic materials, see Dekker, *Origins of Old Germanic Studies*, *passim*; for that of Junius, see Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 216–35.
5 Van Sterkenburg, *Van woordenlijst tot woordenboek*, 37–42, 44–7.
6 *Ibid.*, 42–4; Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*, 377–83. For *schat* and *tresoor*, see Burke, *Toward a Social History of Early Modern Dutch*, 23–4.

7 Dekker, *Origins of Old Germanic Studies*, 342–6 (the translation of the title of the *Aenleidning* is Dekker's); Noordegraaf, 'Historical linguistics in the Low Countries'.
8 Burke, *Toward a Social History of Early Modern Dutch*, 26–7.
9 For Ten Kate's importance to the development of Dutch lexicography, see also De Vries, 'Inleiding', iii.
10 For it, see Singeling, 'Sociable men of letters', 883.
11 For Van Iperen and the Batavian Academy see Taylor, *Social World of Batavia*, 85–6; for his interest in Sundanese, see Moriyama, *Sundanese Print Culture*, 12.
12 Its main discussion of lexicography is Van Iperen, *Proeve*, 54–109.
13 *Ibid.*, 118: 'Engelsche, Fransche, Hoogduitsche of andere zoortgelyke Woordenboeken'.
14 Van Iperen, 'Uitnoodiginge der liefhebbers en kenners van onze moedertale, tot het helpen toestellen van een ordeelkundig Nederduitsch woordenboek'.
15 Dekker, *Origins of Old Germanic Studies*, 356.
16 De Vries, *Verslag der redactie*, 1011, repeated twenty years later in De Vries, 'Inleiding', ii. Cf. Van Sterkenburg, *Van woordenlijst tot woordenboek*, 47.
17 Van Iperen, 'Uitnoodiginge', 510 (echoing Van Iperen, *Proeve*, 53): '*Goede Woordenboeken* hebben wy niet'; and as for Kiliaan: 'het *Hedendaagsch Gebruik* der Woorden is 'er niet in te vinden. TEN KATE en soortgelyke Geleerden hebben hier weinig toe bygebragt.'
18 Van Iperen, 'Uitnoodiginge', 511: 'Meer dan eens hebben my Geleerde en verstandige Lieden aangezet, om, door de Uitgave van een *Nederduitsch Omschryvend Woordenboek*, die gebreken van onze Taal eenigzints tegen te gaan, en 't vootspoer van RICHELET … op te volgen. Maar dit was myn werk niet!'
19 *Ibid.*, 513: 'en vooral over de *Ware Gebruikelyke Beteekenisse*'.
20 Van Iperen, 'Schetze', 546 (*boom-aerde*), 548 (*aan-aerden*: 'Een Woord bij de Planters gebruikelyk').
21 Tollius, 'Taalkundige Heeren!' (I paraphrase 583: 'hoe lastig en schadelijk het gemis van een goed Neêrduitsch Woordenboek … is'). For the lectures, see Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*, 349; and Noordegraaf, 'A matter of time', 219.
22 Singeling, 'Sociable men of letters', 883–4.
23 Daniël van Alphen, presidential address of 13 July 1773, 8: 'eerst in ITALIE; vervolgens in FRANKRYK; en naaderhand ook in ENGELAND; DUITSCHLAND; DEENMARKEN; ZWEEDEN; RUSLAND; en elders'.
24 Ahasuerus van den Berg, letter of 30 August 1769, as reported in *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde* (1770), 22:

> Hy oordeelt dit geen Werk van éénen dag of van éénen Man: Hier toe, zegt hy, moeten zeer vele Boeken gelezen, en uitgetrokken worden; allerlei soorten van Kunstenaers en Handwerkslieden geraedpleegd; alle de byzondere streken van ons Gemenebest niet alleen, maer zelfs der naestaenliggende Landschappen als doorkropen worden, en de Tael der Landlieden en Stedelingen in alle byzondere Oorden een voorwerp van byzondere opmerking zijn, zelfs de Straettael niet uitgezonderd.

25 Van Alphen, presidential address of 13 July 1773, 8:

> gelyk zy deswegens ook in iever voor geene der andere Maatschappijen behoeft te wyken; waarvan een duidelykst kenmerk is het zoo grootsche voorwerp, 't welk zy voorneemens is met onderlinge hulp ter uitvoer te brengen, en naar 't welk alle de geleerde Taalöefenaars hunne oogen reeds hebben gewend; te weeten: *Het vervaardigen van een Algemeen, Omschryvend Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal.*

26 *Ibid.*, 11.

27 For the wordlist, see Gerritsen, 'Dialectology of Dutch', 1537, 1552.

28 Van Alphen, presidential address of 12 July 1774, 4: it would register senses in which a given word 'in de beste werken der voornaamste Nederlandsche Schryveren voorkoomt; en ook nu onder ons in dagelykschen zwang is'.

29 *Ibid.*, 3: 'De eerste en (immers naar myn gering oordeel) de voornaamste beezigheid van deeze tegenwoordige Vergaadering'.

30 *Ibid.*, 3–5:

> Zoodaanig een *Woordenboek* … zal van een onwaardeerbaar nut voor ons gemeene Vaderland zyn … het maaken van een in alle deelen volmaakt *Woordenboek*, waarvan de verdiensten nooit hoog genoeg zullen konnen worden gewaardeerd, is de moeilykste, doch ook tevens de voortreflykste, arbeid van het menschlyk verstand … Ondertusschen ligt onzen Vaderlanderen aan zulken *Woordenboek* zeer veel geleegen; en het zal voor Ons allen een schat zyn, welks rechte waarde Wy nu nog niet genoeg konnen bezeffen, maar dan eerst wel zullen leeren kennen, wanneer Wy het uitneemend geluk moogen hebben, van dien te bezitten.

31 De Vries, 'Inleiding', iv–v; cf. Béjoint, *Lexicography of English*, 94–5.

32 Van Alphen, presidential address of 12 July 1774, 7: 'De Taal is eene verzaameling van de wysheid en het vernuft van een geheel Volk', quoting the Dutch translation (1771) of Michaelis, *Beantwortung der Frage von dem Einfluss der Meinungen in die Sprache und der Sprache in die Meinungen* (1760), corresponding to Michaelis, *Dissertation*, 12. For Michaelis and Herder, see Aarsleff, *Study of Language*, 143–53; and for Michaelis in the Netherlands in the 1760s and 1770s, see Noordegraaf, 'A matter of time', 220–1.

33 Van Alphen, presidential address of 12 July 1774, 10: 'alle andere beroemde Academien, of Maatschappijen van Geleerde Mannen, die in ITALIE, FRANKRYK, en DUITSCHLAND, tot volmaaking der Landtaale'.

34 Kossmann, *Opkomst en voortgang van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde*, 149–52.

35 De Vries, 'Inleiding', v: 'Men maakte uittreksels uit verschillende schrijvers, doorzocht oude oorkonden, landrechten, handvesten, keuren enz., bracht gewestelijke en plaatselijke woorden, volksspreekwijzen en kunsttermen bijeen, en liet lijsten drukken om de spelling, vervoeging enz. der woorden te bepalen.'

36 *Ibid.*: 'Van jaar tot jaar verkoelde de ijver.' See also Kossmann, *Opkomst en voortgang*, 158–61.

37 Van Sterkenburg, *Van woordenlijst tot woordenboek*, 47.

38 Singeling, 'Sociable men of letters', 884–5.

39 For the assistants, see De Vries, 'Inleiding', vii. Van Convent is thanked in Weiland, *Nederduitsch taalkundig woordenboek*, Vol. V (*M–N*, 1804), V; Vol. VI (*O*, 1806), v–vi; and both in Vol. VIII (*S*, 1810), sig. *1r.

40 Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*, 282; cf. Schama, *Patriots and Liberators*, 473.
41 Weiland, *Nederduitsch taalkundig woordenboek*, Vol. I, 4: 'Dan, ter bereiking van dit heilzame oogmerk was de oprigting van *de Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde*.'
42 The quotations from De Decker and the Dutch *Legenda aurea* are not in Van Hoogstraten's *Aenmerkingen* of 1700, but appear, in an entry for *lende* marked as an addition, in the fifth edition of 1759, published as Hoogstraten, *Lijst der gebruikelijkste zelfstandige naamwoorden*.
43 See Wachter, *Glossarium germanicum*, s.v. *lenden*.
44 For the revised editions, see Van Sterkenburg, *Van woordenlijst tot woordenboek*, 48.
45 De Vries, 'Inleiding', vii.
46 Weiland, *Nederduitsch taalkundig woordenboek*, Vol. I, 7, 8.
47 For early attention to Adelung's dictionary in the Netherlands, see *Proeve van oudheid-, taal- en dichtkunde*, 210.
48 Eismann, 'Die zweisprachige Lexicographie mit Russisch', 3068–70; Toscano, 'Orthodox Slavdom', 136.
49 Eismann, 'Die zweisprachige Lexicographie mit Russisch', 3070–1; Birgegård, *Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeld*, 54–5; Kamusella, *Politics of Language and Nationalism*, 154.
50 Jachnow, 'Russische Lexikographie', 2310.
51 Kamusella, *Politics of Language and Nationalism*, 154; Eismann, 'Die zweisprachige Lexicographie mit Russisch', 3071–4; Bartoccioni, 'Les français en Russie', 112–116; Birgegård, *Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeld*, *passim*.
52 Vucinich, *Science in Russian Culture*, 43–8; *Régistres de l'Académie*, Vol. II, 29.
53 Varvazzo Biensan, 'Le premier dictionnaire', 440. For Trediakovsky and Paris, see Reyfman, *Vasilii Trediakovsky*, 24–6, and for his dictionary project, 27, 86.
54 For it, see Varvazzo Biensan, 'Le premier dictionnaire', 440n3.
55 Vucinich, *Science in Russian Culture*, 46.
56 An overview of this work is Wendland, *Peter Simon Pallas*, 492–503; see also Morpurgo Davies, *Nineteenth-Century Linguistics*, 37–8.
57 The Latin title page of the first volume is dated 1786, but the Russian title page is dated 1787; the foreword in both languages is dated 29 December 1786, so it is most unlikely that publication was achieved in the next two days. See Keipert, 'Pallas-Redaktion', 121.
58 The list of the languages in Key, *Catherine the Great's Linguistic Contribution*, 94–105 is supplemented by Comrie in his review of her book.
59 [Pallas], *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia*, Vol. I, sig. π4r: 'quantumvis exteris hocce alphabetum primo adspectu ignotum videri possit, facile tamen, praesertim ab eruditis, ope graeci addiscetur'; see Keipert, 'Pallas-Redaktion', 124.
60 [Pallas], *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia*, Vol. I, sig. π2r–v: 'Quandoquidem AUGUSTAE placuit edendi *Vocabularii* hujus *polyglotti*, omnium quae hucusque extiterunt perfectissimi, curam mihi injungere: partem jam IPSIUS

AUGUSTISSIMAE manu in ordinem redactam summa cum admiratione suscepi et tanquam normam totius proposui.'

61 For Catherine and Court de Gébelin, see Wendland, *Peter Simon Pallas*, 494. For the 'dictionnaire primitif', see Court de Gébelin, *Monde primitif*, Vol. II, 61, 83; in Vol. II, 166 it is 'le Dictionnaire Comparatif des Langues'.

62 Leibniz, *Nouveaux essais sur l'entendement humain*, in *Sämtliche Schriften*, Vol. VI.6, 354: 'Un … Dictionnaire Universel figuré seroit à souhaiter, et ne seroit pas fort difficile à faire.'

63 Catherine II, letter to Johann Georg, Ritter von Zimmermann, May 1785, in Adelung, *Catherinens der Grossen Verdienste*, 40. The undated letter is in Dashkova, *Mon histoire*, 243, no. 47.

64 Liberman, 'Icelandic part in Pallas's dictionary', 377–8.

65 *Ibid.*, 393.

66 Stipa, *Finnisch-ugrische Sprachforschung*, 202–3.

67 Larrucea de Tovar, 'José Celestino Mutis and the report on American languages', 213–29 (see also Klein and Klein, 'The "Russian collection" of Amerindian languages'). Gilbert de Lafayette, letter to George Washington, 10 February 1786, reproduced in Key, *Catherine the Great's Linguistic Contribution*, 63; the whole story of the American responses to Catherine's solicitation is at 60–70.

68 Manuel and Manuel, *James Bowdoin and the Patriot Philosophers*, 197.

69 Marsden, *Catalogue*, 50.

70 Keipert, 'Pallas-Redaktion', 125.

71 Friedrich Adelung saw the manuscript and described it briefly in his *Catherinens der Grossen Verdienste*, 41.

72 Key, *Catherine the Great's Linguistic Contribution*, 73–6; see also Keipert, 'Pallas-Redaktion', 122.

73 Liberman, 'Icelandic part in Pallas's dictionary', 394–5.

74 Dashkova, *Mon histoire*, 170: 'un prétendu dictionnaire … une espèce de vocabulaire en quatre-vingt-dix ou cent langues, dont quelques-unes n'offraient qu'une vingtaine de mots, comme terre, ciel, eau, père, mère, etc. … quelqu'inutile et imparfait que fût ce singulier ouvrage … il était prôné comme un dictionnaire admirable'; translation from Dashkova, *Memoirs*, 216 (and cf. the commentary at 320).

75 For the story of the appointment, see Dashkova, *Mon histoire*, 156–64 (Dashkova, *Memoirs*, 200–8).

76 Dashkova, *Mon histoire*, 167:

> nous parlâmes de la beauté et de la richesse de la langue russe. Je dis à Sa Majesté que je m'étonnais qu'étant auteur elle-même et aimant notre langue comme elle le faisait, elle n'avait point érigé encore une Académie russe, qu'il nous manquait des règles et un bon dictionnaire, qui nous épargnerait la sottise de faire usage de termes et mots étrangers au lieu de ceux que nous possédions et qui sont bien plus énergiques.

Translation from Dashkova, *Memoirs*, 213.

77 Dashkova, *Mon histoire*, 167–8 (Dashkova, *Memoirs*, 213–14).

78 Varvazzo Biensan, 'Le premier dictionnaire', 441.

79 Word count from Unbegaun with Simmons, *Bibliographical Guide*, 124, item 806.
80 For her contributions, see the editorial material in Dashkova, *Mon histoire*, 257.
81 For Marie de l'Incarnation, see Hanzeli, *Missionary Linguistics in New France*, 22; for Williams, see Johnson, *Letters*, Vol. I, 78–80.
82 Varvazzo Biensan, 'Le premier dictionnaire', 443.
83 *Ibid.*, 444, 446.
84 *Ibid.*, 445.
85 Dashkova, *Mon histoire*, 170:

> Les courtisans … trouvaient que le dictionnaire, étant étymologique, était très incommode; Sa Majesté même me demanda à plus d'une reprise pourquoi nous ne l'avions fait par ordre alphabétique. Je lui dis que la seconde édition … serait par ordre alphabétique, mais qu'un premier dictionnaire d'une langue devait être étymologique, afin de montrer et même trouver les racines des mots.

Translation from Dashkova, *Memoirs*, 215.
86 Court de Gébelin, *Monde primitif*, Vol. II, 91: the roots of a given language being obscured by the multiplicity of derivatives, 'Les Auteurs des Dictionnaires tâchent de supléer à ce désordre, en ramenant les dérivés et les composés à leurs racines: mais à cet égard, ils tomboient dans deux inconveniens très-fâcheux.'
87 Jachnow, 'Russische Lexikographie', 2310–11.
88 For these, see Kyril Fitzlyon, in Dashkova, *Memoirs*, 216n1.
89 Kamusella, *Politics of Language and Nationalism*, 161.
90 Unbegaun with Simmons, *Bibliographical Guide*, 124, item 806.
91 Vucinich, *Science in Russian Culture*, 165–6. Unbegaun with Simmons, *Bibliographical Guide*, 124, item 806 reports that 'Dialect material is imperfectly represented', but even imperfect representation of dialect material suggests that the dictionary was not in the narrowest academy tradition.
92 Karamzin, discourse of 5 December 1818 on his reception into the Imperial Russian Academy, quoted in Varvazzo Biensan, 'Le premier dictionnaire', 447: 'qui soutient la comparaison avec les célèbres travaux des Académies de Florence et de Paris'.
93 *Dictionnaire complet françois et russe*, sig. *II: 'Le présent Dictionnaire a été commencé il y a douze ans; la nature de ces sortes de compositions, aussi bien que quelques événements désagréables, en ont retardé la publication, et même cette entreprise auroit probablement manqué, sans les secours qu'a daigné accorder à l'Editeur *Notre Grande Souveraine*.'
94 *Ibid.*, sig. *IV.
95 Eismann, 'Die zweisprachige Lexicographie mit Russisch', 3073.
96 Woll, 'Portugiesische Lexikographie', 1724–5.
97 Entry count from Lupetti, 'Tra Cardoso e Bluteau', 66.
98 They continued to be hard to come by, at least outside Portugal: in 1725, the *Bibliotheca Rostgardiana* identified the 1677 edition as a rare book (165, item 1758).

