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This thesis examines the early modern debates surrounding the incorporation of French loan words into the English vocabulary through an analysis of the prefaces of a variety of early modern English dictionaries and a selection of Restoration plays, political pamphlets and tracts. It considers the long seventeenth century, starting with Robert Cawdrey’s dictionary of ‘hard words’, *A table alphabeticall* (1604) and ending with Samuel Johnson’s *A Dictionary of the English Language* (1755). The thesis is not concerned with whether particular words are in fact French loans, nor with the chronology of their usage, but rather examines the debates surrounding linguistic borrowing identified as French by contemporaries. Neither is the emphasis on the actual words themselves, as much as on the attitudes towards their use and the portrayal of those that use them. The thesis analyses the representation of French linguistic borrowing in three domains of discourse (dictionaries, Restoration satire, political pamphlets and periodical essays), paying particular attention to the metaphors and images that are employed in these representations. Taking into consideration ideas of linguistic purism and language corruption, it explores how representations of French borrowing can be situated within a larger historical context of English nation building and fluctuating Anglo-French relations.
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1 Introduction

This thesis examines the early modern debates surrounding the incorporation of French loanwords into the English vocabulary through an analysis of the prefaces of a variety of early modern English dictionaries and a selection of Restoration plays, political pamphlets and periodical essays. It considers the long seventeenth century, starting with Robert Cawdrey’s dictionary of ‘hard words’, *A table alphabeticall* (1604), and ending with Samuel Johnson’s *A Dictionary of the English Language* (1755). The thesis is not concerned with whether particular words are in fact French loans, nor with the chronology of their usage, but rather examines the debates surrounding French linguistic borrowing identified as such by contemporaries. Neither is the emphasis on the actual words themselves, as much as on the attitudes towards words designated as French borrowings and the portrayal of those that use them. The thesis analyses the representation of French linguistic borrowing in three domains of discourse (dictionaries, Restoration satire and political writings), paying particular attention to the metaphors and images that are employed in these representations. Taking into consideration ideas of linguistic purism and language corruption, it explores how representations of French borrowing can be situated within a larger historical context of English nation building and fluctuating Anglo-French relations.

The thesis is structured as follows. Chapters 2 to 4 present materials and methodology, consider theoretical perspectives and discuss the historical, religious, political, cultural and sociolinguistic context in which the debates took place. Chapters 5 to 7 present the study’s findings. Chapter 5 focuses on depictions of French linguistic borrowing in the prefaces of early modern English-vernacular dictionaries. Chapter 6 considers the representation of French loans in the satirical works of Restoration playwrights. It examines the portrayal of French linguistic borrowing on the Restoration stage through the figure of the Frenchified fop in four Restoration plays in particular. Chapter 7 explores depictions of French borrowing and Anglo-French rivalry in political pamphlets and periodical essays of the period. Finally, Chapter 8 identifies the main themes of representation, discusses the interrelations between the portrayals of French linguistic borrowing in the different genres and considers the role of such depictions in the construction of English national identity.
2 Materials and methodology

The thesis is a qualitative study based on texts acquired from the online corpora Early English Books Online (EEBO) and Lexicons of Early Modern English (LEME).¹ In addition, a number of early modern anthologies compiled by Craigie (1946), Crowley (1991), Burnley (1992) and Görlach (1999) were examined for pertinent primary texts.² While a wide range of texts were consulted for the thesis, the main analysis focuses on a smaller number of selected texts. These texts were read in their entirety and examined for the portrayal of French loanwords and the depictions of those that use them. Emphasis was placed on the vocabulary, metaphors and images used to describe such borrowings and borrowers.

The thesis takes into account both linguistic and historical factors and focuses on the long seventeenth century between the dictionary publications of Robert Cawdrey in 1604 and of Samuel Johnson in 1755.³ References to early modern England and early modern English within the thesis should be taken to include texts and events within this time-frame. The early modern period encompasses such diverse historical periods as the Reformation, the Renaissance, the Restoration and the Enlightenment, however the choice of starting and closing dates varies between different fields of study and from author to author. Histories of Britain generally place the early modern period approximately between the years 1500 and 1800, often choosing to frame the period by such pivotal events as Caxton’s introduction of the printing press in 1476 and the American Declaration of Independence in 1776.⁴ Alternatively, the period may be identified with the Tudor and Stuart monarchies and dated

³ Descriptions such as the as ‘the “long” seventeenth century’ and ‘the “long” eighteenth century’ are used to cover historical periods that straddle calendar centuries. The ‘long’ eighteenth century, for example, is generally taken to start with the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and end with the battle of Waterloo in 1815.
⁴ This is also the case for the third volume of The Cambridge history of the English language, which its general editor notes uses historical events to divide its volumes. Roger Lass, ed., The Cambridge history of the English language, vol. III, 1476-1776, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
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from 1485 to 1714. Histories of English, on the other hand, often situate the linguistic period of early modern English between the years 1500 to 1700, although practices also vary here.\(^5\)


The second domain consists of the works of Restoration playwrights. Chapter 6 focuses specifically on the depiction of the French borrowings and the linguistic practices of the Frenchified fop in four Restoration comedies: James Howard, *The English Mounsieur* (1663, 1674), John Dryden, *Marriage à la mode* (1673), William Wycherley, *The gentleman dancing-master* (1673), and George Etherege, *The man of mode* (1676). These four comedies were selected for the prominent role that the emulation of French fashion, manners and language holds within their plots. While such plays were performed at court under royal patronage, their ridiculing of French affectations can also be read as a social commentary on the Francophile tendencies of the returning Stuart court.

The third domain considered is political writing. Chapter 7 examines the portrayal of French linguistic borrowing in the political discourse of pamphlets and periodical essays within the burgeoning seventeenth-century public sphere.\(^6\) While a large range of political

\(^5\) This is the case for the histories of early modern English by Terttu Nevalainen, Manfred Görlach and Charles Barber. N. F. Blake, on the other hand, chooses to abandon the traditional distinction between early modern and late modern English in his *A history of the English language*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1996).

writings was consulted and is referred to in the thesis’s context chapters, detailed analysis has been limited to the following texts, published at disparate times during the English Civils wars (1642-1651), the Exclusion Crisis (1678-1681), following the Glorious Revolution (1688), and after the Acts of Union (1707): John Hare, *St Edwards ghost: or, Anti-Normanisme* (1647), Marchamont Nedham, *Christianissimus Christianandus, or, Reason for the reduction of France to a more Christian state in Europ*, (1678), John and Mary Evelyn, *Mundus muliebris* (1690), Anon., *Mundus foppensis* (1691), Anon., *A satyr against the French*, (1691), and finally a number of essays by Joseph Addison and Richard Steele in the political periodical *The Spectator* (1711-14). Published during four separate periods, these pamphlets address different political and societal concerns and demonstrate a range of depictions of French linguistic borrowing.

The Restoration plays, political tracts and pamphlets analysed in the thesis have been read in their entirety, while the focus in the dictionaries has been on their prefatory materials, including title pages, epistolary addresses, prefaces, forewords, introductions and liminary verses. Further study, unconfined by the time constraints of a master’s thesis, would allow for a detailed examination of the dictionary entries as well. Similarly, the treatment of Addison’s and Steele’s *The Spectator* considers only a number of essays dealing specifically with French borrowings. While the thesis focuses mainly on French linguistic borrowing, such borrowing is placed within a larger context of French emulation and changing Anglo-French relations. Discussions of French fashion, manners and gastronomy have therefore also been considered in the thesis.

3 Theoretical perspectives

This thesis draws on the work of a number of scholars within different fields. The following provides a brief overview of the theoretical perspectives within which the thesis situates itself.

3.1 The linguistic and cultural turn

The expression ‘the linguistic turn’ first appeared in the title of Richard Rorty’s 1967 anthology *The linguistic turn*, which dealt with the relation between language and philosophical questions. It has since come to be associated with the French poststructuralist traditions of Julia Kristeva, Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida and the historical work of intellectual historians such as J. G. A. Pocock and Quentin Skinner. A central argument of these theorists is that historical textual accounts cannot be taken at face value as absolute truths, nor can they be described objectively by historians; rather, both the accounts and historians’ attempts to describe them must be seen as representations of reality. The linguistic turn, Mark Knights points out, ‘involves the recognition that language “acts”’ and that ‘change can be understood through the study of language, or rather, the study of how language was used at any point in time can tell us a great deal about the society in which it was used.’ The linguistic turn gained prominence with historians of the early modern period working on the history of political discourse and within the literary movement known as new historicism. Such scholars focused, in the words of Louise Montrose, not only on ‘the historicity of texts’ but also on the ‘textuality of history’.

The ‘linguistic turn’ was accompanied by a ‘cultural turn’ amongst historians, with increased attention paid to the social and cultural aspects of language. Works on the social and cultural history of language have been published by historians such as Peter Burke and Roy Porter, amongst others, with titles such as *Language, self and society: a social history of language* (1991) and *Languages and communities in early modern Europe* (2004). The study of the cultural and social aspects of language in the early modern period is greatly aided, as Roger Lass points out, by the ‘extensive metalinguistic discourse’ available in the

---

9 Louise Montrose quoted in Knights, *Representation and misrepresentation*, 42.
form of writing on language in early modern England. The interests of historians following the linguistic and cultural turn thus merged with those of historical sociolinguistics.

A study of the attitudes towards and representations of loanwords in early modern English naturally draws on the work of historical sociolinguists. A relatively new field of linguistic study, historical sociolinguistics combines sociolinguistic concerns with a historical perspective. Since its first appearance in the title of Suzanne Romaine’s *Socio-Historical Linguistics: its Status and Methodology* (1982), historical sociolinguistics has become an established field, with the founding of the e-journal *Historical Sociolinguistics and Sociohistorical Linguistics* in 2000 and of the Historical Sociolinguistics Network (HiSoN) in 2005. As Terttu Nevalainen points out in her essay on the origins, motivations and paradigms of historical sociolinguistics, while its establishment as an academic field is relatively recent, the concerns of historical sociolinguistics have long featured in standard histories of English.

Within the field of the history of English, a number of works focus specifically on foreign borrowings, including Mary Serjeantson’s *A history of foreign words in English* (1935), Geoffrey Hughes’s *A history of English words* (2000) and most recently Philip Durkin’s *Borrowed words: a history of loanwords in English* (2014). Certain works deal specifically with French loanwords, notably the second volume of Fraser Mackenzie’s *Les relations de l’Angleterre et de la France d’après le vocabulaire* (1939) which focuses on French linguistic influences and ‘gallicismes anglais’ and Douglas A. Keebe’s *For to Speke French Trewely* (1991) which focuses on the French language in England during the period 1000-1600. Discussions of early modern English are found both in general histories of the

---

13 Terttu Nevalainen and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg, ibid., 23.
English language and in specific works on the subject.\textsuperscript{16} An introduction to early modern English is provided by Terttu Nevalainen, whereas book-length surveys of the period have been published by Charles Barber and Manfred Görlach. The third volume of the \textit{Cambridge History of the English language} considers the early modern period from 1476-1776 specifically.\textsuperscript{17}

One of the concerns within both sociolinguistics and historical sociolinguistics is with attitudes to language. Barber thus includes a chapter on language attitudes in early modern England, and Richard Foster Jones surveys opinions regarding the English vernacular from the introduction of printing through to the Restoration.\textsuperscript{18} Despite its Whiggish vision of a triumphalist progression of the English language, Jones’s \textit{A triumph of the English language} draws on a wealth of primary sources that discuss attitudes towards the English language. The representation of the English language is also addressed in Richard W. Bailey’s \textit{Images of English: a cultural history of the language} (1992).\textsuperscript{19}

In a thesis dealing with language attitudes in the early modern period, it is natural to discuss the concept of linguistic purism. As Nils Langer and Agnete Nesse have pointed out, the study of linguistic purism is complicated by the difficulty of pinpointing its exact nature: whether it is limited to the removal of foreign words, or whether it includes ridding a


language of other undesirable elements. George Thomas defines linguistic purism as the latter. Linguistic purism, he states, is:

The manifestation of a desire on the part of the speech community (or some section of it) to preserve a language from, or rid it of, putative foreign elements, or other elements held to be undesirable (including those originating in dialects, sociolects, and styles of the same language). It may be directed at all foreign elements but primarily the lexicon.

It is, he continues, ‘an attitude to language that labels certain elements as “pure” (therefore desirable) and others as “impure” (therefore undesirable)’. 

Linguistic purism deals with the perception of language varieties, Langer and Nesse argue, and is therefore closely related to historical linguistic issues of standardisation and stigmatisation. In their contribution to the Blackwell Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics, they list four principal discourses of linguistic purism identified by Andreas Gardt (2001):

1. structural discourse [sprachstruktureller Fremdwortdiskurs]
2. ideological discourse [sprachideologischer Fremdwortdiskurs]
3. pedagogical discourse [sprachpädagogisch-sprachsoziologischer Fremdwortdiskurs]
4. metalinguistic discourse [sprachkritischer Fremdwortdiskurs].

The structural discourse argues that foreign lexemes unbalance the state of purity of a language, leading to its breakdown, and should therefore be replaced with archaisms instead. The ideological discourse is based on ideas of genealogical purity of a language as part of a nation’s culture, and foreign elements are conceived of as a corruption of this culture. In the pedagogical discourse the emphasis is placed on ideas of societal division produced by the introduction of foreign elements not liable to be understood by the less educated. Finally, the metalinguistic discourse is related to aesthetics: the use of foreign words is associated with affectation and superficiality and is therefore to be avoided.

---

22 Thomas, ibid., 19.
James Milroy distinguishes between two types of purism: sanitary purism (Deborah Cameron’s ‘verbal hygiene’) and genetic purism.\(^{25}\) While sanitary purism considers that the corruption of language may be caused by vulgarity or error, genetic purism locates the corruption of language only in the effects caused by other languages through the processes of co-mixing and hybridisation. Sanitary purism, as Milroy points out, is about ‘cleanliness and orderliness’ with language imagined as a physical object that can be cleansed and purified through the expunging of the impurity.\(^{26}\) Such sanitary purist activity, he argues, ‘is an important strategy in any process of language standardization’.\(^{27}\) Genetic (or etymological) purism, on the other hand, focuses either on the idea that a language has remained unmixed with others; or, if such mixing is acknowledged to have occurred, on the need to replace words of foreign origin with words of an imagined native origin. Genetic purism thus does not strive to standardise a language, but rather to legitimise it through reference to its illustrious past and attempts to restore it to its native glory. It is therefore not part of the process of standardization, but is rather involved with ‘the ideology of the standard language’.\(^{28}\)

As there can be no absolute linguistic purity, linguists tend to view purism as an ultimately futile endeavour.\(^{29}\) However, as Langer and Nesse indicate, creating a normative and prestige variety of language invariably involves some form of language purism. Linguistic purism, they argue, is both a feature of language standardisation and associated with nation-building.\(^{30}\) In its role both as a prescriptive and a proscriptive text, the early modern dictionary played an important role in the eventual standardisation of the English language. The first substantial work on early modern English dictionaries was De Witt T. Starnes and Gertrude E. Noye’s seminal *The English dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson, 1604-1755*, first published in 1946 and reissued with an introduction and updated appendices by Gabriele Stein in 1991. It provided the first major overview of the monolingual dictionaries of the period and supplemented previous work on bilingual Latin-English and


\(^{26}\) Milroy, ‘Some effects of purist ideologies’, 325.

\(^{27}\) Milroy, ‘Some effects of purist ideologies’, 326.

\(^{28}\) Milroy, ‘Some effects of purist ideologies’, 329.

\(^{29}\) Langer and Davies, *Linguistic purism in the Germanic languages*, 11.

English-Latin dictionaries. Their text included lexicographical characterisations of the individual dictionaries in historical perspective and included a census of the dictionary editions held in American libraries. In 1966, a worldwide census of dictionary editions and their locations was published by Dr R. C. Alston as the fifth volume of his Bibliography of the English Language from the Invention of Printing to the Year 1800, which dealt exclusively with dictionaries. In 1985, Stein published her own monograph The English dictionary before Cawdrey which complemented the work of Starnes and Noyes. Jürgen Schäfer’s meticulous two-volume study, Early modern English lexicography (1989), surveys the monolingual glossaries and dictionaries in the period 1475-1640 and provides an extensive word list with cross-references to the early modern dictionaries and glossaries in which they appear. Early modern dictionaries are discussed in recent histories of English lexicography such as Henry Béjoint’s The lexicography of English: from origins to present (2010) and the two-volume Oxford history of English lexicography (2009) edited by Anthony Paul Cowie, while early modern lexicographers are considered in three of the five volumes of the Ashgate critical essays on early English lexicographers (2012).

While the work of Starnes and Noyes focused on the non-specialised monolingual dictionaries, a broader perspective on the early modern lexicographical domain has been provided by Schäfer’s work on glossaries, Janet Bately’s and Monique Cormier’s work on bilingual and multilingual dictionaries, John Considine’s work on early modern dictionaries and the heroic, Julie Coleman’s and Maurizio Gotti’s work on cant and slang dictionaries and Noel Osselton’s work on branded words. Historical lexicography has since become its own

subdiscipline: In 2002 Julie Coleman organised the first biannual International Conference on Historical Lexicography and Lexicology (ICHLL) which lead to the establishment of an International Society for Historical Lexicography and Lexicology (ISHLL). The papers presented at these biannual conferences have since been published in several volumes edited by Considine and Coleman, amongst others.36

Central to metalexicography is the idea that the dictionary is not a neutral reference work, but a rich source of and reflection on societal and authorial values. Alain Rey, in his work on the seventeenth-century monolingual French dictionary, coined the image of the dictionary as a palimpsest to be read at several levels: from the dictionary as a reflection of society to the dictionary as the work of a specific author, whose personal views are entwined within his text.37 Three of the main evidential uses of dictionaries in linguistic research, Coleman argues, are ‘with reference to attitudes towards language, social anxiety, and linguistic change.’38 Dictionaries, she emphasises, can provide insights into contemporary attitudes and language concerns:

Dictionaries do not just reflect the status of a language, they also play a symbolic function in shaping it, and the existence of authoritative dictionaries can enhance the status of a national form and help in the development of a national identity.39

Joshua Fishman similarly argues that dictionaries are both ‘culturally-constructed and culturally constructing’.40

The work on early modern lexicography and metalexicography has been greatly facilitated by the historical database, Lexicons of Early Modern English (LEME), edited by

---


Ian Lancaster. This online historical database is comprised of ‘monolingual, bilingual, and polyglot dictionaries, lexical encyclopedias, hard-word glossaries, spelling lists, and lexically-valuable treatises surviving in print or manuscript from the Tudor, Stuart, Caroline, Commonwealth, and Restoration periods.’\textsuperscript{41} It currently holds 209 searchable lexicons and 161 fully analysed lexicons, as well as an index to over 1,300 known lexical works in the period which are searchable by date, author, title, subject, and genre. The licensed version of the database allows for simple and advanced word searches, and provides a complete word-list of the database that can be browsed.\textsuperscript{42}

3.2 English national identity and Anglo-French relations

Much has been written on the rise of English nationalism in recent years. While it has traditionally been argued that ideas of nationalism and national identity first emerged in the early nineteenth century, new scholarship has located instances of nationalistic thought much earlier. Gerald Newman and Linda Colley thus situate the beginnings of nationalism in the eighteenth century, Herbert Grabes in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and Andrew Hadfield traces the roots of English nationalism to early sixteenth-century literature.\textsuperscript{43}

These scholars differ in their definitions of national identity. Hadfield draws on Anthony D. Smith’s definition of a nation:

\begin{quote}
 a named human population sharing an historic territory, common myths and historical memories, a mass, public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members\textsuperscript{44}
\end{quote}

Like Hadfield, Grabes emphasises the role of writing in the construction of national identity, arguing that:

\textsuperscript{41} Ian Lancashire, ‘Introduction to Lexicons of Early Modern English’, http://leme.library.utoronto.ca/public/intro.cfm
\textsuperscript{44} Anthony D. Smith quoted in Andrew Hadfield, \textit{Literature, politics and national identity: Reformaion to Renaissance}, (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994), 2.
‘writing the nation’ can be taken in a quite literal sense; that English national identity was constructed in and disseminated by the new print medium – above all in the genre of the pamphlet as a forerunner of the newspaper.45

Common to many of these scholars is the idea that English, or in the case of Colley, British, nationalism was forged in opposition to some foreign other. In her seminal work Britons: forging the nation 1707-1837 (2012), Colley argues that this political and religious other was the French. While Gerald Newman claims that Hogarth was one of the first to express artistic outrage at French cultural influence, both Sara Warneke and Michael Duffy demonstrate that Hogarth’s English ape in French clothes drew on images and criticism from the preceding century.46 Thus Warneke concludes that English nationalism was not forged in the Age of Reason, but ‘clearly emerged in the early modern criticisms of foreign cultural influence generally and criticism of the traveller who abandoned his cultural and national identity particularly’.47

The Anglo-French love-hate relationship has been the subject of much interest, especially following the centenary celebrations of the Entente Cordiale in 2004. Like Colley’s Britons, Jeremy Black’s Natural and necessary enemies (1986) focuses on Anglo-French relations in the eighteenth century. Robert and Isabelle Tombs’s That sweet enemy (2006) traces the fluctuating exchanges of France and Britain from Louis XIV to the early twenty-first century, while Richard Gibson’s Best of enemies (2011) starts its foray into the vicissitudes of Anglo-French relations with the Norman Conquest of 1066, as does Glenn Richardson’s article ‘The contending kingdoms’ (2004). In ‘The noisie, empty, fluttering French’ (1982), Michael Duffy focuses on English images of the French during the long eighteenth century (1689-1815).48

According to Duffy, English xenophobia reached its zenith during the ‘Second Hundred Years’ War’ with France, which spanned from the onset of the Nine Years War in 1689 to Napoleon’s defeat at Waterloo in 1815. In his The Englishman and the foreigner (1986) he examines political and social satirical prints for English attitudes towards

45 Grabes, ed., Writing the early modern English nation, xi.
He argues that the English satirical prints of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England ‘gave graphic representation to the ideas, assumptions and environment of that era.’

From an analysis of such images he concludes that the French were ‘the supreme bugaboo’ of late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England. He notes that English attitudes to the French underwent a revolution in the seventeenth century. From being allies against Spain in the 1590s and forming another Anglo-French alliance in 1657, France and England became bitter political enemies by the end of the seventeenth century. Likewise the French princess Henrietta Maria’s marriage to Charles I in 1625 was first seen as an escape from a dreaded Spanish match, yet Henrietta Maria’s initial popularity soon waned in parallel with the growing Catholicism of her court.

---

49 Specifically the political and social satires from 1600-1832 held in the Department of Prints and Drawings of the British Museum and reproduced on microfilm by Chadwyck-Healy.


4 Historical, religious, political, cultural and socio-linguistic context

Any account of attitudes to linguistic borrowing must necessarily take into account the socio-linguistic context of the period being studied; this, in turn, is shaped by the politics, religion and culture of that period. The following sections will therefore provide a brief overview, not only of the history of foreign borrowings in the English language, but also of the religious, political and cultural context of seventeenth-century and early eighteenth-century England.

4.1 Historical and sociolinguistic context

A pivotal event in the history of the English language was the invasion and occupation of England in 1066 by Duke William II of Normandy, later known as William the Conqueror. In the centuries following the Conquest, numerous Norman French words entered the English language, including place names and personal names. French eventually became the language of the rulers and was used in law, administration and the courts in medieval England, thus leading to a triglossic situation of Latin, French and English. Clanchy notes: ‘French remained the language of the influential group immediately around the king for more than two centuries, as each “new French queen brings with her a new swarm of Frenchmen”’. According to Douglas Keebe, during the course of the fifteenth century, French would no longer be favoured in law, written administration and much of everyday private writing, but nevertheless retained its use and prestige as the most important modern foreign language throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

This situation of triglossia meant that medieval and early modern English was characterised by an exponential increase of vocabulary. According to Wermser’s statistics, loanwords constitute between forty and fifty percent of all new vocabulary recorded in this period. Drawing on Wermser, Nevalainen argues:

> The figures suggest that borrowing is by far the most common method of enriching the lexicon in Early Modern English. With the exception of the period 1510-24, loan words constitute a higher proportion of all neologisms in the sixteenth and

---

53 Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307, 213.
54 Douglas Keebe, For to Speke Frenche Trewely, 185.
55 The following section on the ‘inkhorn controversy’ draws on an essay submitted by the present writer as part of the module MLI 315 Autumn 2014.
seventeenth centuries than the three major word-formation processes of affixation, compounding and conversion put together. Of these loanwords, Latin and French words constituted the majority. For some contemporary writers, these borrowings improved the English language and contributed to its richness; for others they were a corruption and the use of foreign words as a means of elevating style was heavily criticised.

Such issues were at the heart of a well-known language debate known as the ‘inkhorn controversy’, which continued through the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. This debate pitted neologisers such as Thomas Elyot and George Pettie against noted purists such as the Cambridge professor John Cheke, a fellow of St John’s College, Ralph Lever, another St John’s member, and Thomas Wilson. In these debates, the inkhorn, an inkwell commonly made of horn and used by most scholars, was taken to refer to opaque foreign language borrowings associated with pretentiousness and pedantry. Wilson, one of the most ferocious critics of Latinisms, warned in his 1553 Art of Rhetorique that amongst all other lessons, the first to be learned was to never affect any ‘straunge ynkehorne termes’ but rather to speak plainly. To prove his point he included a supposedly original ‘ynkehorne letter’ filled with foreign borrowings and elaborate Latinisms. Often it was use of obscure Latinism that was the focus of the ‘inkhorn’ debate, but sixteenth-century purists also criticised the use of ‘outlandish speech’, which included French terms and phrases. Wilson thus specifically complains of the travellers that return from France and unabashedly ‘talke Frenche English’.