99 Holtus and Mühlschlegel, 'Wörterbücher', 173–5; Hulet, 'Portuguese language', 97; Woll, 'Portugiesische Lexikographie', 1726–7.
100 Pougens, 'Plan', 95: 'Les Portuguais qui ont à peine une littérature ont cependant un Vocabulaire en dix volumes.'
101 Hulet, 'Portuguese language', 97–8.
102 *Ibid.*, 100; Woll, 'Portugiesische Lexikographie', 1727.
103 Casteleiro, 'Estudo linguístico', 48–9.
104 Adamska Sałaciak, 'Linde's dictionary', 73–4.
105 *Diccionario da lingoa portugueza*, iii:

> O muito, que o infatigavel e erudito P. D. Raphael Bluteau tentou fazer em beneficio da nossa lingoa, de justiça deve merecer á Nação Portugueza não menor reconhecimento, do que a Hespanhola dedica por igual motivo a D. Sebastião Covarrubias … Mas assim como a Real Academia Hespanhola não teve por bastante o anterior trabalho do seu Covarrubias para deixar de compôr hum Diccionario inteiramente novo, com igual razão se deve formar o nosso.

106 *Ibid.*, iv: 'os vocabulos puramente Portuguezes'.
107 *Ibid.*, iv note d: 'idade mais elegante da pureza da nossa lingoa'; for the number of authors, see Casteleiro, 'Estudo linguístico', 59.
108 For *OED* and *African*, see Gilliver, 'Not altogether treated as I should treat it now', 223–4.
109 José Vicente Gomes de Moura, quoted in Casteleiro, 'Estudo linguístico', 49: 'se este Diccionario se acabasse, competiria com os mais ricos das linguas vivas da Europa'.
110 *Ibid.*, 52, 56.
111 Holtus and Mühlschlegel, 'Wörterbücher', 175–6, 178; Casteleiro, 'Estudo linguístico', 53.
112 Woll, 'Portugiesische Lexikographie', 1726: 'der direkte Stammvater aller modernen portugiesischen Wörterbücher'.
113 *Bibliotheca Rostgardiana*, 425, item 1123; 426, item 1124.
114 See e.g. *ibid.*, 543, item 975 ('*Tatiani* Harmonia qvatuor Evangeliorum cum vetusta versione Francica, qvam ex codice MS. Bibliothecae Bodlejanae omni cura descripsit F. Rostgard, 1694'); and item 976 ('*Glossaria Francica* maximam partem hactenus inedita ex Autographis *Francisci Junii* in Bibliotheca Bodlejana summa cum cura descripsit Fridericus Rostgaard, 1694').
115 Bjerrum, 'Peder Syvs danske ordbog', 68–9; Larsen, *Frederik Rostgaard og bøgerne*, 22–3.
116 The following account of the work of Rostgaard and Langebek is from Jacobsen and Juul-Jensen, 'Inledning', xvii–xviii; and Pedersen, *Lovers of Learning*, 134–7.
117 For his unfinished projects, see Larsen, *Frederik Rostgaard og bøgerne*, 80–3.
118 Fleeman, *Bibliography*, Vol. I, 415.
119 Pedersen, *Lovers of Learning*, 34–7.
120 *Scriptorum a societate Hafniensi pars prima*, 317–94 ('Historico-physica enarratio de stupendis luminis borealis phoenominis, natura et origine'); 211–306 ('De pulvere pyrio, quando in Europa inventus, et quamdiu in usu fuerit

apud Danos'); 55–76 ('De linguae Danicae fatis, et conditione cum superiori tum praesenti aevo in Cimbria Australi sive Ducatu Slesvicensi').

121 *Ibid.*, 57: 'facili negotio probari potest, antiqvissimam, verissimam et familiarissimam regionis istius lingvam minime esse Teutonicam sed Danicam'.

122 For the renewed dictionary project from 1776 onwards, see Pedersen, *Lovers of Learning*, 137–41.

123 *Ibid.*, 137; for the vacancy, see 108–18, and for Hielmstierne, see 28.

124 *Ibid.*, 138.

125 Quoted in Jacobsen and Juul-Jensen, 'Inledning', xviii: 'Ordbogen maatte allene være i Landets eget Sprog og blive lige kiær for Lærde og Ulærde.'

126 Entry count from Bergenholtz and Pálfi, '*Videnskabernes Selskabs Ordbog*', 143.

127 Hovdhaugen *et al.*, *History of Linguistics in the Nordic Countries*, Section 3.2.

128 See Östlund, 'Two pre-modern etymologists'.

129 For Christina's interest in language and in constituting an academy, see Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 246.

130 Loman, 'Inrättning', 5.

131 *Ibid.*, 8.

132 *Ibid.*

133 Malmgren, 'Das schwedische Akademiewörterbuch', 301; Dornröschen is the folktale character called the Sleeping Beauty in English.

134 Nencioni, 'The Accademia della Crusca today', 53.

9 Afterword: the year 1800 as a turning point

1 Details in Schweickard, 'Vocabolario', 59–61.

2 Morellet, *Du projet annoncé par l'Institut National*, esp. 6.

3 Courtat, *Monographie*, 79.

4 Quemada, 'L'Académie française et ses dictionnaires', 84.

5 Pougens, *Trésor des origines et Dictionnaire grammatical*, esp. v–xiv.

6 For some commentary on successive editions, see Terry, 'Spanish lexicography', 960–2; and Lebsanft, 'Der *Diccionario*', 67–70.

7 For Todd's editions, see Fleeman, *Bibliography*, Vol. I, 460–2 (two issues of 1818 edition), 467–8 (second Todd edition, 1827); for Latham's, *ibid.*, Vol. I, 475–7.

8 For a selection of criticisms of Johnson, see Congleton and Congleton, *Johnson's Dictionary*, 28–38 (items 82–115); for projected dictionaries intended to replace his, see Read, 'Projected English dictionaries'.

9 Jones, 'Lingua teutonum victrix?', 146.

10 Campe, *Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, Vol. V, iv; for Campe's dictionary, see now Orgeldinger, 'J. H. Campe: *Wörterbuch*'.

11 Schrader, 'Adelung', 165.

12 Kamusella, *Politics of Language and Nationalism*, 161; Unbegaun with Simmons, *Bibliographical Guide*, 125, item 810.

13 Overviews in Bergenholtz and Pálfi, '*Videnskabernes Selskabs Ordbog*'; and Pedersen, *Lovers of Learning*, 142–4.

14 Vilhelm Thomsen and Ludvig Wimmer, in *Dansk ordbog*, vii: 'Det maa nu blive andres Sag at give en ny og mere fuldkommen Ordbog for vort Modersmaal stemmende med Sprogvidenskabens Krav i vor Tid.'
15 De Vries, 'Inleiding', vii.
16 See Metcalf, *On Language Diversity and Relationship*, 34–53 (and *ibid.*, 'Index of subjects and terms', s.v. *languages: Scythian*); updated by Van Hal, 'On "the Scythian Theory"'.
17 See Timpanaro, 'Friedrich Schlegel', xiv–xvii for some judicious early comments; Szemerényi, 'About unrewriting', 151–60 for a defence of Jones; and Campbell, 'Why Sir William Jones got it all wrong' for a more recent statement of the other side of the argument (I am grateful to Konrad Koerner for the last reference).
18 Timpanaro, 'Friedrich Schlegel', xvi; Morpurgo Davies, *Nineteenth-Century Linguistics*, 49–52 points out that this was not altogether innovative.
19 Hervás, *Origine, formazione, meccanismo*, 179:

> La diversità de'numeri singolare, duale, e plurale, e quella de'casi ne'nomi, delle varie terminazioni negli aggettivi (come ne hanno il Greco, il Latino, il Betoi, il Kanarino, ed altri dialetti dell'Hinduo): l'uso degli articoli prepositivi, o pospositivi, quello de'verbi ausiliari, de'verbi attivi, passivi, negativi &c., ed in somma le varie sintassi danno fondamento per la divisione degl'idiomi, o delle nazioni in classi.

For Betoi, see Hervás, *Catalogo delle lingue*, 51–2; and Campbell, *American Indian Languages*, 33.
20 Koerner, 'Friedrich Schlegel', 343 (Gyarmathi), 347 ('vergleichende Sprachlehre/Grammatik'), 361 ('Schlegel paved the way').
21 See Hovdhaugen, 'Field work and data elicitation', 1481.
22 On this topic, see also Zgusta, *Lexicography Then and Now*, 27–86.
23 Krömer, 'Lexicography II: Latin', 214–15.
24 Jamieson, letter to Grimur Thorkelin, 18 January 1802, in Rennie, *Jamieson's Dictionary*, 120–1.
25 For the intellectual background shared by Jamieson and Passow, see Considine, 'John Jamieson, Franz Passow'.
26 For historical principles as they developed after 1812, see my 'Historical dictionaries: History and Development', in Philip Durkin, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Lexicography* (Oxford University Press, forthcoming), Chapter 10.
27 For the changing principles of the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal*, see Eickmans, '*Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal*', 272.

Bibliography

MANUSCRIPT AND ARCHIVAL SOURCES, AND INDIVIDUAL COPIES OF EARLY PRINTED BOOKS

Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek

GkS 769 2°. First redaction of Matthias Moth's dictionary. 18 vols.: I (*A*), V (*B*), VI (*D*), VII (*E*), VIII (*F*), IX (*G*), X (*H*), XI (*I–J*), XII (*K*), XIII (*L*), XIV (*M*), XV (*N*), XVI (*O*), XIX (*S*), XX (*T*), XXI (*U*), XXII (*V*), XXIII (*Y*, *Æ*, *Ø*). Plus another 2 vols. that in fact belong to the second redaction: XVII (*P*), XVIII (*R*).

GkS 770 2°. Alphabetical index of Danish words with brief Latin glosses. 4 vols.

GkS 771 2°. Volume of Danish proverbs and other related materials.

GkS 772 2°. Volume of miscellaneous materials on phraseology, the use of particles, and dialect.

GkS 773 2°. Miscellaneous contributions from informants on dialect. 3 vols.

GkS 774 2°. Second redaction of Matthias Moth's dictionary. 15 vols. of lexical dictionary: III (*A*), V (*B*), VI (*D–E*), VIII (*F*), IX (*G*), X (*H–J*), XI (*K*), XII (*L–N*), XIIb (*O*), XIII (*S–Sl*), XIV (*Sm–Sø*), XV (*T–U*), XVI (*V–Ø*). 7 vols. of encyclopedic dictionary: XVII (*A–B*), XVIII (*D–F*), XIX (*G–H*), XX (*I–K*), XXI (*L–N*), XXII (*S*), XXIII (*T–Ø*).

GkS 775 2°. Latin–Danish indexes in Moth's hand. 2 vols.

Hannover, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek

MS IV, 470. Folder containing working notes by G. W. von Leibniz, some in the form of loose slips.

MS IV, 471. Draft of a historical and etymological dictionary of German, in four guardbook vols. filled with pasted slips, partially compiled under the direction of G. W. von Leibniz, in and after 1705.

London, British Library

628 a. 7. Robert Hooke's copy of Schottelius, *Teutsche Sprachkunst* (1641), with original inscription 'Theodore Haack' and then presentation inscription added above and below to read 'presented by | Theodore Haack | to R. Hooke | March, 168¾'.

MS Lansdowne 845. Collection of academic orations, including two bearing on the Accademia della Crusca, compiled by or for an English owner no earlier than 1712.

PRINTED AND ONLINE SOURCES: PRIMARY

Adelung, Johann Christoph. *Grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der hochdeutschen Mundart*. 4 vols. Leipzig: bey Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf und Compagnie, 1739–1801.

Neues grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der englischen Sprache für die Deutschen. 2 vols. Leipzig: im Schwickertschen Verlage, 1783.

'On the relative merits and demerits of Johnson's English dictionary'. In *Three Philological Essays*, trans. A. F. M. Willich, clxix–clxxxvi. London: for T. N. Longman, 1798.

Versuch eines vollständigen grammatisch-kritischen Wörterbuches der hochdeutschen Mundart. 5 vols. Leipzig: verlegts Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf und Sohn, 1774–86.

'Vorrede'. In *Neues grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch*, Vol. I, iii–xii.

L'Apothéose du Dictionnaire de l'Académie. The Hague: chez Arnout Leers, 1696.

Bailey, Nathan, with the assistance of George Gordon, Philip Miller, and Thomas Lediard. *Dictionarium Britannicum; or, A more compleat universal etymological English dictionary than any extant*. 2nd edn. London: for T[homas] Cox, 1736.

Baker, Thomas. *Reflections upon Learning*. London: printed for A[lexander] Bosvile, 1699.

Baldinucci, Filippo. *Vocabolario toscano dell'arte del disegno*. Florence: per Santi Franchi, 1681.

Barcia Carballido y Zúñiga, Andrés González de. *Planta, y methodo, que, por determinacion de la Academia Española, deben observar los academicos, en la composicion del nuevo diccionario de la lengua castellana; a fin de conseguir su mayor uniformidad*. Madrid: en la Imprenta Real, por Joséph Rodríguez y Escobár, Impressor del Rey y de la Academia Española, 1713.

Bartholin, Rasmus. *De naturae mirabilibus quaestiones academicae*. Copenhagen: sumptibus Petri Hauboldi, Acad[emiae] Bibliop[ola], literis Georgii Gödiani, Reg[iae] Maj[estatis] Typogr[aphus], 1674.

Besnier, Pierre. 'Discours sur les etymologies françoises'. In Ménage, *Dictionnaire etymologique*, sigs. ē1r–ū4v.

Bibliotheca Rostgardiana, in duas partes divisa, vendenda Hafniae, anno 1726, a. d. 7. Januarii et seqq. Copenhagen: apud Johann[em] Georg[ium] Höpffnerum, universitat[is] typographum, [1725].

Bibliothèque raisonnée des ouvrages des savans de l'Europe. 52 vols. Amsterdam: chez les Wetsteins et Smith [imprint varies], 1728–53.

Blount, Thomas. *A world of errors discovered in The new world of words, or general English dictionary, and in Nomothetes*. London: T[homas] N[ewcomb] for Abel Roper, John Martin, and Henry Herringman, 1673.

Boccaccio, Giovanni. *Il decameron*. Ed. Vincenzio Borghini, Pier Francesco Cambi, Bastiano Antinori, and Heredi di Philippo de Giunta. Florence: nella stamperia de i Giunti, 1573.

The Decameron. Trans. J. M. Rigg. London: A. H. Bullen, 1903.

Bohun, Edmund. *A Geographical Dictionary*. London: printed for Charles Brome, 1693.

Boileau-Despréaux, Nicolas. *Oeuvres*. 2 vols., Vol. I. Paris: chez la veuve Alix, 1740.

Borghini, Vincenzio. *Annotationi et discorsi sopra alcuni luoghi del 'Decameron'*. Florence: nella stamperia de i Giunti, 1574.

Annotazioni et discorsi sopra alcuni luoghi del 'Decameron'. 4th edn, with notes from the manuscripts of Borghini and A. M. Salvini. Florence: Felice Le Monnier, 1857.

Boswell, James. *Boswell on the Grand Tour: Germany and Switzerland 1764*. Ed. Frederick A. Pottle. London: William Heinemann, 1953.

Life of Johnson. Ed. George Birkbeck Hill, rev. L. F. Powell. 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934.

Life of Johnson. 4 vols, Vol. I: *1709–1765*. Ed. Marshall Waingrow. Edinburgh University Press; New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994.

Boyer, Abel. *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 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*. London: printed for R[obert?] Clavel [et al.], 1699.

Boyle, Emily, Countess of Corke and Orrery, ed. *Orrery Papers*. 2 vols. London: Duckworth, 1903.

Campbell, Archibald. *Lexiphanes: A Dialogue*. London: printed for, and sold by, J[ohn] Knox, 1767.

Campe, Joachim Heinrich. *Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. 5 vols. Braunschweig: in der Schulbuchhandlung, 1807–11.

Cawdrey, Robert. *A table alphabeticall, conteyning and teaching the true writing and vnderstanding of hard vsuall English wordes borrowed from the Hebrew, Greeke, Latine, or French*. London: printed by I[ames] R[oberts] for Edmund Weaver, 1604.

Chambers, Ephraim. *Cyclopaedia; or, An universal dictionary of arts and sciences*. 2 vols. London: printed for James and John Knapton, 1728.

Choffin, David Etienne. *Nouveau dictionnaire du voyageur/Vollständiges französisch–deutsch–lateinisches Wörter-Buch*. New edn. Frankfurt am Main and Leipzig: verlegts Heinrich Ludwig Brünner, 1770.

Corneille, Thomas. *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*. 2 vols. [issued as Vols. III and IV of *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*]. Paris: chez la veuve de Jean Baptiste Coignard, et chez Jean Baptiste Coignard, 1694.

Court de Gébelin, Antoine. *Monde primitif, analysé et comparé avec le monde moderne*. 9 vols. [Paris]: chez l'auteur [*et al.*], 1773–82.

Covarrubias Horozco, Sebastián. *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española*. Madrid: por Luis Sanchez, impressor del Rey, 1611.

The Critick. 22 numbers. London: printed for W[illiam] Hinchcliffe and sold for J[ames] Roberts [et al.], 1718.

d'Olivet, [Pierre-Joseph Thoulier], abbé. *Histoire de l'Académie françoise depuis 1652 jusqu'à 1700*. [Issued as Vol. II of a revised edition of Pellisson, *Relation contenant l'histoire de l'Académie françoise*.] Paris: chez Jean-Baptiste Coignard Fils, Imprimeur du Roi, et de l'Académie françoise, 1729.

[?]. Letter to Jean-Paul Bignon, and memorandum on the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*, 24 January 1727, ed. Henri Léonard Bordier [who is identified as the editor in a reprint of the piece in *L'Athenaeum français* 2.37 (10 September 1853), 877]. *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire de France* (1853–4), 25–9.