In his The Art of Reason rightly termed, Witcraft (1573), Lever draws on ideas of linguistic purity and appeals to patriotic sentiment, chastising those ‘that with inckhorne termes doe change and corrupt the same, making a mingle mangle of their natuie speache, and not obseruing the propertie therof.’ Like other purists, he advocated the use of traditional English words, either by giving them new technical meanings, or by using them to create new English words through compounding or affixation, with examples including ‘forespeech’ for preface, ‘saywhat’ for definition, ‘endsay’ for conclusion, and ‘witcraft’ for logic.

I am of this opinion that our own tung shold be written cleane and pure, vnvmixt and vnmaneged with borrowing of other tungen, wherin if we take not heed bi
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He used English equivalents for classical words as often as possible, such as ‘crossed’ for crucified and ‘gainrising’ for resurrection, in his translation of St Matthew’s Gospel, thus distancing himself from the Latin vocabulary of the Roman Catholic church. Inherent in the criticisms of these purists are ideas of inkhorn terms as counterfeit, falseness and concealment with Cheke praising plain English language which ‘bouroweth no counterfeitness of other tunges to attire her self withall’. For these authors English compounds were largely preferable as they were self-evident in meaning whilst inkhorn terms constituted a misuse of language.

Lever’s notion of English as a ‘mingle mangle’ and Cheke’s portrayal of English as mixed and mangled were echoed in Continental criticisms of English. The Swiss humanist Conrad Gesner regarded the English language ‘of all the most mixed and corrupt’, while a century later the Dane Ludwig Holberg would be even more graphic, recounting the anecdote that ‘the devil once threw all the ancient and modern languages into a brass pot’ and ‘made the English language out of the scum.’ At the start of the early modern period, certain English authors were apt to agree. Speaking of his mother tongue the archaiser E.K. reproved: ‘they patched vp the holes with peces and rags of other languages, borrowing here of the French, there of the Italian, euery where of the Latine, not weighing how il, those tongues accorde with themselues, but much worse with ours: So now they haue made our English tongue, a gallimaufry or hodgepodge of al other speches.’

Yet for neologisers such as Pettie and Elyot the incorporation of such foreign words was seen as a means of improving the perceived barbarism and rudeness of English. Their neologisms, they claimed, were necessary augmentations of the language that would contribute to its eloquence. To borrow from Latin was highly desirable, Pettie claimed ‘for it is in deed the ready way to inrich our tongue, and make it copious, and it is the way which all tongues haue taken to inrich them selues’. Likewise in The boke named the Gouernour (1531) Elyot argued for the necessity of drawing on Latin loans, using the familiar trope of words as citizens:
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66 Pettie quoted in Barber, Early modern English, 59.
I am constrained to usurpe a latine worde callyng it Maturitie: whiche worde though it be strange and darke yet by declaring the vertue in a fewe mo wordes the name ones [once] brought in custome shall be as facile to vnderstande as other wordes late commen out of Italy and France and made denizens amonge vs…. And this I do nowe remembre for the necessary augmentation of our langage.67

Not only did these authors consider such loans necessary for the improvement of English, but they argued that a large portion of everyday speech was already the unacknowledged product of borrowing. In his preface to The ciuile conuerstation of M. Steeuen Guazzo (1581) Pettie thus marvels:

> how our english tongue hath crakt it [its] credite, that it may not borrow of the Latine as well as other tongues: and if it haue broken, it is but of late for it is not vknown to all men how many woordes we haue fetcht from thence within these fewe yeeres which if they should be all counted inkpot termes, I know not how we should speake any thing without blacking our mouthes with inke: for what woord can be more plaine then this word plaine, and yet what can come more neere to the Latine?68

David Crystal (as did Pettie) underlines the irony of the purist ideal whose criticism of foreign loanwords were themselves expressed with words of non-Germanic origins, such as the word ‘pure’ itself.69 The word ‘plaine’, Barber points out, is in fact a Middle English loan from French, much as Elyot’s ‘maturitie’ is more closely linked to the French ‘maturité’ and created with the suffix -ity, itself derived from French.70

This desire for linguistic purity was also accompanied by a desire to fix and preserve the English tongue. In the sixteenth century the variety and changeability of English was contrasted with the fixity of Latin. According to Barber, ‘the movement in favour of regulation grew in strength during the seventeenth century, and was very powerful from the Restoration onwards’.71 The move towards standardisation was greatly aided by Caxton’s 1476 introduction of the printing press to England, which encouraged the multiplication and increased distribution of printed texts in the vernacular. The role of the printing press in contributing to standardisation has been emphasised by Elisabeth Eisenstein in her seminal work on the printing press as an agent of social and cultural transformation in early modern Europe.72

68 Crystal, ibid., 61.
69 Crystal, ibid., 61.
70 Barber, Early modern English, 55.
71 Barber, ibid., 53.
In the early modern period, academies responsible for the standardisation and the compiling of dictionaries were founded across Europe in Florence (1582), Paris (1635), Madrid (1713), Copenhagen (1742), Lisbon (1779), Moscow (1783) and Stockholm (1786). A number of English authors called for the establishment of an academy to standardise the English language, including John Dryden (1664), John Evelyn (1665), Daniel Defoe (1697) and Jonathan Swift in his well-known *A Proposal for correcting, improving and ascertaining the English Tongue* (1712). Such calls, however, remained unanswered.

Although England had no such official body to regulate the English language, the publication of grammars and dictionaries by individual authors flourished. In the process of standardisation and lexical expansion of early modern English during this period, Barber argues, these early modern dictionaries and grammars played an important role. For those who wished to regulate the English language, dictionaries and grammars would legislate for good usage, whilst simultaneously preventing this usage from changing. Rather than being purely descriptive, the early modern dictionaries became increasingly prescriptive and proscriptive.

### 4.2 Religious, political and cultural context of early modern England

The early modern period in England was a period of significant religious transformation. Following the English Reformation and the Act of Supremacy in 1534, England moved from being a Catholic nation whose church was under papal dominion, to a being a Protestant nation whose monarch had become the head of its national church. By the seventeenth century Protestantism was firmly ensconced in England and Protestant-Catholic rivalry was current. Anti-Catholic sentiment led to rumours of Catholic involvement in two devastating events of the mid-1660s: the Great Plague of 1665-1666 and the Great Fire of London in 1666. The establishment of a printing press in London in 1476 as the opening date of the period. Such as choice, the editor Roger Lass argues in his introduction to the volume, ‘is not just a matter of convenience or symbolism: printing plays a vital role in certain later developments’. Roger Lass, ed., *The Cambridge history of the English language*, vol. III, 1476-1776, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 6.

This was not, however, a unified Protestantism and a number of dissident religious groups separated from the Church of England during the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Amongst the English dissenters that emerged during the early to mid-seventeenth century were the Levellers, the Diggers and the Fifth Monarchists. For radical dissenters during the English Civil Wars and the Protectorate see the Marxist historian Christopher Hill, *The world turned upside down: radical ideas during the English revolution*, (London: Penguin books, 1991, [1972]); Andrew Bradstock, *Radical Religion in Cromwell’s England: A Concise History from the English Civil War to the End of the Commonwealth* (London: I B Tauris, 2011).
Catholic minority was seen as liable to instigate political assassination plots such as the Gunpowder plot of 1605 and the fictive Popish plot of 1678-1681.77

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were also a period of political upheaval which witnessed the Civil Wars and the execution of Charles I (1649), the Commonwealth or Interregnum and Cromwell’s Protectorate (1649-1660), the Restoration of Charles II in 1660 and the Glorious Revolution of 1688. It was a period of fluctuating relations within the kingdoms of the British Isles: from the coronation of King James I as monarch of both England and Scotland in 1605, through Anglo-Scottish conflict during the Civil Wars, to the 1707 Acts of Union through which the Kingdom of England merged with the Kingdom of Scotland to become the Kingdom of Great Britain. In addition to such internal strife, early modern England was also marked by international conflict through its involvement in the Thirty Years War (1618-1648) and the prolonged conflict with France known as the Second Hundred Year’s War (1689-1815).

The early modern period also witnessed a number of social and cultural changes. Caxton’s introduction of the printing press to England in 1476 meant that England moved from limited manuscript circulation to a wide dissemination of print culture. The rise of the English vernacular led to the printing of English versions of both the Bible and Book of Common Prayer. Literacy rates rose accordingly.78 In the cultural sphere, London theatres went from flourishing open stages through experiencing Puritan repression to exclusive representations for the Stuart court. London theatres were closed by ordinance in 1642 and were not officially reopened until after the Restoration in 1660.79

4.3 Attitudes towards the French in early modern England

Representations of French linguistic borrowing were naturally influenced by Anglo-French relations. Attitudes towards the French varied during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, both over time and in different circles. The vehement Francophobia of late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England can be seen as a counter-reaction to equally passionate instances of Francophilia. This section provides an overview of the fluctuating Anglo-French relations of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and discusses how such relations affected the

depiction of the French borrowing. During periods of conflict, vicious or satirical representations of the French became commonplace in literature, pamphlets and prints.

4.3.1 The Saxon myth and the Norman yoke

During the early seventeenth-century Anglo-Saxonist movement, English writers reflected upon the origins of the English language and the respective roles of Anglo-Saxon and Norman-French. In 1605 Richard Verstegan and William Camden published two works tracing the Saxon origins of the English nation, entitled *A restitution of decayed intelligence: in antiquities, concerning the most noble and renovvmed English nation* and *Remaines of a greater worke, concerning Britaine, the inhabitants thereof, their languages, names, surnames, empreses, wise speeches, poësies, and epitaphes*, respectively. These works argued that England’s current population was not descended from the British peoples, who had been displaced to Wales, but rather was of Teutonic Saxon origin.

Such histories of the Saxon origins of the English language and people were accompanied by writings discussing the political and linguistic implications of the Norman Conquest, often referred to as the ‘Norman yoke’. Christopher Hill traces the changing versions of this theory through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in his essay ‘The Norman yoke’. He states its main outlines as the following:

> Before 1066 the Anglo-Saxon inhabitants of the country lived as free and equal citizens, governing themselves through representative institutions. The Norman Conquest deprived them of this liberty, and established the tyranny of an alien King and landlords.  

The ‘Norman yoke’ had thus been imposed on a free Saxon people. The idea that England has enjoyed free democratic institutions until the Norman Conquest imposed autocracy was used by radicals such as the Levellers and the Diggers during the English Revolution to argue that their opposition to royalty and its institutions was merely aimed at the restitution of ancient rights. These Norman impositions were also referred to as ‘Normanismes’, hence the Leveller John Hare’s 1647 pamphlets spoke of both of the ‘Normane yoke’ and ‘anti-Normanisme’.

---

4.3.2 ‘A Universal Monarchy’ and ‘A Universal Commerce’

In the second half of the seventeenth century, French territorial and commercial expansion gave rise to pamphlets warning against French hegemony and the imposition of a Universal Monarchy and a Universal Commerce.81

Steven Pincus echoes Duffy in asserting that English attitudes towards the French changed dramatically during the course of the seventeenth-century. His article ‘From Butterboxes to Wooden shoes’ chronicles the change in public opinion from anti-Dutch to anti-French during the course of the third Anglo-Dutch war (1672-74). While earlier scholars have maintained that this shift was due to religious and domestic factors, Pincus contends that the change in public opinion was related to ‘the proper identification of the universal monarch’, which switched from the republican Dutch to the absolutist French. Although he concedes the importance of such domestic events as the Duke of York’s public confession of the Catholic faith or the publication of the immensely successful pamphlet England’s appeal from the private cabal at Whitehall to the great council of the nation (1673)82 (which identified the French with the threat of Popery in England), he argues that it was in fact political events abroad that provided the impetus for this shift.

Not only was France accused of aiming at a Universal Monarchy, it was also suspected of attempting to impose a Universal Commerce. Pamphlets abounded with tales of how French trade was destroying the English and accounts of their unjust taxation and unfair trade practices. A case in point is the pamphlet An account of the French usurpation upon the trade of England, and what damage the English do yearly sustain by their Commerce (1679).83

4.3.3 ‘Universal Catholicism’ and anti-Protestant persecution

Anti-French sentiment was further stoked by tales of the French king Louis XIV’s oppression of the Huguenots in France and by his Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685), which had granted them tolerance of religion. His ‘Dragonnades’ policy of billeting dragoons in the homes of Huguenot dissenters led to massive Protestant emigration. French massacres of

82 Englands appeal from the private cabal at White-hall to the great council of the nation, the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled. By a true lover of his country, (London: s.n., Anno 1673). This pamphlet has been variously attributed to Sir William Coventry, Baron de Lisola, Peter du Moulin, and John Trevor.
83 J. B., An account of the French usurpation upon the trade of England and what great damage the English do yearly sustain by their commerce, and how the same may be retrenched, and England improved in riches and interest. London: Printed in the year, 1679.
Protestants were vividly portrayed in English prints.\(^84\) The significance of such events is illustrated by B. E.’s *A New Dictionary of the Terms Ancient and Modern of the Canting Crew* (1699) which chose to define ‘Refugies’ as ‘French and Vaudois Protestants, forced to quit their own and fly into others Countries to have the Exercise of their Religion’ and Benjamin Norton Defoe’s *A new English dictionary* (1735) which defined ‘Refugee’ as ‘a French Protestant fled for Refuge from the Persecution in France’.\(^85\) A number of broadsides and prints depicted the Devil, the Pope and Louis XIV in the same image, with the tyrant Louis XIV shown drinking blood or ‘wading to Hell in Blood above the knees’.\(^86\) Louis XIV was likened to the most Christian Turk, and his French oppression of Huguenots was compared to Turkish barbarity towards the Greeks.\(^87\)

The conflation of the political and religious spheres in this period is underlined by Colley, who notes that during the Nine Years War (1689-97), the War of Spanish Succession (1702-13) and the War of Austrian Succession (1739-48) one of France’s primary objectives was to invade Britain in support of the Stuart claimants to the throne (the exiled James II, his son James Edward Stuart and grandson Bonnie Prince Charlie, Charles Edward Stuart). As these claimants were all Roman Catholic, these wars catered not only to political but also to religious fears.\(^88\)

4.3.4 ‘A Universal Language’

While some pamphlets warned of the threat of French ‘Universal Monarchy’ and French ‘Universal Commerce’, others envisioned the danger of a French ‘Universal language’. The fear of England being overrun politically, culturally and linguistically by the French was not without precedent. Peter Burke recounts how Edward I of England in 1295 claimed that the French king planned to invade and ‘wipe out the English language’ and cites fourteenth-century English parliament speeches claiming that the French had plans ‘to annihilate the whole nation and the English language’.\(^89\) Nor was an imagined war of languages entirely without substance. Territorial expansion was often followed by some form of language regulation. While Norman French eventually became the official language of court and administration in medieval England after the Norman Conquest, French was
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\(^{84}\) Duffy includes a number of such atrocity prints in his *The Englishman and the foreigner* (1986), notably of the massacre of the Cevennois Protestants (1703-4), 94-95, 102-103.
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imposed in the conquered territories of Flanders and Alsace in the 1680s and in Roussillon in 1700 following French military campaigns.\(^90\) In the seventeenth century ‘the language whose speakers made the strongest bid for European hegemony was of course French’, notes Burke, and the fact that Cardinal Richelieu was thought to have a plan to make French the language of Europe was one in a line of many similar claims.\(^91\)

The prevalence of French in the English language and high society following the Restoration was emphasised by Guy Miege in his bilingual *A new dictionary French and English, with another English and French* (1677), whose utility he naturally sought to underline:

> By all which contrivance and care it is now come to pass, that the French Tongue is in a manner grown Universal in Europe, but especially amongst the Gentile part of it. And of all Parts of Europe next to France, none is more fond of it than England, whose Language is so much made up of the French, that (according to Mr. Howell in his Epistle upon Cotgrave) an English-man had need to study French to speak good English. So that it is no wonder why the French Tongue should be so kindly received here among all Sorts of people.\(^92\)

Guy Miege’s bilingual dictionary drew on a long tradition of bilingual French-English lexicons which reflected the status of French as a language of culture throughout the early modern period.\(^93\) In 1685 the refugee philosopher and historian Pierre Bayle maintained that French was a ‘transcendental language’ used amongst all the people of Europe, while a funeral oration on Louis XIV noted how the language of his subjects was today spoken in all the courts.\(^94\)

\(^90\) Burke, ibid., 74-75.
\(^91\) Burke, ibid., 85.
\(^92\) ‘Preface to the reader, shewing the necessity, substance, and method of this work’ in Miege, *A New Dictionary French and English with another English and French* (1677). The full title of Miege’s dictionary was *A NEW DICTIONARY French and English, With Another English and French; According to the Present USE, and Modern ORTHOGRAPHY of the FRENCH. INRICH’D With New WORDS, Choice PHRASES, and Apposite PROVERBS; DIGESTED Into a most Accurate METHOD; And CONTRIVED For the USE both of English and Foreigners. By GUY MIEGE, Gent. LONDON, Printed by Tho. Dawks, for Thomas Basset, at the George, near Clifford’s-Inn, in Fleetstreet. 1677.*
\(^94\) Bayle quoted in Burke, *Languages and communities*, 86, 87.
Such territorial expansion and the primacy of French as the European language of diplomacy, alongside European-wide publications of periodicals and newspapers in French and the wide-spread dissemination of French Enlightenment texts were considered part of the French bid for European political, cultural and linguistic hegemony. In 1669 John Webb warned against the ‘Latinizing, Italianizing, Frenchizing’ of English; while in 1745 London tradesmen founded ‘The Laudable Association of Anti-Gallicans’ which, amongst other things, campaigned against the use of French phrases in English.95 Ideas of language purism and fears of linguistic invasion were often linked to ideas of empire. Thus Thomas Sprat (1635-1713), founding member and historian of the Royal Society, would declare that ‘the purity of speech and greatness of empire have in all countries still met together’.96 The desire for linguistic purity was also intertwined with religious concerns. Indeed much of the Protestant rhetoric against Catholicism drew on the language of impurity, and the hostility to Latin and its modern derivatives Italian and French was also related to the hatred of the Church of Rome in the works of Protestant authors such as John Cheke and Henri Estienne. As Burke notes, there were ‘clear links between purism and Puritanism.’97

4.3.5 The Francophilia of the Restoration and emerging Francophobia

In early modern England, France was the country most visited by English travellers and educational travel to France was often seen as an essential part of young noblemen’s upbringing. Young noblemen were sent on the ‘Grand Tour’, a tradition that continued in the eighteenth century.98 French customs had already been encouraged by Queen Henrietta Maria and her French court in the early seventeenth century; following the Restoration, early modern England witnessed a new wave of French culture and language affecting its courtly circles.

When the royal court returned from exile in France in 1660, they brought with them the cultural influence of la grande nation and its ‘courtly language’. In Fashioning masculinity (1996), Michèle Cohen examines the role the feminine representations of French language and manners played in the formation of an English masculine national identity. The construction of English masculinity, she claims, was premised on the gendering of cultural relations between England and France. Similar arguments are set forward by David Kuchta in

95 Webb (1669) quoted in Burke, Languages and communities, 152; Colley, Britons: forging the nation, 88.
96 Sprat quoted in Burke, Languages and communities, 152.
97 Burke, Languages and communities, 158.
his monograph *The three-piece suit and modern masculinity* (2002). He emphasises the role that French modes of politics and fashion were seen to play in the corruption of English political culture, and notably Stuart court culture.\(^{99}\) By introducing French modes and manners, the Stuart court was opening the door to French vices such as tyranny, luxury and effeminacy. Such a gendered discourse not only addressed French customs, but touched upon the legitimacy of the royal court itself: ‘By defining court splendor as inherently feminine’, Kuchta affirms, ‘critics undermined the Stuart crown’s patriarchalist claims to power, transforming father into fop.’\(^{100}\)

Lawrence Klein has underlined the importance of representations of French manners and conversation in the ‘the rise of politeness’ in late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century England. His article explores how three of the most prominent Whig ideologists following the Glorious Revolution of 1688 (the third earl of Shaftesbury, Joseph Addison and Richard Steele) portrayed France in terms of a certain sociability against which they would define proper English sociability. In what he terms ‘a politics of manners’ or ‘a politics of sociability’ in the writings of Whig ideologists, ‘ideals of polite sociability were advanced in conjunction with an attack on France.’\(^{101}\)

Such an attack on France, he argues, was only possible because of the pre-existing notion of France as the country *par excellence* of well-breeding, art and eloquence. When the Stuart royal family returned from exile in France in 1660, they brought with them French modes of being from their time in the refined French court. While certain authors praised a subsequent improvement in court eloquence and manners, others viewed this imposition of French manners and culture as a growing threat. In his diary John Evelyn questioned the attraction that Paris held for the princes of Europe, warning that their travels exposed them to:

> the mode as well as the Language of France, & disposed them to an undervaluing of their owne Countrys, with infinite prejudice to the rest of Europ; the French, naturaly active, insinuating & bold having with their trifles & new modes allmost debaucht all the sobriety of former times. Continuauly aspiring to inlarge their Tyranny, by all the arts of dissimulation; & tretchery.\(^{102}\)

\(^{100}\) Kuchta, *The three-piece suit and modern masculinity*, 57.
Such notions of French seduction and deception were echoed in the large number of anti-French pamphlets that followed the 1666 Great Fire of London, which rumours attributed to malign French intervention.\(^{103}\)

These pamphlets, Klein notes, chose either to emphasise the French threat or belittle it, but all maintained the French association with manners. And it was this association with French excesses of sociability that gave rise to ‘an epidemic of fops’\(^{104}\) on the Restoration stage:

> A hostility to France that fixed on its sociability crystallized in ideas about French foppishness in the first two decades of the Restoration. In the fully developed characterization of fops that appeared in the 1670s, the complaisance of the French was recast as a distortion of true gentlemanliness. Fops were assigned traits associated with French sociability but blamed for abuses of form in the major zones of comportment, clothing, and conversation. Foppish manners were French distortions: ‘Instead of true Gallantry (which once dwelt in the Breasts of Englishmen) [the fop] is made up of Complements, Cringes, Knots, Fancies, Perfumes, and a thousand French apish Tricks’.\(^{105}\)

The emulation of French fashion, manners and language thus gave rise to two counter-reactions in Restoration England. The first was hostility, voiced in the form of pamphlets and broadsides; the second derision, frequently expressed in the form of satiric plays, poems and prints.

> Such derision was not only directed at French customs, but focused equally on the Englishmen who were fools enough to adopt them. A case in point is Samuel Butler’s *Satire upon our ridiculous imitation of the French*. Composed in the years 1670-1671, but published posthumously, Butler’s text laments the English appropriation of French mores, claiming that it would be better to steer through burning seas, than ‘see one Nation go to School, / and learn of another, like a Fool / To study all its Tricks and Fashions / With epidemic Affectations.’\(^{106}\) His text enumerates all the ways in which the English were governed by the French, ranging from determining the length of their breeches and the styles of their hats, to commanding their gestures and the volume of their voices. He likens Englishmen to puppets governed by French rules of art. Their slavish imitation continued no matter how ridiculous the French custom, ‘for nothing can be bad or good, / But as ‘tis in or
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104 Robert B. Heilman, ‘Some fops and some versions of foppery’, *ELH*, vol. 49, no. 2 (Summer, 1982), 388.
out of mode’. He admonishes the Englishmen who ‘disdain the country where they were born’, ‘admire whate’er they find abroad’ and are ‘only foreigners at home’. Having covered excesses in fashion, voice and movement, Butler ends his satire with a reflection on French linguistic borrowing that draws on metaphors of venereal disease and echoes arguments from the Inkhorn Controversy:

T’ adorn their English with French Scraps,
And give their very Language Claps;
[...]
And, while they idly think t’enrich,
Adulterate their native Speech;
For though to smatter Ends of Greek
Or Latin be the Rhetorique
Of Pedants counted, and vain-glorious,
To smatter French is meritorious;
And to forget their Mother-Tongue,
Or purposely to speak it wrong.

Francophobic reactions to French borrowings was thus enabled by the very popularity of such borrowings. While sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century criticism often focused on the exaggerated use of Latinisms, from the late seventeenth century onwards criticism centred largely on the fashionable adoption of French vocabulary. Complaints about the unjustified influence of French on English, Manfred Görlach points out, lasted from the 1660s to the 1750s.110

---
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5 Representations of French linguistic borrowing in early modern English-vernacular lexicons

The influx of new vocabulary in the early modern period was often cited as justification for the first monolingual English dictionaries. These were so called ‘hard word’ dictionaries, dedicated to the explication of difficult words, the majority of which were foreign loans from classical languages or from French. \(^{111}\) Foreign borrowings were thus an essential part of these dictionaries; however, the attitudes expressed regarding their incorporation into the English language vary. Whereas some, like Robert Cawdrey, admonished their use and recommended replacing them by plainer terms, others, such as Henry Cockeram, praised their contribution to the copiousness of the English language and were responsible for introducing additional borrowings.

The following chapter examines in chronological order the depictions of French borrowing in the prefatory matter of ten major early modern English-vernacular dictionaries. The early modern dictionaries here considered can be divided into three broad categories. The first hard-word dictionaries focused mainly on foreign loans: Cawdrey (1604), Bullokar (1616), and Cockeram (1623). Starting with Thomas Blount the lexicographers also aimed to provide etymologies of the words they included in their encyclopaedic-style dictionaries: Blount (1656), Phillips (1658), Coles (1676) and Hogarth (1689). However, it is not before the early eighteenth century that common words were included in dictionary entries: Kersey (1702), Bailey (1727, 1737) and Johnson (1755). This was the advent of the universal dictionary, made well-known by Samuel Johnson. \(^{112}\)

5.1 Robert Cawdrey, *A Table Alphabeticall* (1604)\(^ {113}\)

The first English monolingual dictionary was the school master Robert Cawdrey’s *A Table Alphabeticall* (1604). \(^ {114}\) The title page of Cawdrey’s dictionary reads as follows:
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\(^{111}\) Barber, Early modern English, 76.