Lettres de l'abbé d'Olivet (1719–1745), ed. Christiane Lauvergnat de Gagnière and Henri Duranton. 2 vols. Saint-Etienne: Université de Saint-Etienne, 1976.

Dansk ordbog, udgiven under Videnskabernes Selskabs bestyrelse. 8 vols., Vol. I: *A–E* (Copenhagen: trykt hos Hofbogtrykkerne N. Moller og Søn, 1793); Vol. II: *F–H* (Copenhagen: trykt hos Direkteur Johan Frederik Schultz, Kongelig og Universitetsbogtrykker, 1802); Vol. III: *I–L* (Copenhagen: trykt i S. Popps, E. A. H. Møllers og P. D. Kiøppings Officiner, 1820); Vol. IV: *M–O* (Copenhagen: trykt i P. D. Kiøppings Bogtrykkeri, 1826); Vol. V: *P–R* (Copenhagen: trykt i P. D. Kiøppings Bogtrykkeri, 1829); Vol. VI: *S* (Copenhagen: trykt i P. D. Kiøppings og F. S. Løsers Officiner, 1848); Vol. VII: *T–U* (Copenhagen: trykt i F. S. Løsers Bogtrykkeri, 1863); Vol. VIII: *V–Z* (Copenhagen: trykt i F. S. Løsers Bogtrykkeri, 1905).

Danske grammatikere fra midten af det syttende til midten af det attende aarhundrede. Ed. Henrik Bertelsen, rev. Caroline C. Henriksen and Carl Behrend. 6 vols. Copenhagen: Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab, 1979.

Dante Alighieri. *The Divine Comedy*. Trans. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. 3 vols. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1867.

Dashkova, Princess Ekaterina. *Memoirs*. Trans. and ed. Kyril Fitzlyon [Kyril Zinovieff]. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 1995.

Mon histoire: Mémoires d'une femme de lettres Russe à l'époque des lumières. Ed. Alexandre Woronzoff-Dashkoff, Catherine LeGouis, and Catherine Woronzoff-Dashkoff. Paris and Montreal: L'Harmattan, 1999.

[Defoe, Daniel.] *An Essay upon Projects*. London: printed by R[obert?] R[oberts?] for Tho[mas] Cockerill, 1697.

Diccionario da lingoa portugueza, publicado pela Academia Real das Sciencias de Lisboa, Vol. I: *A* [no more published]. Lisbon: na officina da mesma Academia, 1793.

Diccionario de la lengua castellana, compuesta por la Real Academia Española. 6 vols. Madrid: en la imprenta del Francisco Hierro, Impressór de la Real Académia Españóla, 1726–39.

Diccionario de la lengua castellana, compuesta por la Real Academia Española, reducido á un tomo para su mas fácil uso. Madrid: por D[on] Joaquin Ibarra, impresor de cámara de S[u] M[ajestad] y de la Real Academia, 1780.

Dictionnaire complet françois et russe, composé sur la dernière édition de celui de l'Académie françoise, par une société de gens de lettres. 2 vols. St Petersburg: de l'Imprimerie impériale, 1786.

Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise. 2 vols. [plus the 2 vols. of Corneille, *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*]. Paris: chez la veuve de Jean Baptiste Coignard, et chez Jean Baptiste Coignard, 1694.

Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise. 2 vols., 3rd edn. Paris: chez Jean Baptiste Coignard, 1740.

Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise. 2 vols., 4th edn. Paris: chez la veuve de Bernard Brunet, 1762.

Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise. 2 vols., 5th edn. Paris: chez J. J. Smits, [1798]. [See also *Grand dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* and *Nouveau dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*.]

Le Dictionnaire des Halles; ou, Extrait du Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise. Brussels: chez François Foppens, 1696.

L'Enterrement du Dictionnaire de l'Académie. N.p., 1697.

Estienne, Robert, ed. *Dictionaire francoislatin, auquel les mots Francois, auec les manieres d'vser d'iceulx, sont tournez en Latin*. Rev. edn. Ed. Jehan Thierry, with a dedicatory epistle by Jacques Dupuys. Paris: chez Jehan Macé, 1564.

Estienne, Robert, *Dictionaire francoislatin, autrement dict Les mots François, auec les manieres duser diceulx, tournez en Latin*. Corrected and augmented edn. Paris: de l'imprimerie de Robert Estienne Imprimeur du Roy, 1549.

Dictionaire francoislatin, contenants les motz et manieres de parler François, tournez en Latin. Paris: de l'imprimerie de Robert Estienne, 1539[–40].

Evelyn, John. *Memoirs, Comprising His Diary, from 1641 to 1705–6, and a Selection of His Familiar Letters*. Ed. William Bray. 5 vols. London: Henry Colburn, 1827.

Florio, John. *Queen Anna's new world of words, or dictionarie of the Italian and English tongues*. London: printed by Melch[ior] Bradwood [and William Stansby], for Edw[ard] Blount and William Barret, 1611.

Friedrich II, king of Prussia. *Œuvres de Frédéric le Grand*, ed. J. D. E. Preuss. 31 vols. Berlin: chez Rodolphe Decker, 1846–57.

Frisch, Johann Leonhard. *Teutsch–Lateinisches Wörter-Büch*. Berlin: Verlegts Christof Gottlieb Nicolai, 1741.

Furetière, Antoine. *Dictionaire universel, contenant generalement tous les mots françois, tant vieux que modernes, et les termes de toutes les sciences et des arts*. 3 vols. The Hague and Rotterdam: chez Arnout et Reinier Leers, 1690.

Dictionnaire universel, contenant generalement tous les mots françois, tant vieux que modernes, et les termes des sciences et des arts. 3 vols. The Hague and Rotterdam: chez Arnoud et Reinier Leers, 1701–2.

Essais d'un dictionaire universel, contenant generalement tous les mots françois tant vieux que modernes, et les termes de toutes les sciences et des arts. [Paris?: for the author], 1684.

Factum (1684). In *Nouveau recueil des factums*, Vol. I, 1–260.

Nouveau recueil des factums du procez d'entre défunt Mr. l'abé Furetière, l'un des quarante de l'Académie françoise, et quelques-uns des autres membres de la même académie. 2 vols. Amsterdam: chez Henry Desbordes, 1694.

Second factum (1685). In *Nouveau recueil des factums*, Vol. II, 263–544.

Geddes, Alexander. 'Three Scottish poems, with a previous dissertation on the Scoto-Saxon dialect'. *Archaeologia scotica* I (1792): 402–40.

Le grand dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise, 'seconde edition' [i.e. of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* of 1694]. 'Paris: chez la veuve de Jean Baptiste Coignard, et chez Jean Baptiste Coignard' [really Amsterdam: Marc Huguetan], 1695.

Gueintz, Christian. *Die deutsche Rechtschreibung*. Halle in Sachsen: gedruckt bey Christof Salfelden, 1645. [Facsimile reprint Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Georg Olms, 2008.]

Deutscher Sprachlehre Entwurf. Köthen: [Fürstliche Druckerei], 1641. [Facsimile reprint Hildesheim and New York: Georg Olms, 1978.]

H., R. *New Atlantis begun by the Lord Verulam, Viscount St. Albans, and continued by R. H. Esquire*. London: printed for John Crooke, 1660.

Harris, John. *Lexicon technicum, or, An universal English dictionary of arts and sciences, explaining not only the terms of art but the arts themselves*. London: printed for Dan[iel] Brown [et al.], 1704.

Harsdörffer, Georg Philipp. *Specimen philologiae Germanicae, continens disquisitiones* XII. *de linguae nostrae vernaculae historia, methodo, et dignitate*. Nuremberg: impensis Wolfgangi Endteri, 1646.

'Unvergreiffliches wolgemeintes Bedencken, wie ein Teutsches Dictionarium oder wortbuch zuverabfassen'. In Krause, *Ertzschrein*, 387–92.

Hawkins, Sir John. *The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* London: printed for J[ames] Buckland [et al.], 1787.

Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo. *Catalogo delle lingue conosciute e notizia della loro affinità e diversità*. Vol. XVII of *Idea dell'universo*, 1784.

Idea dell'universo. 21 vols. Cesena: per Gregorio Biasini, 1778–87.

Origine, formazione, meccanismo, ed armonia degl'idiomi. Vol. XVIII of *Idea dell'universo*, 1785.

The History of the Works of the Learned. 12 vols. London: printed for H[enry] Rhodes [et al.; imprint varies], 1699–1710.

Hooke, Robert. *The Diary, 1672–1680*. Ed. Henry W. Robinson and Walter Adams. London: Taylor and Francis, 1935.

Hottinger, Johann Heinrich. *Bibliothecarius quadripartitus*. Zurich: sumptibus Melchioris Stauffacheri, 1664.

Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde [originally published as *Handelingen van de Maetschappye der Nederlandsche Letterkunde te Leyden* and under other titles]. Multiple vols. Leiden: Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde, 1766–. Available at www.dbnl.org/.

Johnson, Samuel. *A Dictionary of the English Language*. 2 vols. London: printed by W[illiam] Strahan for J[ohn] and P[aul] Knapton, T[homas] and

T[homas] Longman, C[harles] Hitch and L[acy] Hawes, A[ndrew] Millar, and R[obert] and J[ames] Dodsley, 1755.

'A grammar of the English tongue'. In *English Language*, 275–36.

Johnson on the English Language. Ed. Gwin J. Kolb and Robert DeMaria, Jr. The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson 18. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005.

The Letters of Samuel Johnson. Ed. Bruce Redford. 5 vols. Princeton University Press, 1992–4.

The Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets, with Critical Observations on Their Works. Ed. Roger Lonsdale. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006.

The Plan of a Dictionary of the English Language. In *English Language*, 25–59.

'Preface' to *A Dictionary of the English Language*. In *English Language*, 73–113.

'A short scheme for compiling a new dictionary of the English language'. In *English Language*, 378–427.

Jones, Sir William, *et al*. *Dissertations and miscellaneous pieces relating to the history and antiquities, the arts, sciences, and literature, of Asia*. 4 vols. London: for Vernor and Hood [et al.], 1792–8.

Kiliaan, Cornelis. *Etymologicum teutonicae linguae: sive dictionarium teutonico-latinum*. Antwerp: ex officina Plantiniana, apud Ioannem Moretum, 1599.

Kramer, Matthias. *Das herrlich grosse Teutsch–Italiänische Dictionarium/Il gran dittionario reale, Tedesco–Italiano*. 2 vols. Nuremberg: in Verlegung Johann Andreä Endters Sel. Söhne, 1700–2.

Il nuovo dizzionario delle due lingue, Italiana–Tedesca e Tedesca–Italiana/Das neue Dictionarium oder Wort-Buch in Italiänisch–Teutscher und Teutsch–Italiänischer Sprach. Nuremberg: in Verlegung Wolfgang Moritz Endter und Johann Andreas Endters Sel. Erben, 1676.

Krause, Gottlieb, ed. *Der Fruchtbringenden Gesellschaft ältester Ertzschrein*. Leipzig: Verlag der Dyk'schen Buchhandlung, 1855.

Lassels, Richard. *The Voyage of Italy; or, A Complete Journey through Italy*. Paris and London: printed by Vincent Moutier, and to be sold by John Starkey, 1670.

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm von. 'Brevis designatio meditationum de originibus gentium, ductis potissimum ex indicio linguarum'. *Miscellanea berolinensia ad incrementum scientiarum* 1 (1710): 1–16.

Collectanea etymologica, ed. Johann Georg von Eckhardt. Hannover: sumptibus Nicolai Foersteri, 1717.

Otium hanoueranum, sive miscellanea ex ore et schedis illustris viri, piae memoriae, Godofr[idi] Guilielmi Leibnitii, ed. Joachim Friedrich Feller. Leipzig: impensis Joann[is] Christiani Martini, 1718.

Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe. 8 Reihe, in progress. Darmstadt etc.: Akademie Verlag, 1923–.

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm von, and Hiob Ludolf. *Leibniz and Ludolf on Things Linguistic: Excerpts from Their Correspondence (1688–1703)*. Ed. and trans. John T. Waterman. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1978.

Marsden, William. *A Catalogue of Dictionaries, Vocabularies, Grammars, and Alphabets*. London: [for the compiler], 1796.

'Observations on the language of the people commonly called *Gypsies*, in a letter to Sir Joseph Banks, Bart., PRS'. *Archaeologia* 7 (1783): 382–6.

'Remarks on the *Sumatran* languages, in a letter to Sir Joseph Banks, Bart., President of the Royal Society'. *Archaeologia* 6 (1782): 154–8.

Maxwell, John. *A letter from a friend in England to Mr. Maxwell, complaining of his dilatoriness in the publication of his so-long-promised work, with a character of Mr. Johnson's English dictionary*. Dublin: printed by S[amuel] Powell, 1755.

Ménage, Gilles. *Dictionnaire etymologique, ou, Origines de la langue françoise*. 2nd edn [of *Les Origines*]. Paris: chez Jean Anisson, directeur de l'Imprimerie royale, 1694.

Les Origines de la langue françoise. Paris: chez Augustin Courbé, 1650.

Le Parnasse alarmé. Paris: n.p., 1649.

Le Mercure galant. Paris: chez Michel Brunet, 1672–1710.

Michaelis, Johann David. *A dissertation on the influence of opinions on language and of language on opinions* [translation of *Beantwortung der Frage von dem Einfluss der Meinungen in die Sprache und der Sprache in die Meinungen*]. 2nd edn. London: printed for W[illiam] Owen, J[oseph] Johnson, and W[illiam] Bingley, 1771.

Molyneux, William. *Dioptrica nova: A Treatise of Dioptricks*. London: printed for Benj[amin] Tooke, 1692.

Montagu, Mary Wortley. *The Complete Letters*. Ed. Robert Halsband. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965–7.

Morellet, André. *Du projet annoncé par l'Institut National de continuer le Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*. Paris: chez Migneret [et al.], [1801].

Morhof, Daniel Georg. *Polyhistor literarius, philosophicus, et practicus*, ed. Johann Frick and Johann Moller. Lübeck: sumtibus Petri Boeckmanni, 1747.

Nicot, Jean. *Thresor de la langue francoyse, tant ancienne que moderne*. Paris: chez David Douceur, 1606.

Nizzoli, Mario. *Nizolius, sive Thesaurus Ciceronianus*. Ed. Marcello Squarcialupi, Basilio Zanchi, and Celio Secondo Curione. Basel: ex officina Hervagiana, per Eusebium Episcopium, 1576.

Nouveau dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise. 2 vols. Paris: chez Jean Baptiste Coignard, 1718.

Ostersen, Christen. *Glossarium juridico-danicum*. Copenhagen: prentet aff Melchior Martzan, 1641.

[Pallas, Peter Simon, ed.]. *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa*. 2 vols. St Petersburg: typis Iohannis Caroli Schnoor, 1786 [really 1787]–1789.

[Pellisson, Paul.] *Relation contenant l'histoire de l'Académie françoise*. Paris: chez Pierre le Petit, 1653.

Pergamino, Giacomo. *Il memoriale della lingua italiana, estratto dalle scritture de'migliori, e più nobili autori antichi*. 2nd edn. Venice: appresso Gio[vanni] Battista Ciotti, 1617.

Petrarch. *Lyric Poems: The 'Rime sparse' and Other Lyrics*. Ed. and trans. Robert M. Durling. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Philips, Ambrose. *Poems*. Ed. M. G. Segar. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1937.

Phillips, Edward. *The New World of English Words; or, A General Dictionary*. London: printed by E[van] Tyler for Nath[aniel] Brooke, 1658.

The New World of Words; or, A Universal English Dictionary. 5th edn. London: printed for R[ichard] Bentley, H[enry] Rhodes, and J[ohn] Taylor, 1696.

Piozzi, Hester Lynch. *Anecdotes of the Late Samuel Johnson, ll.d. during the Last Twenty Years of His life*. London: printed for T[homas] Cadell, 1786.

Politi, Adriano. *Dittionario toscano, compendio del Vocabolario della Crusca, con la nota di tutte le differenze di lingua che sono trà questi due Populi Fiorentino, e Senese*. Rome: appresso Gio[vanni] Angelo Ruffinelli, stampato per Giacomo Mascardi, 1614.

Pougens, Marie-Charles-Joseph de. *Archéologie française; ou, Vocabulaire de mots anciens tombés en désuétude, et propres a être réstitués au langage moderne*. 2 vols. Paris: Th. Desoer, 1821–5.

Mémoires et souvenirs, ed. Louise Brayer de Saint-Léon. Paris: Librairie de H. Fournier jeune, 1834.

'Plan du Dictionnaire complet de la langue française' [1794], ed. P. J. Wexler. *Cahiers de lexicologie* 1 (1959): 95–8.

Trésor des origines et Dictionnaire grammatical: Specimen. Paris: de l'Imprimerie royale, 1819.

Vocabulaire de nouveaux privatifs français, imités des langues latine, italienne, espagnole, portugaise, allemande, et anglaise, avec des autorités tirées des meilleurs écrivains. Paris: chez les Directeurs de l'Imprimerie du Cercle Social, 1794.

The Present State of Europe. 48 [really 50] vols. [under varying titles]. London: printed for Henry Rhodes and John Harris [imprint varies], 1690–1738.

Proeve van oudheid-, taal- en dichtkunde, door het genootschap Dulces ante omnia musae. Utrecht: bij A[braham] van Paddenburg [en] J[ohannes] van Schoonhoven, 1775.