\(^{112}\) For these divisions see N. E. Osselton


\(^{114}\) For the important role of Cawdrey’s dictionary for the shaping of subsequent seventeenth-century English vernacular dictionaries, see Kusuijo Miyoshi, ‘Cawdrey’s *Table Alphabeticall* (1604) reconsidered: its driving force for early English lexicography’ in John Considine, ed., *Adventuring in dictionaries: new studies in the history of lexicography*, (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010), 14-22 and Gabriele Stein, ‘Lexicographical Method and Usage in Cawdrey’s *A Table Alphabeticall* (1604)’, *Studia Neophilologica*, vol. 82, (2010), 163–177.
In the preface, Cawdrey reiterated his intention to provide the ‘true Orthography … of many hard English words, borrowed from the Greek, Latine & French’ but also ‘how to know one from the other’ through their interpretation by ‘plaine English words’. In his preface, he singles out French borrowings specifically: while words derived from Latin ‘haue no marke at all’, words from the French are marked with the symbol §, of which there are 423 occurrences in his 2,543 entries.

His preface emphasises the importance of choosing one’s words wisely. Four things, he noted, were to be observed in the choice of words. First, that they should be proper to English (‘proper vnto the tongue wherein we speake’); second, that they should be plain (‘plaine for all men to perceiue’); third, that they should be appropriate (‘apt and meete, most properly to set out the matter’); and finally, that tropes (or ‘words translated, from one signification to another’) should be used to ‘beautifie the sentence, as precious stones are set in a ring, to commend the gold’. He warned against the excessive use of foreign borrowings. No wise man, he claimed, would think that ‘wit resteth in strange words’ for ‘do we not speak, because we would haue the other to vnderstand vs’? The necessity of ‘banish[ing] all affected Rhetorique’ was thus the justification for his dictionary, which would allow his readers to choose plain English words in its stead:

Those therefore that will auoyde this follie, and acquaint themselves with the plainest & best kind of speech, must seeke from time to time such words as are commonlie receiued, and such as properly may expresse in plaine manner, the whole conceit of their mind. And looke what words wee best vnderstand, and know what they meane, the same should soonest be spoken, and first applied, to the vttrance of our purpose.

Throughout his preface, Cawdrey set up a number of dichotomies including outlandish English versus mothers tongue, over-sea language versus Kings English, learned English
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116 Cawdrey, ibid., 3.
117 Cawdrey, ibid., 7.
118 Cawdrey, ibid., 5.
119 Cawdrey, ibid., 6-7.
versus rude English, and court talk versus country speech. His position in the inkhorn debate is indicated by the unacknowledged citation of Wilson’s *Arte of Rhetorique*. Cawdrey thus admonished those who speak publicly to:

… neuer affect any strange ynckhorne termes, but labour to speake so as is commonly receiued, and so as the most ignorant may well vnderstand them: neyther seeking to be ouer fine or curious, nor yet liuing ouer carelesse, vsing their speech, as most men doe, & ordering their wits, as the fewest haue done.\(^\text{120}\)

He warned against incorporating foreign loanwords, claiming (in Wilson’s words) that such borrowing was transforming the English language beyond recognition:

Some men seek so far for outlandish English, that they forget altogether their mothers language, so that if some of their mothers were aliue, they were not able to tell, or vnderstand what they say, and yet these fine English Clearks, will say they speak in their mother tongue; but one might well charge them, for counterfeyting the Kings English.\(^\text{121}\)

Such borrowing was only made worse by noblemens’ penchant for educational travel abroad, and Cawdrey once more singles out French borrowings, again citing Wilson’s *Arte of Rhetorique*:

some far iournied gentlemen, at their returne home, like as they loue to go in forraigne apparrell, so they will pouder their talke with ouer-sea language. He that commeth lately out of France, will talk French English, and neuer blush at the matter.\(^\text{122}\)

The link between fashion, cosmetics and words is underlined through the comparison of the love of foreign words with the love of foreign clothes and the image of speech ‘powdered’ with over-sea language.

5.2 John Bullokar, *An English expositor* (1616)\(^\text{123}\)

Subsequent ‘hard word’ dictionaries continued to increase their number of word entries. The second monolingual dictionary was compiled by the physician John Bullokar, son of the

\(^{120}\) Cawdrey, ibid., 5.

\(^{121}\) Cawdrey, ibid., 5.

\(^{122}\) Cawdrey, ibid., 5-6.

\(^{123}\) Bullokar’s *An English expositor* was republished throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth century. New editions are found in 1616, 1621, 1641, 1654, 1656, 1663, 1667, 1671, 1676, 1680, 1684, 1688, 1695, 1698, 1707, 1713, 1719, 1726, 1731a, 1731b, 1744, 1750, 1766, 1769, 1775. Alston, *A bibliography of the English language, Volume 5: The English dictionary*, 3-5.
linguist Wiliam Bullokar. John Bullokar’s *An English Expositor* (1616), like Cawdrey’s *Table alphabeticall*, aimed at ‘teaching the interpretation of the hardest words us’d in our Language’. It expanded upon both the number of word entries (4,249) and the length of definitions, incorporating information about orthography, meaning and occasionally field of discourse. His title page read as follows:

**AN ENGLISH EXPOSITOR: Teaching the interpretations of the hardest words us’d in our Language. With Svndry Explications, Descriptions, and Discourses. By I. B. Doctor of Physicke.**

His dictionary title drew on an Anglo-Norman, old French loanword with his dictionary defining ‘Expositour’ as ‘An expounder or interpreter’. Again, the majority of explicated words were from the classical languages or French.

In his address ‘To the Courteous Reader’, Bullokar drew attention to the many years his dictionary had taken to compile due to the ‘great store’ of foreign borrowings in the English language:

… this I will say (and say truely) in my yonger yeares it hath cost mee some obseruation, reading, study, and charge; which you may easily beleeue, considering the great store of strange words, our speech doth borrow, not only from the Latine, and Greeke, (and some from the ancient Hebrew) but also from forraine vulgar Languages round about vs…

Unlike Cawdrey, his aim was not to discourage the use of these words, but through his dictionary to ‘open the signification of such words, to the capacitie of the ignorant, whereby they may conceiue and vse them as well as those which haue bestowed long study in the languages’. This he argued was necessary, for not only was it ‘familiar among best writers to vsurpe strange words’, but that he ‘suppose[d] withall their desire is that they should also be understood’. Nor was he entirely disparaging of the ‘hard’ words upon which his dictionary was based. This foreign borrowing by authors, he noted, was in fact ‘sometime
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necessary by reason our speech is not sufficiently furnished with apt termes to expresse all meanings’.\(^{130}\) Like Cawdrey before him, Bullokar dedicated his work to a female readership of ‘greatest Ladies and studious Gentlewomen’. Besides strange (foreign) words, his dictionary also included ‘sundry olde words now growne out of vs, and diuers termes of art, proper to the learned in Logiche, Philosophy, Law, Physicke, Astronomie, &c. yea, and Diuinitie it selfe, best knowne to the seuerall professors thereof.’ The old words ‘onely vsed of some ancient writers, and now growne out of vse’ would be marked in his dictionary by an asterisk *.\(^{131}\)

5.3 Henry Cockeram, *The English Dictionarie* (1623)\(^ {132}\)

While certain dictionaries criticised this new foreign vocabulary or merely sought to elucidate it, others contributed to its dissemination. In the preface to his *The English Dictionarie, or an Interpreter of Hard English Words* (1623), Henry Cockeram promoted the use of these ‘hard words’ which he considered ‘the choisest words themselues in vse, wherewith our language is inriched and become so copious’.\(^{133}\) The full title of the Cockeram’s dictionary was:

THE ENGLISH DICTIONARIE: OR, AN INTERPRETER of hard English Words. Enabling as well Ladies and Gentlemens, young Schollers, Clarcks, Merchants, as also Strangers of any Nation to the vnderstanding of the more difficult Authors already printed in our Language, and the more speedy attaining of an elegant perfection of the English tongue, both in reading, speaking and writing. Being a Collection of some thousands of words, neuer published by any heretofore.

On the title page of the first edition of his dictionary, Cockeram acknowledged his debt to both Cawdrey and Bullokar, but his work also drew heavily on Thomas Thomas’s 1587 Latin-English dictionary and John Rider’s *Bibliotheca Scholastica*.\(^{134}\) He remarked on the praiseworthy nature of the earlier lexicographer’s labours, but maintained the necessity of his own work, claiming that ‘what any before me in this kinde haue begun, I haue not onely fully
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\(^{130}\) Bullokar, ibid., 6-7.

\(^{131}\) Bullokar, ibid., 6, 8.

\(^{132}\) Cockeram’s *The English dictionarie* was republished a number of times over the next fifty years, New reissues and editions were published in 1623a, 1623b, 1626, 1631, 1632, 1637a, 1637b, 1639, 1642, 1647, 1650, 1651, 1655, 1658, 1661, 1670. Stein, ‘Chronological list of dictionaries with their editions and locations’ in Starnes and Noyes, *The English dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson*, ed. Stein, (1991), xxii-xxvi.


\(^{134}\) Two editions of the dictionary were published in 1623. The first of these contained the acknowledgement ‘Being a Collection of the choisest words contained in the Table Alphabeticall and English Expositor, and of some thousands of words, neuer published by any heretofore.’ The second 1623 and all subsequent editions no longer referenced Cawdrey or Bullokar’s works. For the sources of Cockeram’s *The English Dictionarie* see Starnes and Noyes, *The English dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson, 1604-1755*, new edition by Gabriele Stein, 26-36.
finished, but thoroughly perfected.135 By anglicising Thomas and Rider’s Latin entries, as well as providing ornate ‘translations’ for common words (‘To Babble: Deblaterate, Babling, Loquacity, Verbosity, love of Babling: Phylologie’), Nevalainen argues, Cockeram introduced a large number of inkhorn terms into English.136 Of the 3,413 neologisms that the CED (Chronological English Dictionary) cites from the period 1610 to 1624, twenty-five percent are attributed to dictionary sources of which Cockeram provided a great number.137

While the first book of Cockeram’s dictionary is dedicated to the ‘choisest words’, the second contains the ‘vulgar words’, which he would provide the means to express by ‘a more refined and elegant speech’. In this second book, Cockeram notes, he had inserted:

>... euen the mocke-words which are ridiculously vsed in our language, that those who desire a generality of knowledge may not bee ignorant of the sense, euen of the fustian termes, vsed by too many who study rather to bee heard speake, than to vnderstand themselues.138

He recommends his work especially to ‘Ladies and Gentlewomen, Clarke, Merchants, young Schollers, Strangers, Trauellers, and all such as desire to know the plenty of the English’139, and by doing so aligns himself with Elyot and Pettie in the belief that lexical borrowings into English only added to its copiousness.