Racine, Jean. *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Raymond Picard. 2 vols. Paris: Gallimard, 1966.

Les Régistres de l'Académie françoise, 1672–1793, ed. Camille Doucet. 4 vols. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1895–1906.

Régnier-Desmarais, François Séraphin. 'Preface pour le Grand Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise'. In *Recueil de pieces curieuses et nouvelles, tome* I*, premiere partie*, 627–47. The Hague: chez Adrien Moetjens, 1694.

Richelet, Pierre. *Dictionnaire françois, contenant les mots et les choses, plusieurs nouvelles remarques sur la langue françoise, ses expressions propres … avec les termes les plus connus des arts et des sciences, le tout tiré de l'usage et des bons auteurs de la langue françoise*. Geneva: chez Jean Herman Widerhold, 1680.

Rochefort, César de. *Dictionaire general et curieux, contenant les principaux mots, et les plus usitez en la langue françoise, leurs definitions, divisions, et etymologies, enrichies d'eloquens discours*. Lyon: chez Pierre Guillimin, [1685].

Sainte-Palaye, Jean-Baptiste de Lacurne de. *Dictionnaire historique de l'ancien langage françois*, ed. Léopold Favre with Léon Pajot. 10 vols. Niort: L[éopold] Favre, 1875–82.

Projet d'un glossaire françois. Paris: chez H[ippolyte] L[ouis] Guerin and L[ouis] F[rançois] Delatour, 1756.

Salviati, Lionardo. *Degli avvertimenti della lingua sopra'l Decamerone*. 3 vols., Vol. I. Venice: presso Domenico & Gio[vanni] Battista Guerra, 1584.

Schottelius, Justus Georgius. *Ausführliche Arbeit von der teutschen HaubtSprache*. Braunschweig: gedrukt und verlegt durch Christoff Friedrich Zilligern, 1663.

Teutsche Sprach Kunst, vielfaltig vermehret und verbessert. Braunschweig: in Verlegung Christof Friederich Zilligern, 1651.

Teutsche Sprachkunst. Braunschweig: gedruckt bey Balthasar Grubern, 1641.

Scriptorum a societate Hafniensi bonis artibus promovendis dedita, pars prima. Trans. P. P. Copenhagen: sumptibus et typis Orphanotrophii Regii, excudit Gottmann[us] Frid[ericus] Kisel, Orphanotroph[ii] Reg[ii] typogr[aphus], 1745.

Skinner, Stephen. *Etymologicon linguae anglicanae*. London: typis T[homae] Roycroft, et prostant venales apud H[enricum] Brome [et al.], 1671.

Spence, Joseph. *Observations, Anecdotes, and Characters of Books and Men, Collected from Conversation*. Ed. James M. Osborn. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.

Sprat, Thomas. *The History of the Royal-Society of London for the Improving of Natural Knowledge*. London: printed by T[homas] R[oycroft] for J[ohn] Martyn and J[ames] Allestry, printers to the Royal Society, 1667.

Stevin, Simon. *De beghinselen der weeghconst*. Leiden: inde Druckerye van Christoffel Plantijn, by Françoys van Raphelinghen, 1586.

[Stieler, Kaspar.] *Der Teutschen Sprache Stammbaum und Fortwachs, oder Teutscher Sprachschatz … durch unermüdeten Fleiß in vielen Jahren gesamlet von dem Spaten/Teutonicae linguae semina et germina, sive lexicon Germanicum … accurante Serotino*. Nuremberg: in Verlegung Johann Hofmanns, 1691.

Stubbe, Henry. *Clamor, rixa, joci, mendacia, furta, cachini, or, a severe enquiry into the late oneirocritica published by John Wallis, grammar-reader in Oxon*. London: n.p., 1657.

Syv, Peder. *Den Danske sprog-kunst eller grammatica samt et tilheng om dette sprogs skrive-rigtighed* [1685]. In *Danske grammatikere*, Vol. III, 147–250.

Nogle betenkninger om det Cimbriske sprog [1663]. In *Danske grammatikere*, Vol. I, 75–272.

Tollius, Herman [writing as H. v. B., i.e. Herman van Breda]. 'Taalkundige Heeren!'. *Maendelijksche by-dragen ten opbouw van Neer-land's tael- en dichtkunde* 49 (November 1762): 583–90.

Van Hoogstraten, David. *Aenmerkingen over de geslachten der zelfstandige naemwoorden*. Amsterdam: by François Halma, 1700.

Lijst der gebruikelijkste zelfstandige naamwoorden, ed. Adriaan Kluit. Amsterdam: bij Pieter Meijer, 1759.

Van Iperen, Josua. *Proeve van taalkunde als eene wetenschap behandeld*. Amsterdam: G. Rykman, 1755.

'Schetze van woorden-scharinge en zin-bepalinge, die men hoopt te volgen, in het toestellen van een oordeelkundig Nederduitsch woordenboek'. *Maendelijksche by-dragen ten opbouw van Neer-land's tael- en dicht-kunde* 48 (October 1762): 541–51.

'Uitnoodiginge der liefhebbers en kenners van onze moedertale, tot het helpen toestellen van een ordeelkundig Nederduitsch woordenboek'. *Maendelijksche by-dragen ten opbouw van Neer-land's tael- en dicht-kunde* 47 (September 1762): 509–14.

Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca. Venice: appresso Giovanni Alberti, 1612.

Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca. 2nd edn. Venice: appresso Iacopo Sarzina, 1623.

Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca. 3rd edn. 3 vols. Florence: nella stamperia dell'Accademia della Crusca, 1691.

Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca. 4th edn. 6 vols. Florence: appresso Domenico Maria Manni, 1729–38.

Wachter, Johann Georg. *Glossarium germanicum*. Leipzig: apud Joh[annis] Frid[erici] Gleditschii B. filium, 1737.

Weiland, Petrus. *Nederduitsch taalkundig woordenboek*. 11 vols. Amsterdam: bij Johannes Allart, 1799–1811.

Wilkins, John. *An Essay towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language* [with an 'Alphabetical dictionary' by William Lloyd]. London: printed for Sa[muel] Gellibrand and for John Martyn, printer to the Royal Society, 1668.

The World. 4 vols. London: printed for R[obert] Dodsley, and sold for M[ary] Cooper [imprint varies], 1753–6.

Worm, Ole. *Museum Wormianum, seu, Historia rerum rariorum quae Hafniae Danorum in aedibus authoris servantur*. Amsterdam: apud Ludovicum et Danielem Elzevirios, 1655.

Wotton, William. *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning*. London: printed by J[ohn] Leake for Peter Buck, 1694.

PRINTED AND ONLINE SOURCES: SECONDARY

Aarsleff, Hans. 'The study and use of etymology in Leibniz'. *Studia Leibnitiana supplementa* 3 (1969): 173–89.

The Study of Language in England 1780–1860. 2nd edn. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; London: Athlone Press, 1983.

Adams, Jonathan, and Peter Zeeberg. 'The dictionary database at www.renaessencesprog.dk: An online tool for the study of Renaissance language in Denmark'. *Renaessenceforum* 6 (2010): 43–57.

Adamska Sałaciak, Arleta. 'Linde's dictionary: A landmark in Polish lexicography'. *Historiographia linguistica* 28.1/2 (2001): 65–83.

Adelung, Friedrich. *Catherinens der Grossen Verdienste um die vergleichende Sprachenkunde*. St Petersburg: Friedrich Drechsler, 1815.

Alvar Ezquerra, Manuel. *De antiguos y nuevos diccionarios del español*. Madrid: Arco/Libros, 2002.

Alvarez de Miranda, Pedro. 'La Real Academia Española et l'Académie française'. In Quemada with Pruvost, *Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*, 403–15.

Amatuzzi, Antonella. 'L'apport de Nicot et Ménage au *Tresor de recherches et antiquitez Gauloises et Françoises* de Pierre Borel'. In Considine, *Adventuring in Dictionaries*, 45–57.

Andersen, Kirsti. 'An impression of mathematics in Denmark in the period 1600–1800'. *Centaurus* 24.1 (1980): 316–34.

ARTFL Project. '*Dictionnaire de l'Académie* françoise [1798], revu, corrigé et augmenté par l'Académie elle-même: Cinquième édition'. Available at http://dictionnaires.atilf.fr/dictionnaires/index.htm.

Auroux, Sylvain, E. F. K. Koerner, Hans-Josef Niederehe, and Kees Versteegh, eds. *History of the Language Sciences/Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften/Histoire des sciences du langage*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2001.

Ball, Gabriele. '"Alles zu nutzen": The Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft (1617–1680) as a German Renaissance academy'. In Van Dixhoorn and Speakman Sutch, *The Reach of the Republic of Letters*, Vol. II, 389–422.

Bartoccioni, Stefania. 'Les français en Russie et les russes en France au XVIII[e] siècle: Note sur la lexicographie français–russe et le Dictionnaire manuel en quatre langues de Veneroni (Moscou, 1771)'. *Quaderni del CIRSIL* 4 (2005): 89–118. Available at www.lingue.unibo.it/cirsil.

Beaulieux, Charles. 'La gestation de la première édition du *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise*'. In François-Eudes de Mézeray, *Observations sur l'orthographie de la langue françoise*, ed. Beaulieux, 5–89. Paris: Honoré Champion, [1951].

Béjoint, Henri. *The Lexicography of English*. Oxford University Press, 2010.

Beltrami, Pietro G., and Simone Fornara. 'Italian historical dictionaries'. *International Journal of Lexicography* 17.4 (2004): 357–84.

Benedikz, Eiríkur. 'Árni Magnússon'. *Saga-Book of the Viking Society* 16 (1962–5): 89–93.

Benzie, William. *Dr. F. J. Furnivall: A Victorian Scholar Adventurer*. Norman, OK: Pilgrim Books, 1983.

Bergenholtz, Henning, and Loránd-Levente Pálfi. '*Videnskabernes Selskabs Ordbog*: Das erste dänische Nationalwörterbuch'. In Haß, *Große Lexika*, 137–47.

Bircher, Martin. 'The Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft and Italy: Between Admiration and Imitation'. Trans. Jill Bepler. In *The Fairest Flower*, 121–132.

Birgegård, Ulla. *Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeld and the 'Lexicon slavonicum': His Contribution to the 17th Century Slavonic Lexicography*. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell for the Bibliotheca R[egalis] Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1985.

Bjerrum, Marie. 'Peder Syvs danske ordbog'. *Sprog og kultur* 20 (1956): 53–69.

Blair, Ann M. *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age*. London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

Boas Hall, Marie. Review of Sir Geoffrey Keynes, *Bibliography of Dr. Robert Hooke*. *Isis* 53.3 (September 1962): 420–1.

Born, Renate. 'The evolution of modern standard German'. In Brian Murdoch, Malcolm Read, and Will Hasty, eds., *The Camden House History of German Literature*. 10 vols., Vol. IV: *Early Modern German Literature 1350–1700*, ed. Max Reinhart, 89–134. Rochester, NY, and Woodbridge: Camden House, 2007.

Borst, Arno. *Der Turmbau von Babel: Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielhalt der Sprachen und Völker*. 4 vols. in 6, continuously paginated. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1957–63.

Bray, Laurent. *César-Pierre Richelet (1626–1698): Biographie et œuvre lexicographique*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1986.

'La lexicographie française des origines à Littré'. In Hausmann *et al.*, *Wörterbücher/Dictionaries/Dictionnaires*, Vol. II, 1788–1818.

Matthias Kramer et la lexicographie du français en Allemagne au XVIII^e^ *siècle*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2000.

Breen, Quirinus. 'The *Observationes in M. T. Ciceronem* of Marius Nizolius'. *Studies in the Renaissance* 1 (1954): 49–58.

Brévot-Dromzée, Claude. 'Remarque sur la communication de P. Cahné'. In Quemada with Pruvost, *Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*, 221–5.

Broadus, E. K. 'Addison's influence on the development of interest in folk-poetry in the eighteenth century'. *Modern Philology* 8.1 (1910): 123–34.

Brock, Peter. *Nationalism and Populism in Partitioned Poland*. London: Orbis, 1973.

Brown, Peter M. *Lionardo Salviati: A Critical Biography*. Oxford University Press, 1974.

Burke, Peter. *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe. 2nd edn. Aldershot and Brookfield, VT: Scolar Press and Ashgate, 1994.

Toward a Social History of Early Modern Dutch. Amsterdam University Press, 2005.

Butterwick, Richard. *Poland's Last King and English Culture: Stanisław August Poniatowski 1732–1798*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Campbell, Lyle. *American Indian Languages: The Historical Linguistics of Native America*. Oxford University Press, 1997.

'Why Sir William Jones got it all wrong, or Jones' role in how to establish language families'. In Joseba Lakarra and José Ignacio Hualde, eds., *Studies in Basque and Historical Linguistics in Memory of R. L. Trask*, 245–64. Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea, 2007. Available at www.ehu.ed/ojs/index.php/ASJU/article /viewFile/438443.

Cant, Ronald G. 'David Steuart Erskine, 11th Earl of Buchan: Founder of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland'. In A. S. Bell, ed., *The Scottish Antiquarian Tradition: Essays to Mark the Bicentenary of the Society of*

Antiquaries of Scotland and Its Museum, 1780–1980, 1–30. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1981.

Carels, Peter E., and Dan Flory. 'Johann Heinrich Zedler's *Universal Lexicon*'. In Kafker, *Notable Encyclopedias of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, 165–96.

Carlyon, Jonathan Earl. *Andrés González de Barcia and the Creation of the Colonial Spanish American Library*. University of Toronto Press, 2005.

Carriazo Ruiz, José Ramón, and Maria Jesús Mancho Duque. 'Los comienzos de la lexicografía monolingüe'. In Medina Guerra, *Lexicografía española*, 205–34.

Casteleiro, João Malaca. 'Estudo linguístico do 1.º Dicionário da Academia (1793)'. *Memórias da Academia das Ciências de Lisboa, Classe de Letras* 22 (1981/2): 47–63.

Caudle, James J. 'James Boswell (1740–1795) and his design for *A Dictionary of the Scottish Language*, 1764–1825'. *Dictionaries* 32 (2011): 1–32.

Cevolini, Alberto. *De arte excerpendi: Imparare a dimenticare nella modernità*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2006.

Chambers, David S. 'The earlier "academies" in Italy'. In Chambers and Quiviger, *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, 1–14.

Chambers, David S., and François Quiviger, eds. *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*. London: Warburg Institute, 1995.

Claes, Frans. *Bibliographisches Verzeichnis der deutschen Vokabulare und Wörterbücher, gedruckt bis 1600*. Hildesheim and New York: Georg Olms, 1977.

Cochrane, Eric. 'The Renaissance academies in their Italian and European setting'. In *The Fairest Flower*, 21–39.

Tradition and Enlightenment in the Tuscan Academies 1690–1800. University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992.

Comrie, Bernard. Review of Mary Ritchie Key, Catherine the Great's Linguistic Contribution. *Language* 58.1 (1982): 240.

Congleton, J. E., and Elizabeth C. *Johnson's Dictionary: Bibliographical Survey 1746–1984 with Excerpts for All Entries*. Terre Haute, IN: Dictionary Society of North America, 1984.

Considine, John, ed. *Adventuring in Dictionaries: New Studies in the History of Lexicography*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010.

'Ancient Greek among the eighteenth-century languages of science: Linnaeus, Dillenius, and the lexicographical record'. *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 16.3/4 (2009): 330–43.

Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe: Lexicography and the Making of Heritage. Cambridge University Press, 2008.

'Historical dictionaries: History and development.' In *The Oxford handbook of lexicography*, ed. Philip Durkin, chapter 10. Oxford University Press, forthcoming.

'John Jamieson, Franz Passow, and the double invention of lexicography on historical principles'. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 75.2 (2014): 259–79.

'Leibniz and lexicography'. In Marijke Mooijaart and Marijke van der Wal, eds., *Yesterday's Words: Contemporary, Current and Future Lexicography*, 41–52. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008.

'Leibniz as lexicographer?' In Gerda Haßler and Gesina Volkmann, eds., *History of Linguistics 2008: Selected Papers from the Eleventh International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences (ICHoLS* XI*), 28 August–2 September 2008, Potsdam*, 217–24. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2011.

'The lexicographer as hero: Samuel Johnson and Henri Estienne'. *Philological Quarterly* 79.2 (2001): 205–24.

'Matthias Moth and the dictionary project as cultural treasury'. In Laura Pinnavaia and Nicholas Brownlees, eds., *Insights into English and Germanic Lexicology and Lexicography: Past and Present Perspectives*, 251–66. Monza: Polimetrica, 2010.

'Stephen Skinner's *Etymologicon* and other English etymological dictionaries 1650–1700'. *Studia etymologica cracoviensia* 14 (2009): 123–51.

Courtat, Félix-Titus. *Monographie du Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*. Paris: Henri Delaroque, 1880.

Dahlerup, Verner. 'Principer for ordbogsarbejde'. *Danske studier* (1907): 65–78.

Darnton, Robert. *The Business of Enlightenment: A Publishing History of the 'Encyclopédie', 1775–1800*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1979.

Davies, Martin. *Aldus Manutius: Printer and Publisher of Renaissance Venice*. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1999 [1995].

De Mauro, Tullio, and Lia Formigari, eds. *Leibniz, Humboldt, and the Origins of Comparativism*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1990.

De Sanctis, Francesco. *Storia della letteratura italiana*. 2 vols. Naples: Domenico Morano and Antonio Morano, 1870.

De Vries, Matthias. 'Inleiding'. In De Vries and L. A. te Winkel, eds., *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal*, 24 vols., Vol. I: *A–ajun*, i–xcvi. The Hague and Leiden: M[artinus] Nijhoff et al., 1882.

Verslag der redactie van het Nederlandsch woordenboek. Haarlem: A. C. Kruseman, 1862.

DeCoursey, Christina. 'Society of Antiquaries (*act.* 1586–1607)'. In Matthew, Harrison, and Goldman, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

DeJean, Joan. 'The salons, "preciosity", and the sphere of women's influence'. In Hollier, *A New History of French Literature*, 297–303.

Dekker, Kees. *The Origins of Old Germanic Studies in the Low Countries*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

DeMaria, Robert, Jr. *Johnson's Dictionary and the Language of Learning*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

'Johnson's extempore history and grammar of the English language'. In Lynch and McDermott, *Anniversary Essays*, 77–91.

The Life of Samuel Johnson. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1993.

Domson, Charles. 'Nicolas Fatio de Duillier and the Prophets of London'. Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1972.
Doucette, Leonard E. *Emery Bigot, Seventeenth-Century French Humanist*. University of Toronto Press, 1970.
Droixhe, Daniel. *La Linguistique et l'appel de l'histoire (1600–1800): Rationalisme et révolutions positivistes*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1978.
Duranton, Henri. 'Introduction'. In Olivet, *Lettres*, Vol. I, 3–10.
Durkin, Philip. *The Oxford Guide to Etymology*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
Dutz, Klaus D. *Zeichentheorie und Sprachwissenschaft bei G. W. Leibniz: Eine kritisch annotierte Bibliographie der Sekundärliteratur*. Münster: Institut für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität, 1983.
Eickmans, Heinz. 'Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal (WNT)'. In Haß, *Große Lexika*, 271–91.
Eismann, Wolfgang. 'Die zweisprachige Lexikographie mit Russisch'. In Hausmann *et al.*, *Wörterbücher/Dictionaries/Dictionnaires*, Vol. III, 3068–85.
Faber du Faur, Curt von. *German Baroque Literature: A Catalogue of the Collection in the Yale University Library*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.
Fabre, Jean. *Stanislas-Auguste Poniatowski et l'Europe des lumières*. Paris: Institut d'Etudes Slaves, 1952.
The Fairest Flower: The Emergence of Linguistic National Consciousness in Renaissance Europe. Ed. Fredi Chiappelli. Florence: [for the Accademia della Crusca], 1985.
Fisher, John H. *The Emergence of Standard English*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996.
Fleeman, J. D. *A Bibliography of the Works of Samuel Johnson*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
Floor, Willem. 'Čāp' (1990). In *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, online edition. Available at www.iranicaonline.org/.
Fox, Adam. 'Printed questionnaires, research networks, and the discovery of the British Isles, 1650–1800'. *Historical Journal* 53.3 (2010): 593–621.
François, Alexis. 'Les origines italiennes du Dictionnaire de l'Académie française'. In *Mélanges d'histoire littéraire et de philologie offerts à M. Bernard Bouvier*, 149–74. Geneva: Société Anonyme des Editions Sonor, 1920.
Garofalo, Silvano. 'Gianfrancesco Pivati's *Nuovo dizionario*'. In Kafker, *Notable Encyclopedias of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, 197–219.
Gemmingen, Barbara von. 'Le "Dictionnaire à part" de l'Académie française: Le *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences* de Thomas Corneille (1694)'. In Quemada with Pruvost, *Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*, 153–64.
'Los inicios de la lexicografía española'. In Medina Guerra, *Lexicografía española*, 151–74.
Gencer, Yasemin. 'İbrahim Müteferrika and the age of the printed manuscript'. In Christiane J. Gruber, ed., *The Islamic Manuscript Tradition: Ten Centuries of Book Arts in Indiana University Collections*, 155–93. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010.

Gerritsen, Marinel. 'The dialectology of Dutch'. In Auroux *et al.*, *History/Geschichte/Histoire*, 1536–53.

Gilliver, Peter. '"Not altogether treated as I should treat it now": James Murray's early editorial decisions for the *New English Dictionary*'. In Considine, *Adventuring in Dictionaries*, 212–37.

Goldgar, Anne. *Impolite Learning: Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters 1680–1750*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995.

Grayson, Cecil. 'The growth of linguistic national consciousness in England'. In *The Fairest Flower*, 167–73.

Grazzini, Giovanni. *Di Crusca in Crusca: Per una bibliografia dell'Accademia*, ed. Rosaria di Loreto. Pisa: Pacini Editore, 2000.

Grimm, Jacob, and Wilhelm Grimm, eds. *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. 32 vols. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1854–1960.

Grüner-Nielsen, Hakon Harald. 'Matthias Moths landsindsamling af danske ord 1697–1700'. *Sprog og Kultur* 7 (1939): 109–36.

'Den ældste landsindsamling af danske folkemaal ved Matthias Moth omkring 1700'. *Sprog og Kultur* 10 (1941): 37–114.

Hankins, James. 'The myth of the Platonic Academy of Florence'. *Renaissance Quarterly* 44.3 (1991): 429–75.

Hanzeli, Victor Egon. *Missionary Linguistics in New France: A Study of Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Descriptions of American Indian Languages*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1969.

Harnack, Adolf. *Geschichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*. 3 vols. in 4. Berlin: gedruckt in der Reichsdruckerei, 1900.

Haß, Ulrike, ed. *Große Lexika und Wörterbücher Europas: Europäische Enzyklopädien und Wörterbücher in historischen Porträts*. Berlin and Boston, MA: de Gruyter, 2012.

Haß-Zumkehr, Ulrike. *Deutsche Wörterbücher: Brennpunkt von Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2001.

Haugen, Einar. 'Introduction'. In Eva L. Haugen, *A Bibliography of Scandinavian Dictionaries*, 1–61. White Plains, NY: Kraus International, 1984.

Hausmann, Franz Josef. 'Die gesellschaftlichen Aufgaben der Lexikographie in Geschichte und Gegenwart'. In Hausmann *et al.*, *Wörterbücher/Dictionaries/Dictionnaires*, Vol. 1, 1–19.

'La réception de la première édition: Grandeurs et misères'. In Quemada with Pruvost, *Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*, 133–8.

Hausmann, Franz Josef, Oskar Reichmann, Herbert Ernst Wiegand, and Ladislav Zgusta, eds. *Wörterbücher: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexicographie/Dictionaries: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography/Dictionnaires: Encyclopédie internationale de lexicographie*. 3 vols. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1989.

Hollier, Denis, ed., *A New History of French Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Holtus, Günter, and Ulrike Mühlschlegel. 'Die Wörterbücher von Raphael Bluteau (1712/1728) und von Antonio de Moraes Silva (1789): Ein Vergleich am Beispiel der diasystemischen Markierungen'. In Bruno Staib,

ed., *Linguistica romanica et indiana: Festschrift für Wolf Dietrich*, 171–85. Tübingen: Narr, 2000.

Hovdhaugen, Even. 'Field work and data elicitation of unwritten languages for descriptive and comparative purposes: Strahlenberg, Sjögren, Castrén, Böhtlingk'. In Auroux *et al.*, *History/Geschichte/Histoire*, 1480–5.

Hovdhaugen, Even, Fred Karlsson, Carol Henriksen, and Bengt Sigurd. *The History of Linguistics in the Nordic Countries*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 2000. Available at www.ling.helsinki.fi/~fkarlsso/Hist_Ling_Nord.pdf.

Hulet, Claude L. 'The Portuguese language and the academy in Portugal and Brazil'. In *The Fairest Flower*, 95–105.

Hunter, Michael. 'Founder members of the Royal Society (*act.* 1660–1663)'. In Matthew, Harrison, and Goldman, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

IJsewijn, Jozef. *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*. 2nd edn. 2 vols. [Vol. II with Dirk Sacré]. Leuven University Press, 1990–8.

Jachnow, Helmut. 'Russische Lexikographie'. In Hausmann *et al.*, *Wörterbücher/Dictionaries/Dictionnaires*, Vol. II, 2309–29.

Jacobsen, Lis, and H[arald] Juul-Jensen. 'Inledning'. In Danske Sprog- og Litteratureskab, *Ordbog over det danske sprog*, 28 vols., Vol. I, xi–lii Copenhagen: Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab, 1919.

Jespersen, Knud J. V. *A History of Denmark*. Trans. Ivan Hill. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Jones, William Jervis. 'Early dialectology, etymology and language history in German-speaking countries'. In Auroux *et al.*, *History/Geschichte/Histoire*, 1105–15.

German Lexicography in the European Context: A Descriptive Bibliography of Printed Dictionaries and Word Lists Containing German Language (1600–1700). Berlin: Walther de Gruyter, 2000.

'Lingua teutonum victrix? Landmarks in German lexicography (1500–1700)'. *Histoire épistémologie langage* 13.2 (1991): 131–52.

Kafker, Frank A., ed. *Notable Encyclopedias of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: Nine Predecessors of the 'Encyclopédie'*. Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century 194. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1981.

Kalkar, Otto. *Ordbog til det ældre danske sprog (1300–1700)*. 5 vols. Copenhagen: Thieles Bogtrykkeri, 1881–1918.

Kamusella, Tomasz. *The Politics of Language and Nationalism in Modern Central Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan 2009.

Kanthak, Gerhard. *Der Akademiegedanke zwischen utopischem Entwurf und barocker Projektmacherei: Zur Geistesgeschichte der Akademiebewegung des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1987.

Keipert, Helmut. 'Die Pallas-Redaktion der Petersburger *Vocabularia comparativa* und ihre Bedeutung für die Entwicklung der slavischen Sprachwissenschaft'. *Historiographia linguistica* 40.1/2 (2013): 121–49.

Key, Mary Ritchie. *Catherine the Great's Linguistic Contribution*. Carbondale, IL and Edmonton, AB: Linguistic Research, 1980.

Keynes, Sir Geoffrey. *A Bibliography of Dr. Robert Hooke*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.

Klein, Harriet E. Manelis, and Herbert S. Klein. 'The "Russian collection" of Amerindian languages in Spanish archives'. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 44.2 (1978): 137–44.

Klindt-Jensen, Ole. *A History of Scandinavian Archaeology*, Trans. G. Russell Poole [really Russell G. Poole]. London: Thames and Hudson, 1975.

Koerner, E. F. K. 'Friedrich Schlegel and the emergence of historical-comparative grammar'. *Lingua e stile* 22.3 (1987): 341–65.

Universal Index of Biographical Names in the Language Sciences. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2008.

Korshin, Paul J. 'The mythology of Johnson's *Dictionary*'. In Lynch and McDermott, *Anniversary Essays*, 10–23.

Kössinger, Norbert. 'Die Anfänge der Mittelalterphilologie: Zur Wiederentdeckung und Edition deutschsprachiger Texte des Mittelalters in der frühen Neuzeit, mit einer Fallstudie zu Johann Schilters *Thesaurus antiquitatum Teutonicarum* (Ulm 1726–1728)'. *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 38.151 (2008): 32–51.

Kossmann, Friedrich K. H. *Opkomst en voortgang van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde te Leiden*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.

Krömer, Dietfried. 'Lexicography II: Latin'. In Manfred Landfester, Hubert Cancik, Helmut Schneider, and Francis G. Gentry, eds., *Brill's New Pauly: Classical Tradition*, 22 vols., Vol. III: *Jap–Ode*, 210–19. Leiden and Boston, MA: Brill, 2006–10.

Kyes, Robert L. 'Grammar and grammars in seventeenth-century Germany: The case of Christian Gueintz'. In Irmengard Rauch and Gerald F. Carr, eds., *Insights in Germanic Linguistics 1: Methodology in Transition*, 185–202. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1995.

Landau, Sidney. *Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography*. 2nd edn. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Larrucea de Tovar, Consuelo. 'José Celestino Mutis (1732–1808) and the report on American languages ordered by Charles III of Spain for Catherine the Great of Russia'. In Antonio Quilis and Hans-Josef Niederehe, eds., *The History of Linguistics in Spain*, 213–29. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1986.

Larsen, Knud. *Frederik Rostgaard og bøgerne*. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1970.

Lebsanft, Franz. 'Der *Diccionario de la lengua española* der Real Academia Española'. In Haß, *Große Lexika*, 65–75.

LeibnizCentral. 'Die Zettelsammlung von Martin Fogel'. Available at www.leibnizcentral.de.

Lepschy, Giulio, ed. *History of Linguistics*. 4 vols. Vol. III: *Renaissance and Early Modern Linguistics*. Harlow: Longman, 1998.

Leroy-Turcan, Isabelle. 'Gilles Ménage et l'Académie française'. In Leroy-Turcan and T. R. Wooldridge, eds., *Gilles Ménage (1613–1692): Le rayonnement de*

son œuvre linguistique. Online edn. Toronto: SIEHLDA, 1998. Available at http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~wulfric/siehlda/actesmen.

'Les *Origini della lingua italiana* (1669–1685) de G. Ménage, un ouvrage méconnu dont l'interêt linguistique dépasse son objet propre'. Conference paper, XXIe Congrès international de linguistique et philologie romanes, Palermo, 21 September 1995. Available at http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~wulfric/siehlda/menage/.

Lewis, Rhodri. *Language, Mind, and Nature: Artificial Languages in England from Bacon to Locke*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Liberman, Anatoly. 'The growth of the English etymological dictionary'. In Considine, *Adventuring in Dictionaries*, 164–86.

'The Icelandic part in Pallas's dictionary'. In *Word Heath, Wortheide, Orðheiði: Essays on Germanic Literature and Usage (1972–1992)*. Rome: Il Calamo, 1994.

Lodge, R. Anthony. *French: From Dialect to Standard*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Loman, Bengt. 'En Inrättning, ägnad endast til Språkets förbättring'. In Sture Allén, Loman, and Bengt Sigurd, *Svenska Akademien och svenska språket: Tre studier Svenska Akademien 200 År*, 1–141. Stockholm: Norstedts, 1986.

Lowry, Martin. 'The proving ground: Venetian academies of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries'. In *The Fairest Flower*, 41–51.

Luna, Paul. 'The typographic design of Johnson's Dictionary'. In Lynch and McDermott, *Anniversary Essays*, 175–97.

Lundgreen-Nielsen, Flemming. 'Nordic language history and the history of ideas 1: Humanism'. In Oskar Bandle, Kurt Braunmuller, and Ernst Håkon Jahr, eds., *The Nordic Languages: An International Handbook of the History of the North Germanic Languages*, 2 vols., Vol. I, 354–62. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.

Lupetti, Monica. 'Tra Cardoso e Bluteau: La lessicografia portoghese del Seicento'. *Quaderni del CIRSIL* 4 (2005): 89–118. Available at www.lingue.unibo.it/cirsil.

Lynch, Jack. 'Johnson's encyclopedia'. In Lynch and McDermott, *Anniversary Essays*, 129–46.

Lynch, Jack, and Anne McDermott, eds. *Anniversary Essays on Johnson's 'Dictionary'*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Lyons, John D. 'The age of the technician'. In Hollier, *A New History of French Literature*, 262–7.

Malcolm, Noel. 'Thomas Harrison and his "Ark of Studies"'. *The Seventeenth Century* 19.2 (2004): 196–232.

Malkiel, Yakov. *Etymological Dictionaries: A Tentative Typology*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Etymology. Cambridge University Press, 1993.

'Hispano-Arabic "marrano" and its Hispano-Latin homophone'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 68.4 (1948): 175–84.

Malmgren, Sven-Göran. 'Das schwedische Akademiewörterbuch und das Wörterbuch der dänischen Sprache'. In Haß, *Große Lexika*, 301–15.

Manuel, Frank E., and Fritzie P. Manuel. *James Bowdoin and the Patriot Philosophers*. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 247. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2004.

Matthew, Colin, Brian Harrison, and Lawrence Goldman, eds. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004–.

Maylender, Michele. *Storia delle accademie d'Italia*. 5 vols. Bologna: Licinio Cappelli, 1926–30.

Mazière, Francine. 'Le *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*: Un pacte linguistique. La construction de l'article de dictionnaire de langue'. In Quemada with Pruvost, *Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*, 185–95.

McDowell, R. B. 'The main narrative'. In Ó Raifertaigh, *Royal Irish Academy*, 1–92.

McLelland, Nicola. *J. G. Schottelius's 'Ausführliche Arbeit von der Teutschen HaubtSprache' (1663) and Its Place in Early Modern European Vernacular Language Study*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Medina Guerra, Antonia M., ed. *Lexicografía española*. Barcelona: Ariel, 2003.

Mercier Faivre, Anne-Marie. 'La nation par la langue: Philologie, nationalisme et nation dans l'Europe du dix-huitième siècle'. In Michael O'Dea and Kevin Whelan, eds., *Nations and Nationalisms: France, Britain, Ireland, and the Eighteenth-Century Context*, 161–79. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1995.

Metcalf, George J. *On Language Diversity and Relationship from Bibliander to Adelung*. Ed. Toon Van Hal and Raf Van Rooy. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2013.

Migliorini, Bruno, and T. Gwynfor Griffith. *The Italian Language* ['abridged, revised, and recast' by Griffith from Migliorini's Italian original]. London and Boston, MA: Faber and Faber, 1966.