Of note in Cockeram’s The English Dictionarie are the numerous liminary verses in the outside matter of his dictionary, written by fellow Jacobean authors such as John Ford and John Webster.140 Addressing his ‘industrious friend, the Author of this English Dictionarie’, John Ford comments on the new and strange words appearing in this age of eloquence, and on the beneficial nature of Cockeram’s dictionary:

> (Now in these daies of Eloquence) such change
  Let Gallants therefore skip no more from hence
  To Italie, France, Spaine, and with expence
  Waste time and faire estates, to learne new fashions
  Of complemetall phrases, smooth temptations
  To glorious beggary : Here let them hand
  This Book; here studie, reade, and vnderstand :

135 ‘A premonition from the Author to the Reader’ in Cockeram, The English Dictionarie (1623), 5-6.
137 Nevalainen drawing on Wermser’s statistical studies on the development of the English vocabulary in Nevalainen, ibid., 346.
139 Cockeram, ibid., 7.
Then shall they finde varietie at Home,  
As curious as at Paris, or at Rome.141

There was no need to travel abroad to seek foreign phrases, when a copious variety of words could be gleaned from Cockeram’s text. Cockeram’s goal of explicating complicated words was praised in the verses by Thomas Spicer and Bartholomew Hore, both of whom emphasise the ‘far(re) fetch’d’ (‘brought from far’) origins of many of Cockeram’s selected words:

Hard words far fetch’d, made smooth, before being rough,  
Claime fauour for requitall, that’s enough.142 [Thomas Spicer]

If things farre fetch’d are dearest most esteem’d, /which by times sweatful houres haue been redeem’d, / Of what count’s this, of which sort like was neuer, / Praise it of force you must, and loue him euer.143 [Bartholomew Hore]

The verses by John Day and John Crugge both praised the elegance and style that Cockeram promoted through his dictionary. While Day signals a move from barbarousness to style, from mould to gold and from rough speech to a perfect language, Crugge concludes his verses with the recognition of how much variety adds to elocution:

for thy rare Art / Hath taught vs all good language: a rude pile / Of barbarous sillables into a stile / Gentle and smooth thou hast reduc’t: pure gold / Thou hast extracted out of worthlesse mould. / And that no one may thinke thy merit weake, / Of a rough speech th’ast taught vs all to speake / A perfect language.144 [John Day]

But where a language hath variety, / And euery word a reall property, / How much it adds to elocution, / As doe but reade this Booke, then thinke vpon / The Authors painses and praise, giue him respect / For this addition to our Dialect.145 [John Crugge]

While Cawdrey cited the criticisms against loanwords espoused by purists like Thomas Wilson, Cockeram and his friends focused on the loanwords’ contribution to the variety, copiousness and elegance of the English language emphasised by neologisers like Elyot. Early modern dictionary authors thus found themselves expressing both sides of the arguments that had coloured the previous century’s inkhorn debate.
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141 John Ford, ‘To my industrious freind, the Author of this English Dictionarie, Mr. Henry Cockram of Exeter’ in Cockeram, *The English Dictionarie* (1623), 10.
144 John Day, ‘To my very good friend, Master Cokeram, Author of this worke’ in Cockeram, *The English Dictionarie* (1623), 12.
5.4 Thomas Blount, Glossographia or a Dictionary (1656)\textsuperscript{146}

During the tumults of the Puritan revolution, Tetsuro Hayashi argues, lexicographical production was scarce.\textsuperscript{147} The first new substantial lexicographical work was therefore Thomas Blount’s *Glossographia or a Dictionary* (1656). Aiming to interpret hard words like his predecessors, Blount also endeavoured to explicate the terms of several ‘Arts and Sciences’ and provide etymologies, definitions and historical observations for such words. *Glossographia or a Dictionary* was, as such, the first etymological dictionary. Blount’s title page read as follows:

GLOSSOGRAPHIA OR A DICTIONARY, Interpreting all such Hard Words, Whether Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, French, Teutonick, Belgick, British or Saxon, as are now used in our refined English Tongue. Also the Terms of Divinity, Law, Physick, Mathematicks, Heraldry, Anatomy, War, Musick, Architecture; and of several other Arts and Sciences Explicated. With Etymologies, Definitions, and Historical Observations on the same. Very useful for all such as desire to understand what they read.

His title page indicates the foreign origin of such hard words and emphasises their use in a ‘refined’ English tongue. His dictionary defines ‘Glossographer (glossographus)’ as ‘he that interprets strange words’.\textsuperscript{148}

Blount justifies the need for his dictionary by the fact that despite being well-read in the ‘best English Histories and Authors’ and having a reasonable knowledge of Latin and French and a smattering of other languages:

I was often gravelled in English Books; that is, I encountred such words, as I either not at all, or not thorougly understood, more then what the preceding sence did insinuate.\textsuperscript{149}

Citing Seneca, Blount argues that this ‘new world of words’ was indicative of a situation in which language was changing radically and novelty was encouraged:

whatever is usual is disdained: They [men’s minds] affect novelty in speech, they recall oreworn and uncouth words, they forge new phrases, and that which is newest is best liked; there is presumptuous, and far fetching of words.\textsuperscript{150}

\textsuperscript{146} Editions of Blount’s *Glossographia or a dictionary* were published in 1656, 1659, 1661, 1670, 1674 and 1681. Alston, *A bibliography of the English language, Volume 5: The English dictionary*, 8-9.


\textsuperscript{149} ‘To the reader’ in Blount, *Glossographia or a dictionary*, 3.
Such novelty made it crucial to have a dictionary to help understand ordinary English books, and having found nothing satisfactory pre-existing, he had determined to compile his dictionary, which had taken him more than twenty years to complete. In addition to an explanation of hard foreign words, his dictionary included words of law (‘many of the most useful Law-Terms’), of anatomy (‘the several parts of man’s body’), of diseases (‘the names and qualities of at least ordinary Diseases’), of the sciences (‘Logick, Astrology, Geometry, Musick, Architecture, Navigation, &c’) and of the arts and exercise (as Printing, Painting, Jewelling, Riding, Hunting, Hawking, &c). While all Latin words (‘used without alteration in English’) are explicated, he made a distinct point of leaving out Saxon words:

I have likewise in a great measure, shun’d the old Saxon Words; as finding them growing every day more obsolete then other.151

Blount’s dictionary was not intended for scholars or the very learned, but rather ‘for the more-knowing Women, and less-knowing Men; or indeed for all such of the unlearned, who can but finde in an Alphabet, the word they understand not.’152 To facilitate the understanding of such words, he advises his readers to learn the numbers in Greek and Latin and the particles used in word ‘compositions’ (such as monos, pseudos, hemi, circum etc.). Similarly in comprehending the nature and difference of verbs, nouns, particles and so forth, the learning of one root might allow them to understand all the derivatives. His book would thereby prove useful to ‘Such as neither understand Greek nor Latin’, who

may, with a little pains, and the help of this Book, know the meaning of the greatest part of such words as we now use in English, and are derived from either of those Languages, which are many.153

Blount showed great concern that he should not be thought a neologiser of words, and took care to indicate several times how much his dictionary was indebted to authorities who came before him:

To compile and compleat a Work of this nature and importance, would necessarily require an Encyclopedie of knowledge, and the concurrence of many learned Heads; yet. that I may a little secure the Reader from a just apprehension of my

150 Blount, ibid., 5.  
151 Blount, ibid., 6.  
152 He does note, however, that his work might still be of use to such scholars: ‘yet I think I may modestly say, the best of Schollers may in some part or other be obliged by it. For he that is a good Hebrician, Grecian, and Latinist, perhaps may be to seek in the Italian, French, or Spanish; or if he be skil’d in all these, he may here finde some Words, Terms of Art, or Notions, that have no dependence upon any of those Languages.’, Blount, ibid., 10.  
153 Blount, ibid., 10.
disability for so great an Undertaking, I profess to have done little with my own Pencil; but have extracted the quintessence of Scapula, Minshew, Cotgrave, Rider, Florio, Thomasius, Dasipodius, and Hexams Dutch, Mr. Davies Welsh Dictionary, Cowels Interpreter, &c. and other able Authors, for so much as tended to my purpose; and hope I have taken nothing upon trust, which is not authentick.154

Likewise when defining terms, he notes that he had drawn on a great number of recognised authors who, through their penmanship, had naturalised and familiarised foreign borrowings:

Witness the learned Works of the Lord Bacon, Mr. Montagu, Sir Kenelm Digby, Sir Henry Wotton, Mr. Selden, Mr. Sands, Dr. Brown, Dr Charlton, Dr. Heylyn, Mr. Howel &c. Wherein such words are used more or less: To many of which I have added the Authors names, that I might not be thought to be the innovator of them.155

Blount acknowledges the changing nature of languages, citing Horace’s image of words as leaves with ‘their buddings, their blossomings, their ripenings, and their fallings’.156 He personified the English tongue, drawing on the image of words as clothing:

… our English Tongue daily changes habit; every fantastical Traveller, and homebred Sciolist157 being at liberty, as to antiquate, and decry the old, so to coyn and innovate new Words

It is a metaphor which Blount elaborates further when citing Denham’s preface to The destruction of Troy:

As Speech is the Apparel of our Thoughts, so are there certain Garbs and Modes of speaking, which vary with the times; the fashion of our Clothes not being more subject to Alteration, then that of our Speech.159

To the objection that such changes in language meant that his ‘labor would find no end’ and that his dictionary would soon be outdated, Blount retorts that even the Latin language had gone through changes, and that any omissions could be rectified in future reprints of his dictionary:

Thus we see our Latin Dictionaries seldom or never Reprinted, without some Additions, Corrections, or Denotations of obsolete Words: So when any considerable supplement of new English Words have legally pass’d the Mint and

154 Blount, ibid., 9-10.
155 Blount, ibid., 8.
156 Blount, ibid., 7.
157 ‘Sciolist’ defined as ‘a smatterer in any knowledge, one that fancies himself to be a wit, and to know more, then indeed he doth.’ Blount, Glossographia or a dictionary (1656) in Lexicons of Early Modern English. Date consulted: 13 April 2016. URL: leme.library.utoronto.ca/lexicon/entry.cfm?ent=478-8543
158 ‘To the reader’ in Blount, Glossographia or a dictionary, 7.
159 Blount, ibid., 9.
Test of our Vertuosi, the same liberty may be allowed this Work; not derogating at all from the use of it in the interim.  

The extent of the ‘new world of Words’ is illustrated in Blount’s prefatory epistle, in which he proceeds over two pages to list examples of such words he has encountered in various books, from national histories to works of divinity. Of note is the large proportion of these that he later indicates to be of French origin in his dictionary. He thus lists having encountered during his readings:

In the French History, the Salique Law, Appennages, Vidams, Daulphin, &c. [...] In every Mercurius, Coranto, Gazet or Diurnal, I met with [...] Brigades, Squadrons, Carassiers, Bonemines, Halts, Juncta’s, Paroles, &c. 

Foreign borrowings were not only to be found in such texts, but also ‘in the mouths of common people’, both in London and in the country. Indeed, he comments, ‘Nay, to that pass we are now arrived, that in London many of the Tradesmen have new Dialects’, giving as examples French-derived culinary terms:

The Cook askes you what Dishes you will have in your Bill of Fare; whether Olla’s, Bisques, Hachies, Omelets, Bouillon’s, Grilliades, Ioncades, Fricasses; with a Hautgoust, Ragoust, &c.

French-derived words from the sartorial domain:

The Taylor is ready to mode you into a Rochet, Mandillion, Gippen, Iustacor, Capouch, Hoqueton, or a Cloke of Drap de Bery, &c.

and French-derived sutorial expressions and terms of haberdashery:

The Shoo-maker will make you Boots, Whole Chase, Demi-Chase, or Bottines, &c. The Haberdasher is ready to furnish you with a Vigone, Codebec or Castor, &c.

The Semstress with a Crabbat, Toylet, &c.

He emphasises the importance of understanding terms of heraldry, most of which his dictionary indicated being of French origin:

I held it no less necessary for every Gentleman to be so far seen in Heraldry, as to know (at least) the most usual Terms; as when a Lyon or other Beast is said to be Dormant, Passant, Couchant, Saliant, Rampant, Seisant, &c. and what is meant by
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a Fesse, a Canton, a Bend, &c. that he may by consequence be able at least to blazon his own Coat.\textsuperscript{165}

While Blount claims that it was not his purpose ‘to become an Advocate for the use of such Words’, leaving it to the discretion of the reader to determine their quality, he still encourages the learning of their meanings:

> But certainly, at least to understand them, can be no unnecessary burden to the Intellect; since Knowledge is \textit{Animi pabulum}. And ‘tis Galen’s Axiom, Who ever is ignorant of words shall never judge well of things.\textsuperscript{166}

To the objection that the use of such words was not commendable, he answers that this is largely confuted:

> by our best modern Authors, who have both infinitely enriched and enobled our Language, by admitting and naturalizing thousands of foreign Words, providently brought home from the Greek, Roman, and French Oratories; which though, in the untravel’d ears of our Fathers, would have sounded harsh, yet a few late years have rendered them familiar even to vulgar capacities.\textsuperscript{167}

The positive nature of such loans is emphasised by Blount’s choice of vocabulary, with such loans being ‘provident’ and having ‘infinitely enriched and enobled our Language’.\textsuperscript{168} Of importance is the extent to which such words had been integrated and naturalised by these authors thus ‘commonly the words we borrow from other Languages, are a little altered from their Originals, to make them speak English’.\textsuperscript{169}

5.5 Edward Phillips, The New World of English Words (1658)\textsuperscript{170}

Not to be outdone by his predecessor, Edward Phillips expanded upon the Blount’s listing of terms and his dictionary included approximately 11,000 words.\textsuperscript{171} Drawing on Blount’s account of a ‘new world of words’, Phillips entitled his dictionary \textit{The new world of English words, or a general dictionary}. His full title page was an impressive:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{165} Blount, ibid., 6.
\item \textsuperscript{166} Blount, ibid., 8-9.
\item \textsuperscript{167} Blount, ibid., 11.
\item \textsuperscript{169} ‘To the reader’ in Blount, \textit{Glossographia or a dictionary}, 11.
\item \textsuperscript{170} Seven editions and re-issues of Phillips’ \textit{The new world of English words} were published in 1658, 1662, 1663, 1671, 1678, 1696, 1700, 1706 and 1720. Alston, \textit{A bibliography of the English language, Volume 5: The English dictionary}, 9-10.
\item \textsuperscript{171} Starnes and Noyes, \textit{English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson, 1604-1755}, ed. Stein (1991), 48.
\end{itemize}
Like earlier monolingual dictionaries, his title page advertises the interpretation of hard words and lists the languages such words are derived from. Like Blount in his *Glossographia*, Phillips announces that he will include the etymology and ‘perfect’ definitions for these hard words. Furthermore, he claims to have provided ‘all those Terms that relate to the Arts and Sciences’, rather than merely a selection, and to have included proper names and poetical, historical, mythological and geographical items, as well as ‘all other Subjects that are useful, and appertain to our English Language’.  