Miller, Arnold. 'The last edition of the *Dictionnaire de Trévoux*'. In Frank A. Kafker, ed., *Notable Encyclopedias of the Late Eighteenth Century: Eleven Successors of the 'Encyclopédie'*, 5–50. Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century 315. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1994.

Molbech, Christian. 'Historisk udsigt over de danske ordbogs-arbeider, i det 17de og 18de aarhundrede, af Geheimeraad Matthias Moth, F. Rostgaard og J. Langebek'. *Nye danske magazin* 5.4 (1827): 241–88.

Moriyama, Mikihimo. *Sundanese Print Culture and Modernity in Nineteenth-Century West Java*. Singapore University Press, 2005.

Morpurgo Davies, Anna. *Nineteenth-Century Linguistics*. Vol. IV of Lepschy, *History of Linguistics*. London and New York: Longman, 1998.

Moulin, Claudine. '[Einleitung]'. In Gueintz, *Deutsche Rechtschreibung* (2008 reprint), vii–lxvi.

Mugglestone, Lynda. *Lost for Words: The Hidden History of the 'Oxford English Dictionary'*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005.

Müller, Karl, and Albert Heinekamp. *Leibniz-Bibliographie, Band 2: Die Literatur über Leibniz, 1981–1990*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1996.

Murray, K. M. Elisabeth. *Caught in the Web of Words: James Murray and the 'Oxford English Dictionary'*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1977.

Murray, Timothy. 'The Académie française'. In Hollier, *New History of French Literature*, 267–73.

Nagy, Andrea R. 'Defining English: Authenticity and standardization in seventeenth-century dictionaries'. *Studies in Philology* 96.4 (Autumn 1999): 439–56.

Nencioni, Giovanni. 'The Accademia della Crusca: New perspectives in lexicography'. *Computers and the Humanities* 24.5/6 (1990): 345–52.

'The Accademia della Crusca today: Its tasks and problems'. In *The Fairest Flower*, 53–4.

Niemeyer, Carl. 'The Earl of Roscommon's academy'. *Modern Language Notes* 49.7 (1934): 432–7.

Noordegraaf, Jan. 'Historical linguistics in the Low Countries: Lambert ten Kate'. In Auroux *et al.*, *History/Geschichte/Histoire*, 1115–24.

'A matter of time: Dutch philosophy of language in the eighteenth century'. In Thomas F. Shannon and Johan P. Snapper, eds., *Janus at the Millennium: Perspectives on Time in the Culture of the Netherlands*, 211–25. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2004.

O'Connor, Desmond. *A History of Italian and English Bilingual Dictionaries*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1990.

Ó Raifertaigh, T., ed. *The Royal Irish Academy: A Bicentennial History*. Dublin: The Royal Irish Academy, 1985.

Orgeldinger, Sibylle. 'J. H. Campe: Wörterbuch der Deutschen Sprache'. In Haß, *Große Lexika*, 179–90.

Osselton, Noel. 'Alphabet fatigue and compiling consistency in early English dictionaries'. In John Considine and Giovanni Iamartino, eds., *Words and Dictionaries in the British Isles in Historical Perspective*, 81–90. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007.

Branded Words in English Dictionaries before Johnson. Groningen: J. B. Wolters, 1958.

Östlund, Krister. 'Two pre-modern etymologists: The connections between Johann Georg Wachter (1663–1757) and Johan Ihre (1707–1780)'. *Language and History* 53.2 (2010): 127–37.

Owen, A. L. *The Famous Druids: A Survey of Three Centuries of English Literature on the Druids*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

Parodi, Severina, ed. *Gli atti del primo Vocabolario*. Florence: Sansoni Editore, 1974.

Parodi, Severina, *Quattro secoli di Crusca 1583–1983*. Florence: [Accademia della Crusca], 1983.

Parsons, Gerald. *The Cult of Saint Catherine of Siena: A Study in Civil Religion*. Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008.

Pattison, Mark. 'Classical learning in France: The great printers Stephens'. *Quarterly Review* 117 (1865): 323–64.

Pedersen, Olaf. *Lovers of Learning: A History of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 1742–1992*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1992.
Petrequin, Gilles. *Le Dictionnaire françois de P. Richelet (Genève, 1679/1680): Etude de métalexicographie historique*. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
Pevsner, Nikolaus. *Academies of Art Past and Present*. Cambridge University Press, 1940.
Pfeiffer, Rudolf. *History of Classical Scholarship from 1300 to 1850*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
Pitou, Spire. 'The art of gentle lexicography: Perrot D'Ablancourt and Pierre Richelet'. *Modern Language Notes* 69.2 (1954): 109–11.
Pountain, Christopher J. *A History of the Spanish Language through Texts*. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.
Prévost, Marcel. 'Le dictionnaire'. In *1635–1935: Trois siècles de l'Académie française, par les quarante*, 115–32. Paris: Firmin-Didot, [1935].
Pruvost, Jean. *Les Dictionnaires de langue française*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 2002.
Quemada, Bernard. 'L'Académie française et ses dictionnaires'. In *The Fairest Flower*, 71–84.
Quemada, Bernard, with Jean Pruvost, eds. *Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie française et la lexicographie institutionelle Européenne*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1998.
Quin, E. G. 'Irish studies'. In Ó Raifertaigh, *Royal Irish Academy*, 166–87.
Ravn, Kim. 'Christian Molbech: Proverbs and punctuation. The inspiration of a Danish philologist'. In Jon Stewart, ed., *Kierkegaard and His Danish Contemporaries*. 3 vols. Vol. III: *Literature, Drama, and Aesthetics*, 233–46. Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009.
Read, Allen Walker. 'American projects for an academy to regulate speech'. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 51.4 (1936): 1141–79.
'Projected English dictionaries, 1755–1828'. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 36 (1937): 188–205, 347–66.
Real Academia Española. *Corpus diacrónico del Español* (*CORDE*). Available at http://corpus.rae.es/cordenet.html.
Reddick, Allen. *The Making of Johnson's Dictionary 1746–1773*. Rev. edn. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
Rees, Graham, and Maria Wakely. *Publishing, Politics, and Culture: The King's Printers in the Reign of James I and VI*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
Rennie, Susan. 'Boswell's Scottish dictionary rediscovered'. *Dictionaries* 32 (2011): 94–110.
Jamieson's Dictionary of Scots: The Story of the First Historical Dictionary of the Scots Language. Oxford University Press, 2012.
Revel, Jacques. 'The uses of civility'. In *A History of Private Life* III*: Passions of the Renaissance*, ed. Roger Chartier, trans. Arthur Goldhammer, 167–205. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1989.
Rey, Alain. 'Linguistic absolutism'. In Hollier, *A New History of French Literature*, 373–9.

Reyfman, Irina. *Vasilii Trediakovsky: The Fool of the 'New' Russian Literature*. Stanford University Press, 1990.

Richardson, Brian. *Print Culture in Renaissance Italy: The Editor and the Vernacular Text 1470–1600*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Ricuperati, Giuseppe. 'Linguaggio e mestiere dello storico nel primo Settecento'. *Studi storici* 24.1/2 (1983): 7–36.

Rodríguez Ortiz, Francesc, and Cecilio Garriga Escribano. 'La teoría lexicográfica de la academia en los siglos XVIII y XIX a través de las *Reglas*'. *Quaderns de filología* 15 (2010): 31–56. Available at http://dfe.uab.cat/neolcyt/.

Rojinsky, David. *Companion to Empire: A Genealogy of the Written Word in Spain and New Spain, c. 550–1550*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2010.

Ross, Walter W. 'Antoine Furetière's *Dictionnaire universel*'. In Kafker, *Notable Encyclopedias of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, 53–67.

'Thomas Corneille's *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*'. In Kafker, *Notable Encyclopedias of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, 69–81.

Rostenberg, Leona. *The Library of Robert Hooke: The Scientific Book Trade of Restoration England*. Santa Monica, CA: Modoc Press, 1989.

Runciman, Sir Steven. *The Last Byzantine Renaissance*. Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Sauvy, Anne. *Livres saisis à Paris entre 1678 et 1701*. [Founded on a preliminary study by Moroko Ninomiya.] The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1972.

Schäfer, Jürgen. *Early Modern English Lexicography*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Schama, Simon. *Patriots and Liberators: Revolution in the Netherlands 1780–1813*. 2nd edn. London: Harper Perennial, 1992.

Scheel, Günter. 'Leibniz' Pläne für das "Opus historicum" und ihre Ausführung'. In Kurt Müller and Wilhelm Totok, eds., *Studia Leibnitiana Supplementa IV: Akten des internationalen Leibniz-Kongresses Hannover, 14.–19. November 1966*, 134–55. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1969.

Schneider, Rolf. *Der Einfluß von Justus Georg Schottelius auf die deutschsprachige Lexikographie des 17./18. Jahrhunderts*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995.

Schrader, Norbert. 'Adelung: *Grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der hochdeutschen Mundart*'. In Haß, *Große Lexika*, 163–77.

Schulenburg, Sigrid von der. *Leibniz als Sprachforscher*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1973.

Schweickard, Wolfgang. 'Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca'. In Haß, *Große Lexika* 53–64.

Segar, Mary. 'Dictionary making in the early eighteenth century'. *Review of English Studies* 7 (1931): 210–13.

Sharpe, Kevin. *Sir Robert Cotton, 1568–1631: History and Politics in Early Modern England*. Oxford University Press, 1979.

Shaw, Jean. 'Contributions to a study of the printed dictionary in France before 1539'. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1997. Available at *Edicta: Early Dictionaries/Dictionnaires anciens* http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~wulfric/edicta/.

Silva, Penny. 'Time and meaning: Sense and definition in the *OED*'. In Lynda Mugglestone, ed., *Lexicography and the 'OED': Pioneers in the Untrodden Forest*, 77–95. Oxford University Press, 2000.

Singeling, Kees. 'Sociable men of letters: Literary sociability in the Netherlands in the second half of the eighteenth century'. In Klaus Garber, Heinz Wismann, and Winfried Siebers, eds., *Europäische Sozietätsbewegung und demokratische Tradition: Die europäischen Akademien der Frühen Neuzeit zwischen Frührenaissance und Spätaufklärung*, 2 vols., Vol. I, 881–94. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1996.

Sledd, James H., and Gwin J. Kolb. *Dr. Johnson's Dictionary: Essays in the Biography of a Book*. University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Smith-Stark, Thomas C. 'Lexicography in New Spain (1492–1611)'. In Otto Zwartjes, Ramón Arzápalo Marín, and Smith-Stark, eds., *Missionary Linguistics* IV/*Lingüística misionera* IV*: Lexicography*, 3–82. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2009.

Stammerjohann, Harro. 'The *Vocabolario* and German lexicography'. In *The Fairest Flower*, 57–69.

Stanley, E. G. 'J. Bosworth's interest in "Friesic" for his *Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language* (1838)'. In Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr., Geart van der Meer, and Oebele Vries, eds., *Aspects of Old Frisian Philology*, 428–52. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1990.

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

Stipa, Günter Johannes. *Finnisch-ugrische Sprachforschung von der Renaissance bis zum Neupositivismus*, ed. Klaas Ph. Ruppel. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 1990.

Stroup, Alice. 'Louis XIV as patron of the Parisian Academy of Sciences'. In David Lee Rubin, ed., *Sun King: The Ascendancy of French Culture during the Reign of Louis XIV*. 221–40. Washington, DC: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1992.

Szemerényi, Oswald. 'About unrewriting the history of linguistics'. In Gunter Brettschneider and Christian Lehmann, eds., *Wege zur Universalienforschung: Sprachwissenschaftliche Beiträge zum 60. Geburtstag von Hansjakob Seiler*, 151–62. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1980.

Tancke, Gunnar. *Die italienischen Wörterbücher von den Anfängen bis zum Erscheinen des 'Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca' (1612): Bestandsaufnahme und Analyse*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1984.

Tavoni, Mirko. 'Renaissance linguistics: Western Europe'. Trans. Emma Sansone. In Lepschy, *History of Linguistics*, Vol. III, 2–108.

Taylor, Jean Gelman. *The Social World of Batavia: European and Eurasian in Dutch Asia*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983.

Terry, Edward Davis. 'Spanish lexicography and the Real Academia Española: A sketch'. *Hispania* 57.4 (1974): 958–64.

Thompson, Ian H. *The Sun King's Garden: Louis XIV, André Le Nôtre, and the Creation of the Gardens of Versailles*. New York: Bloomsbury USA, 2006.

Timpanaro, Sebastiano. 'Friedrich Schlegel and the beginnings of Indo-European linguistics in Germany'. Trans. J. Peter Maher, ed. E. F. K. Koerner. In Friedrich Schlegel, *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier*, facsimile edition prepared by E. F. K. Koerner, xi–lvii. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1977.

Toscano, Silvia. 'Orthodox Slavdom'. In Lepschy, *History of Linguistics*, Vol. III, 123–48.

Tylus, Jane. *Reclaiming Catherine of Siena: Literacy, Literature, and the Signs of Others*. University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Unbegaun, B. O., with J. S. G. Simmons. *A Bibliographical Guide to the Russian Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.

Van Alphen, Daniël. Presidential address of 13 July. *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde* (1773): 1–18. Presidential address of 12 July. *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde* (1773): 1–21.

Van der Sijs, Nicoline. *Taal als mensenwerk: Het ontstaan van het ABN*. The Hague: Sdu Uitgevers, 2004.

Van Dixhoorn, Arjan. 'Chambers of rhetoric: Performative culture and literary sociability in the early modern northern Netherlands'. In Van Dixhoorn and Speakman Sutch, *The Reach of the Republic of Letters*, Vol. I, 119–58.

Van Dixhoorn, Arjan, and Susie Speakman Sutch. 'Introduction'. In Van Dixhoorn and Speakman Sutch, *The Reach of the Republic of Letters*, Vol. I, 1–16.

eds. *The Reach of the Republic of Letters: Literary and Learned Societies in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Van Hal, Toon. *'Moedertalen en taalmoeders': Het vroegmoderne taalvergelijkende onderzoek in de Lage Landen*. Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten, 2010.

'On "the Scythian Theory": Reconstructing the outlines of Johannes Elichmann's (1601/1602–1639) planned *Archaeologia harmonica*'. *Language and History* 53.2 (2010): 70–80.

Van Lieshout, H. H. M. 'Dictionnaires et diffusion du savoir'. In Hans Bots and Françoise Waquet, eds., *Commercium litterarium: La communication dans la république des lettres 1600–1750/Forms of Communication in the Republic of Letters 1600–1750*, 131–50. Amsterdam and Maarssen: APA-Holland University Press, 1994.

Van Miert, Dirk. *Humanism in an Age of Science: The Amsterdam Athenaeum in the Golden Age, 1632–1704*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Van Rossem, Stijn. *Portret van een woordenaar: Cornelis Kiliaan en het woordenboek in de Nederlanden*. Antwerp: Provincie Antwerpen Departement Cultuur, 2007.

Van Sterkenburg, P. G. J. *Van woordenlijst tot woordenboek: Inleiding tot de geschiedenis van woordenboeken van het Nederlands*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1984.

Varvazzo Biensan, Sara. 'Le premier dictionnaire de l'Académie de Russie (1789–1794)'. In Quemada with Pruvost, *Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*, 439–47.

Vercruysse, Jérôme. 'Les œuvres alphabétiques de Voltaire'. *Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles*, n.s. 22 (1969–70): 89–98.

Vucinich, Alexander. *Science in Russian Culture: A History to 1860*. Stanford University Press, 1963.

Wendland, Folkwart. *Peter Simon Pallas (1741–1811): Materialen einer Biographie*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1991.

Woll, Dieter. 'Portugiesische Lexikographie'. In Hausmann *et al.*, *Wörterbücher/Dictionaries/Dictionnaires*, Vol. II, 1723–35.

Woodhouse, J. R. 'Borghini and the foundation of the Accademia della Crusca'. In Chambers and Quiviger, *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, 165–73.

'The reluctant academicals: Linguistic individualism in England after the Crusca'. In *The Fairest Flower*, 175–84.

Wooldridge, Terence Russon. 'The birth of French lexicography'. In Hollier, *A New History of French Literature*, 177–80.

Les Débuts de la lexicographie française: Estienne, Nicot, et le 'Thresor de la langue françoyse' (1606). University of Toronto Press, 1977.

Dictionnaire de l'Académie française: Base échantillon analytique 1694–1935. Available at http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~wulfric/academie/.

Le Grand Dictionaire françois-latin (1593–1628): Histoire, types, et méthodes. Toronto: Les Editions Paratexte, 1992. Available at www.etudes-francaises.net/dossiers/wooldridge_gdfl/.

Woronzoff-Dashkoff, Alexander. 'Books make the woman: Princess Dashkova's Moscow Library'. In Sue Ann Prince, ed., *The Princess and the Patriot: Ekaterina Dashkova, Benjamin Franklin, and the Age of Enlightenment*, 71–7. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 96.1. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2006.

Yates, Frances A. 'The Italian academies'. In *Collected Essays*, 2 vols., Vol. II: *Renaissance and Reform: The Italian Contribution*, ed. J. N. Hillgarth and J. B. Trapp, 6–29. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983.

Yeo, Richard. *Encyclopaedic Visions: Scientific Dictionaries and Enlightenment Culture*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Zamora Vicente, Alonso. *La Real Academia Española*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1999.

Zeydel, Edwin H. 'The German language in the Prussian Academy of Sciences'. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 41.1 (1926): 126–50.