His prefatory matter numbered thirty folio pages and included two title pages, three epistolary addresses, an extensive eleven-page preface and an advertisement to the reader. Phillips starts his first prefatory epistle, addressed to the two sister universities of Oxford and Cambridge, by praising the English language, maintaining that

> it is a known truth, and not to be denied that our Language hath in these later Ages been advanced to the admiration, if not the emulation, of other Nations.

Such praise continues throughout his prefatory writings. Phillips thus speaks of the ‘beauties’ of the English language and the ‘Regalia of our Language’, arguing that reproaches against the English tongue were ‘unnatural’ and voiced by ‘petulant critics’. His dictionary had
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173 Epistolary address ‘To the most illustrious, and impartial sisters, the two universities’ in Phillips, *The new world of English words*, (1658), 7.
174 Phillips, ibid., 7.

Phillips’s first epistolary address is filled with grandiloquent language that vaunted not only the merits of the English tongue, but also the importance of the lexicographic enterprise: ‘An universally through-pac’t Dictionary’, Phillips commented:

may serve for an Interpreter or Arbiter of their [those of riper years] Studies and humane Transactions [...] as it doth in it selfe contain all those Idea’s that concern the Speech or Pen, such as are usefull to drive on and inforce with full vigour and strength, the affaires of mankind.176

‘A work thus rightly constituted’, he further maintained, ‘may be said in some kind, to approach near to a Divine Skill’. The proper compiling of a dictionary was necessarily an undertaking of ‘Grandeur’, which carried with it great responsibility and was filled with difficulties and dangers:

he that undertakes this Enterprize should first seriously perpend what difficulties he is to passe through, how dangerous it is for him to faile in such a Design, what a weight of disparagement he is likely to sink under.178

The successful lexicographer needed to demonstrate a necessary knowledge of languages, embark on the ‘Siftings, Anvelings, Traversings’ of the texts of reverend authors, ancient poets, renowned antiquaries and modern poets and playwrights, and commit to the ‘strictest search of most Dictionaries’. Such detailed readings were necessary so that the lexicographer might:

be able to distinguish the terms, several derivations, differences, definitions, interpretations, proper significations of the words of our Tongue, how borrowed, how mixed with others, how with its own.180

Writing of his own dictionary effort, Phillips hopes for ‘a favourable approbation of these labours’, especially if ‘those difficulties are rightly pondered that are to be waded through.’ 181

175 Phillips, ibid., 10.
176 Phillips, ibid., 8.
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He informs his readers that, the labours of one man being insufficient, his dictionary project had drawn assistance from a great number of ‘learned Gentlemen and Artists’, whose thirty-four names and respective domains of language are listed over the two pages following the title page. While he acknowledges in his second epistolary address to Robert Boles and Edward Hussy that ‘decency will not permit me to speak over-high of this Work wherewith I here present you’, he still goes on to affirm:

That Fame hath usher’d it [this work] into the World, with the attest of so many Worthy hands, that never yet in English any Piece came forth with happier Auspices; to which there could have been nothing wanting to Crown its fortune absolutely.\(^{182}\)

His dictionary had been ‘brought to such a perfection’ through years of work and was at last made public ‘for the general good’. He wished his patrons ‘all happinesse in thy necessary search and use of it.’\(^{183}\)

Phillips’s lengthy eleven-page preface starts with a discussion of the notions of ‘words’ and ‘things’, arguing that while the latter provided the ‘more solid and substantial part of Learning’, it was nothing without words, as ‘without Language […] things cannot well be expressed or published to the World’.\(^{184}\) He goes on to address concepts of language, speech, mother tongues and dialects.\(^{185}\) His advertisement to the reader on the importance of the proper knowledge of words, which provided justification for his dictionary, draws on Blount’s address to the reader and the ensuing poem by J. S.:

as Science is first derived to us by notions, so it is made known to us by words:
without our right knowledge of the later it is impossible for us but that in our discourse, writing, or reading, we must either be gravelled, or strangely to seek […] Hence it hath proceeded a Maxim from the Learned, That he that is ignorant of words, shall never have his minde rightly instated to judge of things.\(^{186}\)

In his preface, Phillips discusses not only the origins of English, but also considers the role of foreign borrowings at length:

\(^{181}\) Phillips, ibid., 9.

\(^{182}\) ‘To the truly Noble and Acomplisht Gentlemen, Sir Robert Bolles of Scampton, in the County of Lincoln, Baronet, and Edward Hussy of Cathorp, in the County of Lincoln, Esquire’ in Phillips, The new world of English words, (1658), 13.


\(^{185}\) For example: ‘a Dialect is but the self same Language, spoken in several Provinces of the same Nation, with some small difference’, Preface in Phillips The new world of English words, or a generall dictionary (1658), 16.

\(^{186}\) ‘A brief and familiar advertisement to the reader’ in Phillips, The new world of English words, (1658), 27.
my intention is […] to speak something in general of the Original of our English Tongue, of the basis or foundation of it, of the reason of its several changes, and how far it participates of other Languages, and of the peculiar Idiome or propriety thereof.187

To find the original and unchanged languages, he comments, one must go as far back as to ‘the confusion of Babel, which was the first nativity of Tongues’.188 Having noted that the ‘ancient Brittish language’ [Celtick] was the first language of the British Isles, he emphasises that the current English language originates from the invasion of the Saxons of Germany and ‘derives its Original from the Dutch or Teutonick’.189 This could be observed by the fact that ‘almost all the chief material words, and those which are oftnest used in the most familiar, and vulgar discourse, are all, either meer Dutch, or palpably derived from the Dutch.’190 This was the case with the names of natural things, animals and ‘vegetals’, appellatives, pronouns, kinship terms, numerals, particles and conjunctions.

Phillips acknowledged the large number of foreign borrowings and their transformative impact on the English language: ‘Our English tongue’, he reflects, ‘hath of late ages intertained so great a number of forraign words, that every age it seemeth to swerve more and more from what it was originally’.191 Such foreign words were depicted in a variety of ways, from an ‘Army of forraigne words’, to personified denizens, strangers and foreigners, to a constant stream breaking across the Saxon foundations of the English language:

the Saxon, or German tongue is the ground-work upon which our language is founded, the mighty stream of forraigne words that hath since Chaucers time broke in upon it, having not yet wash’t away the root: onely it lies somewhat obscur’d, and overshadow’d like a Rock, or Fountain overgrown with bushes.

Phillips frequently employs a rhetoric of conflict in his text. He speaks of ‘invading censurers’, but also of the commixture of a Language with ‘that of a bordering or invading Nation’.192 As an example he cites the Saxon invasion of the British island and its effects on the ‘ancient British Language’:

188 Phillips, ibid., 16.
189 Phillips, ibid., 17.
190 Phillips, ibid., 18.
191 On the early modern tendency to not distinguish between Dutch and Low German see Peter Burke, Toward a social history of early modern Dutch, (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006) and Christopher Joby, Dutch language in Britain (1550-1702): A social history of the use of Dutch in early modern Britain, Brill’s Studies in Language, Cognition and Culture, vol. 10, (Leiden: Brill, 2015).
192 Epistolary address ‘To the most illustrious and impartial twin sisters, the two universities’ and preface in Phillips, The new world of English words, (1658), 9, 16.
From this so total a subversion of the *Brittish* Empire by the *English-Saxons*, followed as total a subversion of the *Brittish* language, and even of the very name of *Brittain* (which from the ancient habitation of the *Saxons* near the *Baltick* Sea, was named *Anglia*, or *England*) [...] for it is observable that where the Conquerours over-power the former inhabitants in multitude, their language also by little and little prevails over that of the Countrey, otherwise it wastes and spends it self till it be in a manner utterly lost, like a small quantity of water thrown upon a heap of sand.193

The meeting of old and new words is elsewhere conceived of as a battle of words, where foreign loans are strangers and the Saxon words are old inhabitants:

Certainly as by an invasion of strangers, many of the old inhabitants must needs be either slain, or forced to fly the Land; so it happens in the introducing of strange words, the old ones in whose room they come must needs in time be forgotten, and grow obsolete.194

Ancient words and foreign words are often set up against each other. While the first is ‘the more essential’, the second is ‘the more remote’; while the former is the foundation, the latter is the superstructure.195

On several occasions Phillips avoids taking a stance on whether foreign borrowings were to be considered favourable or unfavourable, stating first:

Whether this innovation of words deprave, or inrich our English tongue is a consideration that admits of various censures, according to the different fancies of men.196

And further on:

now whether they add, or take from the ornament of it, it is rather to be referr’d to sence and fancy, then to be disputed by arguments.197

Despite such statements, his preface presents a largely favourable view of such borrowings, especially as regards Latinate and French loans, which he argues have since been adapted to the English tongue. Such borrowings were of a melodious nature that softened Teutonic harshness:

That they come for the most part from a language, as civil as the Nation wherein it was first spoken, I suppose is without controversy, and being of a soft and even sound, nothing savouring of harshnesse, or barbarisme, they must needs mollifie

194 Phillips, ibid., 18-19.
196 Phillips, ibid., 18.
197 Phillips, ibid., 19.
the tongue with which they incorporate, and to which, though of a different nature, they are made fit and adapted by long use; in fine, let a man compare the best English, now written, with that which was written three, or four ages ago, and if he be not a doater upon antiquity, he will judge ours much more smooth, and grateful to the ear.  

On multiple occasions French and Latin are associated in the text with ‘smoothness’, ‘a soft and even sound’, ‘mollification’, ‘more smooth and grateful to the ear’, ‘sweetening and smoothing’, ‘refin[ing]’, a ‘civil Nation’ and ‘civil Climates’. This is contrasted to the ‘harsh and rough accents’ and the ‘harshness, or barbarisme’ of the language of the Northern countries.

And if the change which is introduced by time, not onely not deprave, but, refine a Language, much more will the alteration that is made by the interspersion of forraign words, especially coming from the more southerly and civil Climates, conduce to the sweetning and smoothing of those harsh and rough accents which are peculiar to the most northerly Countries.

Phillips specifically singles out French borrowings in his preface. Speaking of the words that the English language have ‘made bold with’, he notes that there were ‘many from the French, as Desire, Deny, Command, Embellish, Embossement.’ Similarly, he signposts the abundant French terms employed in various arts, crafts and sciences:

In sundry of the Mathematical Arts, and the politer sort of Mechanicks, we have many words from the French and Italians, as in Architecture, and Fortification, Pilaster, Foliage, Cupulo, Parapet, &c. all our Terms of Heraldry, we have chiefly from the French, as Couchant, Saliant, Engrailled; and as also in Jewelling, Inlaying, Painting, as Carrat, Naif, Boscage, Affinage, Marquetry, &c.

In his description of foreign verb borrowings, he remarks on the numerous verbs that were acquired from Latin through the bias of French, or borrowed from the French language directly:

there are also sundry other Verbes that appear to have been most anciently received, and most inured to our language, which, belike, were had from the Latins at the second hand, we taking them from the French, as they from the Lat. as chiefly those that end in y or ie: for example, to significie, to glorifie, to mollifie, which we borrow from the French, signifier, glorifier, mollifier, and they from the Latin, significare, glorificare, mollificare; besides, those both Verbes, and Nouns which we borrow from the French meerly, as to refresh, to discourage, to

---
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Like Cockeram and Blount, the copiousness and variety provided by such foreign borrowings were emphasised by Phillips. Although he admitted that there may be some Latin words that could not be explained but by a periphrasis, there were others:

both French and Latin, that are match’t with Native words equally significant, equally in use among us, as with the French Denie, we parallel our gainsay, with the Latin resist our withstand, with Interiour, inward, and many more of this nature: So that by this means these forrainers instead of detracting ought from our tongue, add copiousnesse and varity to it.203

There is a strong authoritarian current in Phillips’s writings. The dictionary would inform young men of ‘their deficiencies of the right knowledge of words’, his preface is an introduction to ‘the Right Knowledge of our Language’, he speaks of ‘words that are of a right stamp’, and the necessity of teaching men ‘the right use’ of his Dictionary.204 His work has drawn on the expertise of ‘late Modern Authorizers of words’ so that readers should be ‘forewarned’ and made ‘beware of’ affected style and forced neologisms.205 Similarly, Phillips asserts that ‘men ought to fly all Pedantismes, and not rashly to use all words alike’ and cautions readers to avoid ‘grosse words’.206 His dictionary was one of the first to mark words as undesirable by use of the obelisk symbol207:

I do not deny indeed, but that there are many words in this book (though fewer then in other books of this kinde) which I would not recommend to any for the purity, or reputation of them, but this I had not done, but to please all humours, knowing that such kinde of words are written, & that the undistinguishing sort of Readers would take it very ill if they were not explained, but withall I have set my mark upon them, that he that studies a natural and unaffected stile, may take notice of them to beware of them, either in discourse, or writing.208