Zgusta, Ladislav. *Lexicography Then and Now: Selected Essays*. Ed. Fredric S. F. Dolezal and Thomas B. I. Creamer. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2006.

Index

Academia das Ciências de Lisboa, *see* Academia Real das Ciências de Lisboa
Academia dos Aplicados, 157
Academia Real da História Portuguesa, 158
Academia Real das Ciências de Lisboa, 158, 160, 169, 173
academic names, 15, 30, 73, 78
Académie des Sciences, 55
Académie française, 29–41, 42, 43, 44–47, 49, 51–71, 73, 76, 78, 81, 99, 100, 103, 108, 110, 111, 115, 118, 123, 131, 133, 144, 148, 149, 151, 154, 155, 156, 167, 173, *see also Dictionnaire de l'Academie françoise*
Académie Royale des Sciences et Belles Lettres of Berlin, 110, 118, 119, 139, 148, 154
academies
  emblems of, 15, 19, 74, 113–14, 118
  English, projected, 102–4, 129
  Italian, 14–16, 73
Academy of Naples, 15
academy principle, 2–4
Accademia della Crusca, 9, 11, 17, 18–27, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 54, 63, 64, 71, 73, 74, 77, 78, 81, 100, 103, 104, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 129, 130, 131, 133, 144, 148, 149, 156, 166, 167, *see also Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca*
Accademia Fiorentina, 16, 17, 18, 167
Adams, William, 126
Addison, Joseph, 91, 105
Adelung, Johann Christoph, 76, 110, 137–43, 151, 157, 163, 168, 172, 173
af Botin, Anders, 165
Africa, languages of, 154
Alberti, Giovanni, 22
Aldrete, Bernardo José, 112
alphabetical order, 3, 14, 21, 27, 32, 39, 46, 48, 56, 59, 62, 66, 77, 78, 81, 84, 88, 93, 95, 107, 114, 116, 118, 124, 135, 138, 141, 155, 169
Americas, languages of, 153
Anne, queen of Great Britain, 104
Annius of Viterbo, 78
Anshelm, Thomas, 15
Aphelen, Hans von, 163
Arabic language, 111, 112, 170
Ariosto, Ludovico, 22
Aristotle, 41
arts and sciences
  dictionaries of, 1, 26–27, 45, 46, 58–61, 106–8, 116
  vocabulary of, 20, 22, 31, 32, 43, 47, 62, 64, 65, 81, 85, 100, 103, 116, 122, 135, 141, 148
August II, king of Poland, 119
August III, king of Poland, 119

Bacon, Francis, 100
Bailey, Nathan, 122, 126, 128
Baker, Thomas, 57
Baldinucci, Filippo, 26
ballads, 80, 83, 91, 105
Balzac, Jean-Louis Guez de, 30, 33
Banks, Sir Joseph, 102
Barcia Carballido y Zúñiga, Andrés González de, 114
Bardi, Filippo de', 19
Barreto, João Franco, 159
Bartholin, Rasmus, 80
Basnage de Beauval, Henri, 50
Batavian Academy of Arts and Sciences, 146
Bayle, Pierre, 1, 23, 47, 48, 49, 66, 67, 69, 138, 171
Beaulieux, Charles, 38, 57
Bembo, Pietro, 12, 22, 134
Beni, Paolo, 23, 49, 129
Bergantini, Giovan Pietro, 26, 60
Berynda, Pamva, 151
Besnier, Pierre, 56
Bessarion, 14–15
Betoi language, 171
Bible translations, 11, 75, 87, 130, 140, 147
biblical languages, 82

bibliographies in dictionaries, 21, 24, 25, 43, 116, 158
Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 20
Bignon, Jean-Paul, 63
Birch, Thomas, 125
Blount, Thomas, 47
Bluteau, Rafael, 67, 157–58, 159–60
Boccaccio, Giovanni, 9, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 134
Boileau, Nicolas, 123
Boisrobert, François le Métel de, 33
Bonaparte, Louis, 170
Bonaparte, Lucien, 167
Borghini, Vincenzio, 16–17, 22, 145
Boswell, James, 107, 126, 127, 128, 131, 132, 136
Bosworth, Joseph, 141
Boxhorn, Marcus Zuerius, 96
Boyer, Abel, 57, 103, 142
Bray, Laurent, 43, 56
Breitkopf, Bernhard Christoph, 136–37
Breton language, 28
Breton, Raymond, 154
Brouncker, William, Lord, 101
Brown, Peter, 22
Bruining, Gerbrandt, 150
Burke, Peter, 91
Burnett, Thomas, of Kemnay, 103
Buxtorf, Johannes, 4

Caesar, Julius, 88
Calderón de la Barca, Pedro, 113
Calepino, Ambrogio, 111
Calvin, John, 129
Campbell, Archibald, 132
Campe, Joachim Heinrich, 168
Cardoso, Jerónimo, 157
Carib language, 154
Caro, Annibale, 22
Casaubon, Isaac, 129
Casaubon, Meric, 98
Cassandre, François, 41
Castiglione, Baldassare, 24
Castilian, *see* Spanish
Catherine II, empress of Russia, 152–55, 157
Catherine of Siena, Saint, 25
Catherine the Great, *see* Catherine II, empress of Russia
Cawdrey, Robert, 10, 121, 127
Cervantes, Miguel de, 113
Chambers, David, 15
Chambers, Ephraim, 105, 106–8, 125, 128, 130
Chamfort, Sébastien-Roch Nicolas de, 68
Chapelain, Jean, 30, 31, 33, 39, 41, 45, 54, 75, 76
Charpentier, François, 38, 41, 52, 57, 138
Chesterfield, Philip Dormer Stanhope, Lord, 125, 126
Christina, queen of Sweden, 35, 165
Church Slavonic language, 89, 151, 156
Chytraeus, Nathan, 92
Cicero, 13, 14, 52, 88, 106
citation slips, 19, 43, 88, 93–97, 115, 127
Cochrane, Eric, 16
Coignard family, publishers, 51, 59, 61, 64
Colbert, Jean-Baptiste, 37, 39, 125
Colding, Poul Jensen, 80, 88
Coleridge, Herbert, 18
Collegium antiquitatis of Sweden, 81, 164
Comenius, Johannes Amos, 74
comparative philology, 4, 170–71
Conrart, Valentin, 29, 30, 99
Corneille, Pierre, 59
Corneille, Thomas, 1, 22, 26, 28, 44, 58–61, 62, 64, 69, 93, 100, 103, 107, 116
Cotton, Sir Robert, 99
Court de Gébelin, Antoine, 71, 153, 155
Covarrubias Horozco, Sebastián de, 10, 111–12, 114, 116, 156, 158
Cowell, John, 47, 80, 82, 100
Craigie, William, 140
Crescenzi, Piero de', 10
Croft, Sir Herbert, 84
cross-references, 21, 54, 107, 134, 135

D'Alberti di Villanuova, Francesco, 27
d'Alembert, Jean le Rond, 69
d'Olivet, Pierre-Joseph Thoulier, 63–64, 123
Dacier, André, 63
Dahlerup, Verner, 3
Danet, Pierre, 46, 56
Daniel, Samuel, 121
Danish language, 96
  dictionaries of, 80–92, 160–64, 166, 169
  relationships with other languages, 82
  standardization of, 11
Dante, 9, 10, 16, 19, 20, 22, 130, 134
Dashkova, Princess Ekaterina, 132, 154–55
Dasypodius, Petrus, 74
Dati, Carlo, 25
de Thou, Jacques Auguste, 129
De Vries, Matthias, 146, 149, 151, 170
Decker, Jeremias, 150
Defoe, Daniel, 103
della Casa, Giovanni, 22
DeMaria, Robert, Jr., 130
Demosthenes, 52
Des Houlières, Antoinette, 50
dialects and regionalisms, 90–91
  Danish, 3, 85, 86–87, 162, 163

Dutch, 148, 149
English, 92, 101
French, 49
German, 92, 93, 96, 97, 98, 139
Portuguese, 157
Russian, 156
Scots, 99
Spanish, 116
Swedish, 164
Diccionario de la lengua castellana, 63, 67, 106, 114–19, 125, 129, 150, 155, 156, 158, 162, 168
dictionaries
bibliographical format, 21, 27, 42, 45, 47, 50, 51, 65, 93, 105, 107, 112, 118, 128, 150, 152, 164
complementary, 25, 26, 35, 45, 50, 61, 76, 93, 106, 116, 135, 136
cost of, 8, 27, 105, 108, 118, 128
exclusion of words from, 3, 23, 32, 46, 47, 114, 123, 128, 135, 139, 141, 155, 161
financing of, 23, 90, 109, 113, 119, 122, 127, 145, 161, 166
frontispieces of, 47, 51, 82, 133
perceived shortcomings: archaic character, 23, 27, 56, 151; bias, 23, 50; calumnious definitions, 1, 132; difficulty of consultation, 21, 56, 155; dryness, 48, 67; inadequate status marking, 1; incompleteness, 56, 57, 67, 137, 141, 154; irrational structure, 124; not compiled in the golden age of the language, 52; weak definitions, 1, 34, 57, 63; weak etymologies, 142, 151; weak examples, 34, 56, 63
as personal documents, 8, 44
print runs of, 23, 24, 40, 69, 112, 128, 133, 153
project archives of, 19, 83–84, 162
size and weight, 3, 8, 23, 38, 42, 117
suppression of, 25, 40, 44
Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise, 1, 3, 28–72, 84, 85, 87, 89, 99, 100, 102, 106, 132, 138, 141, 167–68, 172
and Danish lexicography, 162
and Dutch lexicography, 150
and English lexicography, 100, 103, 104–5, 107, 108, 122, 124, 125–26, 129, 131
and German lexicography, 92, 93, 109, 134, 140
and Italian lexicography, 26
and Portuguese lexicography, 158
and Russian lexicography, 155, 156–57
and Spanish lexicography, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118
Dictionnaire de Trévoux, 60, 71, 107, 115
Diderot, Denis, 27
Digitale bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse letteren, 148
Dioscorides, 10, 117
Dodsworth, Roger, 96
Dryden, John, 102, 103, 121, 128
du Cange, Charles, 49, 94, 95, 97, 98, 137
Duclos, Charles Pinot, 64–65, 69
Dugdale, William, 96
Dupuys, Jacques, 29
Durie, John, 99
Dutch language, 30, 75
dictionaries of, 10, 92, 144–51
relationships with other languages, 82, 150

Early English Text Society, 26
Eckhardt, Johann Georg, 97–98
Edelinck, Gerard, 47
Elert, Nicolaj, 163, 164
encyclopedias, 27, 46, 47, 60, 69, 107, 136
encyclopedic information in dictionaries, 1, 2, 10, 22, 43, 48, 60, 65, 112, 122, 157, 159
Encyclopédie, 27, 108
English language, 96, 97
in America, 104
dictionaries of: bilingual, 23, 41, 57, 80, 121, 131, 141, 142, 145; monolingual, 10, 93, 100–8, 121–33, 146; multilingual, 80, 128, 170
Old English, 92, 141
relationships with other languages, 82, 101
standardization of, 11
studied in the Royal Society, 16, 100–2
Ernst August of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, 108
Estienne, Henri, 4, 5, 21, 42, 49, 63, 76, 124, 129
Estienne, Robert, 12, 21, 28–29, 32, 49, 54, 57, 63, 70, 124
etymology
dictionaries of, 25, 35, 56, 93, 106, 110, 112, 131, 135, 136, 145, 146, 164
in general dictionaries, 20, 22, 25, 42, 65, 68, 79, 93, 96–98, 106, 114, 116, 117, 118, 122, 127, 131, 132, 136, 140, 142, 150, 164
as guide to meaning, 76
study of, 49, 56, 95, 100, 112, 135, 136
Evelyn, John, 100–1, 103

Faber, Basilius, 124
Faber du Faur, Curt von, 79
Faroese language, 83
Fatio, Jean-Baptiste, 42
Faxardo, Juan Isidro, 115–16
Felipe III, king of Spain, 112
Felipe V, king of Spain, 112, 117
Feraud, Jean-François, 71, 139

Ferdinand II, king of Aragon, 111
Finnish language, 171
fixity of languages, 3, 34, 52, 57, 65, 113, 116, 123, 129
Fleeman, J. D., 8
Fogelius, Martin, 94, 95, 97
Fonseca, Pedro José da, 158
Fontenelle, Bernard Le Bovier de, 60
Forcellini, Egidio, 172
Frederik IV, king of Denmark, 87
Frederik V, king of Denmark, 90, 162
French language
  dictionaries of, 1, 10, 28–72, 84, 119, 128, 145, 146, 152, 154, 156–57
  Old French, 49
  orthography of, 32, 54, 63–64
  post-Revolutionary innovations in, 70
  relationship with Latin, 75
  standardization of, 11, 29
  status of, 28, 30, 89, 145
Friedrich I, king in Prussia, *see* Friedrich III, elector of Brandenburg
Friedrich II, king of Prussia, 137
Friedrich III, elector of Brandenburg, 108–10, 111
Friedrich Wilhelm I, king in Prussia, 110
Frisch, Johann Leonhard, 2, 109, 110, 133, 135–36, 137, 141, 161
Frisian language, 141
Froissart, Jean, 49
Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft, 73–74, 77, 78, 81, 85, 91, 92, 109, 133, 134, 135, 141, 149, 150, 164
Furetière, Antoine, 1, 23, 28, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 45–50, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 64, 66, 69, 71, 93, 103, 108
Furnivall, Frederick, 18

Galilei, Galileo, 24
Garrick, David, 132
Gellius, Aulus, 88
George I, king of England, 104
German language, 154
  affixation in, 75, 77, 135
  as cardinal language, 75, 109
  cultivation of, 74, 92, 110
  dictionaries of, 58, 74–79, 81, 92–98, 109–10, 119, 128, 133–41, 146, 152, 157, 168
  Low German, 92
  native and borrowed words, 79, 92, 95, 135, 139
  Old High German, 97
  orthography, 75
  standardization of, 11
Germanic languages
  antiquarian study of, 75, 131, 144
  supposed Greek origins of, 98
  union dictionary of, 81
Gerner, Henrich, 86, 90
Gervase of Tilbury, 96
Gessner, Conrad, 88
Giannone, Pietro, 26
Gigli, Girolamo, 25
Giraldi, Giuliano, 19
Goropius Becanus, Johannes, 75
Gothic language, 96
Gottsched, Johann Christoph, 136–37
Gram, Hans, 161, 162
grammar, 77, 101, 170–71
  as allegorical figure, 51
  books and essays about, 12, 31, 34, 61, 66, 81, 90, 102, 111, 118, 129, 130, 134, 154, 155, 165, 167
  in general dictionaries, 42, 54, 142, 155, 159, 164
Greek language
  as cardinal language, 75
  copiousness of, 76
  deadness of, 71, 146
  dictionaries of, 2, 4, 5, 21, 32, 42, 52, 63, 76, 79, 124, 129, 144, 146, 151, 172
  relationships with other languages, 19, 170, 171
  study of, 14–15, 147
  words derived from, 22, 25, 98
Grimm, Jacob, 48, 168, 172
Grimm, Wilhelm, 168, 172
Gueintz, Christian, 74–75, 78
Guicciardini, Francesco, 24
Gustaf III, king of Sweden, 165
Gyarmathi, Sámuel, 171
Gyllenborg, Gustaf Fredrik, 165

Haak, Theodor, 102
Halbertsma, Joast Hiddes, 141
Harris, John, 60, 107
Harsdörffer, Georg Philipp, 76, 77, 78, 81
Hartlib, Samuel, 99
Haß, Ulrike, 4
Haugen, Einar, 3
Hawkins, Sir John, 122
Hayward, John, 121, 128
Hebrew language
  as cardinal language, 75
  dictionaries of, 146
Henisch, Georg, 74, 80
Henri IV, king of France, 29
Herder, Johann Gottfried von, 91, 110, 139, 149
Hertzberg, Ewald Friedrich von, 110, 118
Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo, 170–71
Hesychius, 144

Hielmstierne, Henrik, Count, 163
historical principles in lexicography, 18, 49, 54, 66, 68, 123, 130, 138–39, 142, 171–73
Høegh-Guldberg, Ove, 163
Hofman, Johan, 145
Hollandsche Maatschappij der Wetenschappen, 146
Holstein, Johan Ludvig, Count, 161
honnêteté, 30, 43, 52, 53, 56, 57, 65, 68, 90
Hooft, Pieter Corneliszoon, 150
Hooke, Nathaniel, 106
Hooke, Robert, 100, 102
Horace, 53, 87
Huet, Pierre-Daniel, 39
Huguetan, Marc, 61
Hungarian language, 171
Huron language, 155

Ibañez de Segovia y Orellana, Mateo, 117
Iberian language, 96, 97
Icelandic language, 84
Ihre, Johan, 164
Imperial Academy of Arts and Sciences, 119, 132, 148, 152, 154
Imperial Russian Academy, 110, 154, 156
indexes in dictionaries, 14, 21, 25, 32, 54, 79, 95, 155
Indic languages, 102, 171
Infiammati, Academy of the, 15, 16, 113
Intronati, Academy of the, 15
invented examples in dictionaries, 34, 44, 48, 55, 56, 57, 62, 63, 67, 155
Irish language, 99
Isabella I, queen of Castile, 111
Isidore of Seville, Saint, 112
Italian language, 145
  deadened by the *Vocabolario*, 71
  dictionaries of, 9, 119, 133–35
  questione della lingua, 11–12, 29, 111
  relationships with other languages, 11, 19, 75
  Sienese topolect of, 23, 25
  studied in academies, 15–16
  Tuscan topolect of, 9, 12, 16–27, 58, 73, 89

Jablonski, Daniel Ernst, 110
Jablonski, Johann Theodor, 109–10
Jamieson, John, 172
Japanese language, 153
Javanese language, 146
João V, king of Portugal, 158
Johnson, Samuel, 27, 38, 64, 107, 155, 162, 169
  as lexicographer, 33, 96, 104, 108, 109, 126–28, 140, 141, 172
  as writer on lexicography, 2, 23, 57, 62, 66, 104, 106, 122–26, 161, 172
  Dictionary, 8, 67, 69, 84, 108, 119, 121–22, 128–33, 138, 141, 143, 151, 162, 164, 168, 173
Johnstone, John, 43, 60
Jones, Sir William, 139, 170–71
Jones, William Jervis, 168
Jungius, Joachim, 94
Junius, Franciscus, 71, 97, 98, 131, 144, 145, 146, 160

Kamusella, Tomasz, 156
Kannada language, 171
Karamzin, Nikolay, 156
Kersey, John, 122
Kiliaan, Cornelis, 10, 21, 92, 98, 141, 144, 145, 146, 150
Kok, Lavrids, 87
Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, 148, 162–64, 169
Koninglijk Instituut van Wetenschappen, Letterkunde, en Schoone Kunsten, 170
Korshin, Paul, 4
Kramer, Matthias, 57, 109, 110, 133–35, 136, 137, 141
Kraus, Christian Jacob, 170
Kristian V, king of Denmark, 82, 87
Kristian VI, king of Denmark, 161
Kungliga Svenska Vetenskaps-akademien, 148, 164

Lafayette, Gilbert du Motier, marquis de, 153
Laguna, Andrés de, 117
Landau, Sidney, 20
Langebek, Jacob, 161–62
language and social class, 136
Latham, Robert Gordon, 168
Latin language
  deadness of, 71
  dictionaries of: bilingual, 10, 32, 38, 46, 54, 70, 80, 82, 111, 121, 131, 144, 145, 157, 160; monolingual, 2, 12–13, 21, 32, 52, 63, 103, 105, 111, 124, 137, 172; multilingual, 151, 152
  learned works in, 44
  relationships with other languages, 11, 18, 19, 22, 25, 28, 75, 98, 170, 171
  study of, 14, 15
  in vernacular dictionaries, 9, 21, 28, 29, 32, 41, 46, 77, 79, 88, 95, 110, 135, 136, 157, 160, 161, 163
  Leers, Renier, 47, 55
Legenda aurea, 150
Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm von, 104, 152
  as director of a dictionary project, 18, 93–98, 109
  as projector and founder of academies, 16, 92, 108–10, 113, 151
  as reader of dictionaries, 1, 22, 24, 26, 59, 61, 103, 134, 135, 153

lexicographers
death before completion of project, 18, 30, 33, 35, 47, 89, 92, 97, 135
as drudges, 133
failings of, 37–38, 115, 128
industriousness of, 43, 79
as inventors of words, 25, 79
solitary work of, 4, 44, 64, 83, 104, 105, 107–8, 125, 126, 132, 151
teamwork of, 19, 20, 31, 34, 41, 62, 69, 78, 83, 115, 147, 148, 165–66
varying talents of, 20, 33, 64
women as, 155
Linde, Samuel Gottlieb, 119, 141, 158
Lindenbrog, Friedrich, 98
Linnaeus, Carolus, 139
literary canon, 3, 12, 13, 68
Dutch, 147, 150
English, 102, 103, 104, 105–6, 125, 130, 132
French, 31, 42, 50, 62, 68, 123
German, 74
Italian, 9, 13, 17, 22, 26, 125
Portuguese, 157, 159
Spanish, 113–14, 115, 125
Livy, 38, 96
Lloyd, William, 101
Locke, John, 105, 124
Lomonosov, Mikhail Vasilevich, 156
Lönnrot, Elias, 91
Louis XIV, king of France, 36, 39, 51, 52, 55, 118
Louis XV, king of France, 63, 64
Louis XVIII, king of France, 167
Lucian, 42
Ludolf, Hiob, 96
Ludwig, Christian, 128
Ludwig of Anhalt, 73, 77, 78
Luis de Granada, 113
Luther, Martin, 11, 75, 139, 140

Maaler, Josua, 74, 95
Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde, 147–50
Machiavelli, Niccolò, 24
Maffei, Giovanni Pietro, 24
Magnússon, Árni, 84, 86
Malayo-Polynesian languages, 102
Malherbe, François de, 53, 58
Malkiel, Yakov, 112
Manni, Domenico Maria, 26
Manutius, Aldus, 15
Marie de l'Incarnation, 155
Marmontel, Jean-François, 69
Marsden, William, 102, 153
Martial, 40
Martin, Benjamin, 127
Martini, Luca, 24
Mary II, queen of England, 58
Maucroix, François de, 43
Maxima bibliotheca veterum patrum, 89
Medici family, 17, 20, 36, 71, 99
Cosimo I de', 16, 111
Cosimo III de', 24
Gian Gastone de', 26
Lorenzo de', 22
Meier, Gerhard, 92–93, 94–95
Melanchthon, Philipp, 15
Ménage, Gilles, 25, 34, 35, 40, 44, 53, 56, 61, 93, 106, 136
Mercure galant, Le, 55, 59
Meyer, Lodewijk, 145
Mézeray, François-Eudes de, 35, 37, 40, 41, 46, 235
Michaelis, Johann David, 91, 149
Michelangelo, 24
Middleton, Conyers, 106
Miège, Guy, 41
Milton, John, 132
Minsheu, John, 80
Miscellanea berolinensia, 109
Molbech, Christian, 3
Monet, Philibert, 38
Montellano, José de Solis y Gante, duque de, 115
Moraes Silva, Antonio de, 159–60
Morellet, André, 69
Moréri, Louis, 2
Morhof, Daniel Georg, 2, 27
Moth, Matthias, 3, 18, 70, 82–92, 101, 145, 160, 162, 163
Moth, Sophie Amalie, 82, 87
Murberg, Johan, 165
Murray, James, 37, 39, 140, 172
Müteferrika, İbrahim, 120

Nahuatl language, 111
Nebrija, Antonio de, 111–12
Nencioni, Giovanni, 22
Nicaise, Claude, 103
Nicolai, Friedrich, 153
Nicot, Jean, 10, 21, 29, 34, 38, 41, 42, 80
Nizzoli, Mario, 13
Norwegian language, 81, 82, 83, 90
Novelle antiche, 13

obsolete language in dictionaries, 22, 25, 60, 68, 80, 81, 82, 93, 105, 115, 124, 145, 159, 163
Occitan language, 49
Ólafsson, Jón, frá Grunnavík, 84
Opitz, Martin, 139
Ordbog over det danske sprog, 3
Osborne, Thomas, 38

Ostersen, Christen, 80, 82
Ovalle, Alonso de, 117
Ovid, 88, 89
Oxford English Dictionary, 18, 26, 33, 37, 39, 90, 149, 159, 169, 173

Pallas, Peter Simon, 152–54, 155, 171
Palomino, Antonio, 117
Passow, Franz, 172
Patru, Olivier, 42, 43, 46
Pattison, Mark, 42
Pellisson, Paul, 30, 31, 33, 35, 54, 101, 102, 123
Pergamino, Giacomo, 13–14, 18, 20, 21, 80, 134, 156
Perrault, Charles, 36, 37, 39
Perrault, Claude, 37
Perrot d'Ablancourt, Nicolas, 42, 43, 44
Persian language, 170
Peter the Great, tsar of Russia, 151
Petrarch, 9, 10, 16, 19, 22, 134
Petty, Sir William, 102
Pevsner, Nikolaus, 18
Philippines, languages of, 153
Philips, Ambrose, 91, 105
Phillips, Edward, 103, 105, 122, 130
Philological Society of London, 18, 26, 172
phraseological material in dictionaries, 31, 32, 43, 77, 85, 114, 134, 142
Piozzi, Hester Lynch, 132
Pivati, Gianfrancesco, 27
Placcius, Vincent, 94
plagiarism, 36, 46, 47
Plato, 14
Poggio Bracciolini, 38
Polish language, 119, 141, 158
Politi, Adriano, 23, 25
Polybius, 129
Poniatowski, Stanisław August, 119
Pontoppidan, Erik, 90
Pope, Alexander, 68, 105–6, 125
Portuguese language
  dictionaries of, 157–60, 169
Pougens, Marie-Charles-Joseph de, 67–68, 69, 118, 132, 158, 163, 168
prescriptivism, 30, 33, 53, 69, 106, 114, 139
pronunciation, 42, 54, 123, 142
proper names in dictionaries, 20, 32, 114, 159
proverbs, 54, 77, 81, 82, 90, 101, 116, 122, 140, 149, 159
purism, 18, 22, 24, 31, 56, 74, 81, 92, 100, 101, 113, 114, 123, 135, 139, 145, 154, 155, 159, 161, 163, 165

Quemada, Bernard, 56, 57
Quevedo, Francisco de, 113
Quinault, Philippe, 39
Quintus Curtius, 43, 117
quotations in dictionaries, 9, 12, 19, 42, 44, 48, 49, 50, 62, 63, 67, 103, 105, 115, 117, 118, 124, 127, 130–31, 132, 133, 140, 142, 147, 150, 155, 159, 172, 173

Racine, Jean, 55, 165
Ray, John, 92
Real Academia Española, 63, 64, 100, 110, 112–18, 131, 133, 144, 158, 162, 173
Reddick, Allen, 126, 127, 128
Regis, Pierre de, 50
Régnier-Desmarais, François Séraphin, 41, 51, 62
Resen, Peder Hansen, 84, 89
Rey, Alain, 56, 57
Ricettario Fiorentino, 24
Richelet, Pierre, 28, 34, 41–45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 56, 58, 59, 61, 71, 94, 147, 156
Richelieu, Armand Jean du Plessis de, 30, 31, 33, 36, 71, 111, 125
Rider, John, 80
Rochefort, César de, 46, 60
Rogler, Johann Bartholomäus, 128
Romani language, 102
Roscommon, Wentworth Dillon, Lord, 102
Rossi, Bastiano de', 19
Rostgaard, Frederik, 80, 83, 90, 161, 164, 169
Royal Irish Academy, 99
Royal Society of Edinburgh, 99
Royal Society of London, 16, 80, 100–2, 107, 119, 125, 148, 151, 156, 163
Rudbeck, Olof, 96
Russian empire, languages of, 152, 153
Russian language, 154
  dictionaries of, 58, 151–57, 169
Ruthenian language, 151
Rymer, Thomas, 89

Saint-Amant, Antoine Girard de, 31
Saint Petersburg Academy of Sciences, 151
Saint-Pierre, Charles-Irénée Castel de, 62, 71
Sainte-Palaye, Jean-Baptiste de Lacurne de, 66, 68, 71, 84, 172
Salviati, Lionardo, 16, 17–19, 22
Salvini, Salvino, 104
Sámi language, 82
Sanderson, Robert, 89
Sanskrit language, 170
Sarrazin, Jean-François, 50
Sarron, 78
Saxo Grammaticus, 87
Scandinavian languages, 97
Scheller, Immanuel Johann Gerhard., 172
Schilter, Johann, 135, 136

Schlegel, August Wilhelm, 171
Schlegel, Friedrich, 171
Schöfferlin, Bernhard, 96
Schottelius, Justus Georgius, 75–77, 78, 85, 102, 134
Schrevel, Cornelis, 144
scientific language in dictionaries, 24, 26, 141, 155, 156
Scots language, 99, 136, 172
Scudéry, Madeleine de, 50
Séguier, Pierre, 36
semi-etymological order, 14, 21, 28, 32, 35, 39, 53, 54, 56, 62, 66, 75, 77, 79, 81, 84, 114, 124, 134, 135, 138, 155, 169
senses of words
  differentiation in dictionary entries, 20, 48, 70, 124, 127–28, 131, 138–39, 142, 159, 164, 172
  historical development, 49, 76, 85, 138–39, 172
Serdonati, Francesco, 24
Sévigné, Marie de Rabutin-Chantal, marquise de, 50
Seybold, Johann Georg, 103
Shakespeare, William, 121, 128, 130, 132, 133
Skinner, Stephen, 71, 95, 97, 98, 106, 112, 131
Skytte, Bengt, 99
Slavonic languages, 97
social class and language, 3, 29, 30
Societas Confessionum Conciliatrix, 16
Societät der Wissenschaften, 99, 108–10, 111, 113, 154
Society of Antiquaries of London, 99, 100
Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 99
Solis y Gante, Jaime de, 115
Somner, William, 92
Sophia Charlotte of Hannover, 104, 108, 154
Sophia of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, 104, 108
Spanish language, 145
  dictionaries of, 10, 110–19, 145
  in the Americas, 116
  standardization of, 11
Sparwenfeld, Johan Gabriel, 89
Spelman, Sir Henry, 98
Spence, Joseph, 125
Spenser, Edmund, 130
Speroni, Sperone, 22
Spieghel, Hendrick, 144
spoken language in dictionaries, 22, 24, 27, 85, 90, 116, 147, 148
Sprat, Thomas, 101, 103, 106
Stade, Diederich von, 96
Stammerjohann, Harro, 74, 135
Stammwortprinzip, 75–76, 82, 85, 134, 135, 137, 138, 141
status marking, 1, 25, 32, 42, 114, 123, 140, 142, 164
Steinbach, Christoph Ernst, 110, 136
Stevin, Simon, 75, 144
Stieler, Kaspar, 78–79, 95, 97, 133, 134, 135, 136, 140, 141
Stoer, Jacob, 29
Strøm, Ole, 163
subject order, 93
Suetonius, 88
Sundanese language, 146
Svenska Akademien, 165, 170
Swedish language, 96
  dictionaries of, 81, 165, 170
  relationships with other languages, 82, 164
  standardization of, 11
Swift, Jonathan, 103
Syriac language, 146
Syv, Peder, 80–83, 85, 87, 89, 90, 91, 160, 163, 164

taboo words, 53, 57, 114, 115, 140, 161, 163
Tallement, François, 38
Tasso, Torquato, 22, 23, 24
Tassoni, Alessandro, 24
Taubert, Ivan, 152, 156
Te Water, Jona Willem, 148
technical language in dictionaries, 22, 24, 45, 49, 52, 53, 54, 64, 65, 76–77, 85, 88, 93, 101, 103, 110, 125, 140, 147, 149, 155, 157, 163
Ten Kate, Lambert, 145–46, 150
Terence, 88
Terpager, Peder, 86, 91
Terreros y Pando, Esteban de, 116
Teutleben, Kaspar von, 73
Teutonista, 95
Tillotson, John, 103, 104
Todd, Henry John, 168
Tollius, Herman, 147, 148
Tortelli, Giovanni, 38
Trediakovsky, Vasilii, 151
Turkish language, 82, 120
Tuscan, *see* Italian
typographical features of dictionaries, 3, 9, 13, 21, 26, 29, 42, 47, 54, 58, 59, 70, 117, 118, 131, 152, 164, 169, 173

Umidi, Accademia degli, 16, 18, 99
Unbegaun, B. O., 156
usage, 32, 34, 52, 53, 58, 65, 67, 69, 76, 147

Van Alphen, Daniël, 70, 148–49
Van Convent, Jan, 150
Van den Berg, Ahasuerus, 148
Van den Vondel, Joost, 150
Van Halsema, Diderik Frederik Johan, 148
Van Hoogstraten, David, 147, 150

Van Iperen, Josua, 146–48
Van Lelyveld, Frans, 147, 148
Vater, Joachim Severin, 171
Vaugelas, Claude Favre de, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 41, 43, 50
Vedel, Anders Sørensen, 80, 83, 91
Villedieu, Marie-Catherine de, 50
Villehardouin, Geoffroy de, 49
Villena, Juan Manuel Fernández Pacheco, marqués de, 112–13
Vliet, Jan van, 144, 145, 146
Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca, 9–27, 84, 89, 94, 106, 112, 138, 166, 167
  and Danish lexicography, 162
  and Dutch lexicography, 150
  and English lexicography, 100, 101, 102, 104, 106, 107, 108, 121, 122, 124, 125, 126, 128, 130–31
  and French lexicography, 32, 33, 35, 43, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 59, 63, 67, 69, 71, 118
  and German lexicography, 74, 76, 92, 110, 133, 140
  and Portuguese lexicography, 157, 158–59
  and Russian lexicography, 155, 156
  and Spanish lexicography, 111, 113, 114, 116, 117
Voiture, Vincent, 43
Voltaire, 65–67, 68, 105

Wachter, Johann Georg, 98, 110, 135, 136, 150, 164
Wallis, John, 102, 130
Warburton, William, 106
Warton, Thomas, 130
Washington, George, 153
Weiland, Petrus, 150–51, 170
Widerhold, Jean Herman, 42, 44
Wilkins, John, 70, 101, 106
Willeram, 97
William III, king of England, 58, 145
Williams, Anna, 155
Willich, A. F. M., 141
Winsløw, Peder, 86, 91
Woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal, 146, 149, 150, 151, 170, 173
Worm, Ole, 82, 84

Yates, Dame Frances, 104

Zedler, Johann Heinrich, 136
Zizanij, Lavrentij, 151