202 Phillips, ibid., 23.
204 Epistolary address ‘To the most illustrious and impartial twin sisters, the two universities’ and preface in Phillips, The new world of English words, (1658), 8, 15, 22, 25.
Phillips reserves his harshest criticism for obsolete words and expressions, which he considered as actionable as the excessive use of neologisms. He singles out Spencer’s writings as an example of such linguistic practice:

> for my part that which some attribute to Spencer as his greatest praise, namely his frequent use of obsolete expressions, I account the greatest blemish to his Poem, otherwise most excellent, it being an equal vice to adhere obstinately to old words, as fondly to affect new ones.\(^{209}\)

In contrast to earlier lexicographers, he claimed, he had taken care to avoid such obsolete terms in his own dictionary: ‘Indeed’, he maintained, ‘I have indeavoured to wave obsolete terms which some make it their businesse to pick up at any rate’.\(^{210}\) Should any improper terms have erroneously entered his dictionary unmarked by the obelisk, Phillips refers his readers to their judgement ‘of the harmony of words, and their musical cadence’ to discern them.\(^{211}\) He also warned against the use of ‘Mule-words propagated of a Latin Sire, and a Greek Dam’, referring with this to words created by a Latin prefix and a Greek suffix.\(^{212}\) This he considered a particularly blameworthy type of neologism, often created by the very dictionary authors who later endeavoured to explicate them:

> I have also met with some forged, as I shrewdly suspect, by such as undertook to explain them; so monstrously barbarous, and insufferable, that they are not worthy to be mentioned nor once thought on.\(^{213}\)

Within his prefatory texts Phillips draws on the language of purity and corruption. The English language, he maintains, had been ‘injured’, ‘vitiated’, and ‘corrupted’ by spurious and imperfect dictionary editions, which by their brevity had given the false impression of a lack in breadth in English vocabulary.\(^{214}\) Language had been ‘defaced’ by obsolete terms, it needed to be preserved from ‘barbarismes’ and ‘ruinous deformities of the times’.\(^{215}\) Words that were ‘natural, and ligitimate’ were contrasted to those that were ‘spurious, and forc’st’.\(^{216}\) Phillips underlines the merits of linguistic purity: The ancient authors who had written the best texts had done so ‘in the purest and most genuine Language’.\(^{217}\)

\(^{209}\) Phillips, ibid., 19.
\(^{212}\) Phillips, ibid., 21.
\(^{213}\) Phillips, ibid., 21-22.
\(^{214}\) Epistolary address ‘To the most illustrious, and impartial sisters, the two universities’ in Phillips, The new world of English words, (1658), 7.
\(^{215}\) Phillips, ibid., 9, 10.
\(^{217}\) Phillips, ibid., 15.
Phillips also refers frequently to concepts of country and nation: the works of ancient poets were ‘for the honour of our Nation’, the English language had been presented ‘in her native glories’, his endeavours advanced ‘the renown and glory of the Nation’.²¹⁸ His dictionary was for the benefit of both the English language and the English nation (‘in a designe so usefull to the Nation’²¹⁹), something he underlines in his first epistolary address to the twin universities:

I have already done my Country so much good service as to have stript away those obsolete termes that have defaced our language, not degrading too much from its primitive integrity, nor declining what with judgement I might insert.²²⁰

His preface extols the virtues of the English nation’s authors. Having praised such authors as Plato, Xenophon and Thucydides amongst the Greeks, and Livie [Livy], Cicero and Salust [Sallust] among the Latins for both their content and style, he vaunts the merits of England’s modern authors and their contribution to the refinements of the English language. English is compared favourably to other modern languages:

neither have there been wanting of our own Nation, especially in these later Ages, those, who are not onely justly esteemed to stand in competition with the best of the Ancients for the verity and soundnesse of their matter, but, have also refin’d our Language to that heighth, that, for elegance, for fluency, and happinesse of expression, I am perswaded it gives not place to any Modern Language, spoken in Europe; scarcely to the Latin and Greek themselves.²²¹

There is a distinct sense of ownership over the English language, which had naturalised foreign terms and made them their own.

Of … Latin words there are many (as also some of the French, and others before mentioned) that by long custome are so ingrafted, and naturaliz’d into our tongue, that now they are become free denizons, without any difference, or distinction between them and the Native words, and are familiarly understood by the common sort, and most unlearned of the people; as nature, fortune, member, intend, inform, invent, and the like, others there are which though frequently written, and used in common discourse by the politer sort, and infranchized at least, if not naturalized, are not yet so very trite as to be understood by all.²²²

²¹⁸ Epistolary address ‘To the most illustrious, and impartial sisters, the two universities’ and Preface in Phillips, The new world of English words, (1658), 8, 9, 25.
²²⁰ Epistolary address ‘To the most illustrious, and impartial sisters, the two universities’ in Phillips, The new world of English words, (1658), 10.
²²² Phillips, ibid., 20.
This vocabulary of naturalisation and insertion [‘ingrafted’, ‘naturaliz’d’, ‘free denizons’, ‘infranchized’] was accompanied by images of coinage and stamped approval: ‘the Learned do acknowledge them to be good Bullion stampt and well minted’.  

Though Phillips acknowledges the benefits of foreign borrowings, he argues that these had been appropriated into English, just as Blount had maintained that foreign borrowings had been made to ‘speak English’:

Certainly it is a higher prerogative for our Nations to have these foreign Languages as it were onely in the Landskip, that though we honour the smoothnesse of the French, the neatnesse of the Italian, the gravity of the Spaniard, yet still we remain so happy as to be our own Dictionary.

Foreign loans might play a beneficial role in adding variety and copiousness to the English language, but only in so far as they remained choice embellishments of a refined English tongue. While the reader should ‘seriously consider how our Language is inricht from forreign words, brought home to our doores, from the Greek, Latin, French Orators and Poets’, this should only lead to ‘more inlarged and proper respects to our own Native Laurels’. Foreign borrowings were no longer a result of foreign invasion and linguistic imposition, but rather of deliberate selection:

it is our happinesse that being a terror to other nations, we are now free from invaders that formerly altred our Language, otherwise our clothes should not be more varied then our Speech, as the tyranny of Strangers if it were possible would apparel our very thoughts.

With his reference to ‘clothes’ and ‘apparel’, Phillips ends his advertisement to the reader by engaging with the familiar trope of language as fashion that would soon feature prominently in future Restoration debates about foreign linguistic borrowing.

5.6 Elisha Coles, *An English dictionary* (1676)

Elisha Coles first published his English dictionary two years before the fourth edition of Phillip’s dictionary, and according to Starnes and Noyes, is heavily indebted to it. His dictionary claimed to explain the difficult words of the arts and sciences and to include many
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thousands more hard words than any previous dictionary, along with their etymology, all in a manner more comprehensive than before. His word list numbered 25,698 entries, which consisted of around 8,000 more than in Phillips’s fourth revised edition.228 Despite the expansive number of word entries, Coles’s dictionary was published as a small octavo format with three columns per page and substantially shortened definitions. The full title of Coles’s first edition ran as follows:

An English Dictionary EXPLAINING The difficult Terms that are used in Divinity, Husbandry, Physick, Phylosophy, Law, Naviagation, Mathematicks, and other Arts and Sciences. CONTAINING Many Thousands of Hard Words (and proper names of Places) more than in any other English Dictionary or Expositor. TOGETHER WITH The Etymological Derivation of them from their proper Fountains, whether Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, or any other Language. In a Method more comprehensive, than any that is extant. By E. Coles, School-Master and Teacher of the Tongue to Foreigners.

Coles starts his prefatory epistle ‘To the Reader’ with claim that the various climates of the world have influenced the natures of the inhabitants and that their ‘speeches bear some proportion of Analogy with their Natures.’229 As the moderate climate of England had tempered both its people and their language, any excess in either of these ‘must be attributed to the accession of something Foreign’ and ‘our changes are all professedly owing the Conquests, especially of Sax and Normandy’.230 While the Saxon conquest had by far a greater impact (thus explaining the Teutonic nature of the English language), he claimed, the last was of more concern:

Thought its first irruption was not a violent Inundation, yet it forced us to such a Communication with France, that our Genius is wrought into some resemblance of theirs: and (to imitate them) we bring home fashions terms and phrases from every Nation and Language under Heaven.

This forced communication with France had lead to the consequent imitation of ‘Fashions, Terms, and Phrases’. Coles therefore presents his dictionary as a necessary interpreter to avoid Englishmen filling each other ‘with Confusion and Barbarity’.231

229 Thus ‘The Spanish and the Spaniard are Grave, the Italian and th’ Italians Amourous, the Dutch as boisterous as the Germans, and the French as light as they themselves are.’ ‘To the reader’ in Coles, An English dictionary (1676), n.p.
230 Coles, An English dictionary (1676), n.p.
5.7 *Gazophylacium Anglicanum, or English treasury* (1689)\(^{232}\)

The last dictionary to be published before the end of the seventeenth century was the anonymous *Gazophylacium Anglicanum, or English treasury* (1689), which was an abridged translation of Stephen Skinner’s etymological dictionary *Etymologicon Linguae Anglicanae* (1671).\(^{233}\) It has been variably attributed to both Richard Hogarth and to Skinner. Its title page announced its aim to discover the origins and ‘prime fountains’ of the English mother tongue.

Gazophylacium Anglicanum: CONTAINING THE DERIVATION OF English Words, PROPER and COMMON; Each in an Alphabet distinct: Proving the Dutch and Saxon to be the prime Fountains. And likewise giving the Similar Words in most European Languages, whereby any of them may be indifferently well Learned, and Understood. Fitted to the Capacity of the English Reader, that may be curious to know the Original of his Mother-tongue.

In the preface, the author reflects on the corruption of the English language brought on by conquest, travel and commerce. His aim was to search into ‘the Original of my native language’:

which is so strangely corrupted through Time, that when I look’d an hundred, or an hundred and fifty Years only behind me, I could scarce imagine it ever to have been the Language of my Ancestors, or even of the Country I was born in, ‘tis so chang’d through Commerce, Correspondence, Travellers, and such like Accidents.\(^{234}\)

5.8 John Kersey, *A New English Dictionary* (1702)\(^{235}\)

John Kersey published his dictionary under the initials J.K.

A NEW English Dictionary: Or, a Compleat: COLLECTION Of the Most Proper and Significant Words, Commonly used in the LANGUAGE; With a Short and Clear Exposition of Difficult Words and Terms of Art. The whole digested into Alphabetical Order; and chiefly designed for the benefit of Young Scholars, Tradesmen, Artificers, and the Female Sex, who would learn to spell truely; being so fitted to every Capacity, that it may be a continual help to all that want an Instructer.

---


\(^{233}\) Considine, ‘Elisha Coles in context’, 47.

\(^{234}\) *Gazophylacium Anglicanum, or English treasury* (1689), 4.

In his preface, Kersey specifically signalled that he would be focusing on English words and omitting words of a barbarous or foreign nature:

For that purpose, we have taken care to make a Collection of all the most proper and significant English Words, that are now commonly us’d either in Speech, or in the familiar way of Writing Letters, &c; omitting at the same time, such as are obsolete, barbarous, foreign or peculiar to the several Counties of England; as also many difficult, abstruse and uncouth Terms of Art, as altogether unnecessary, nay even prejudicial to the endeavours of young Beginners, and unlearned Persons, and whereof seldom any use does occur.\(^{236}\)

He identifies Bullokar’s and Coles’s dictionaries as being the closest in design to his dictionary compilation. While noting that Bullokar’s *An English expositor* was ‘defective in several respects’, his main criticisms are of Coles’s *English dictionary*, which he devotes the next four pages to criticising. Indeed Cole’s inclusion of certain French words and phrases irked his fellow lexicographer, whose dictionary, he maintained ‘is intended only to explain such English Words as are genuine, and used by Persons of clear Judgement and good Style; leaving out all those foreign Terms, that in Mr. Cole’s time were viciously introduc’d into our Language, by those who sought to approve themselves Learned rather by unintelligible Words than by proper Language.’\(^{237}\)

5.9 Nathan Bailey, *The Universal Etymological English Dictionary (3\(^{rd}\) edition, 1737)\(^{238}\)

The Universal Etymological English Dictionary: CONTAINING An Additional Collection of Words (not in the first Volume) with their Explications and Etymologies from the Ancient British, Teutonick, Dutch, Saxon, Danish, French, Italian, Spanish, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, &c. each in its proper Character. ALSO An Explication of hard and technical Words, or Terms, in all ARTS and SCIENCES; with ACCENTS directing to their proper Pronunciation, shewing both the Orthography and Orthoepia of the English Tongue. Illustrated with above Five Hundred CUTS, giving a clearer Idea of those Figures, not so well apprehended by verbal Description. LIKewise A Collection and Explanation of WORDS and PHRASES us’d in our ancient Charters, Statutes, Writs, Old Records and Processes at Law. ALSO The Theogony, Theology, and Mythology of the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, &c. being an Account of their Deities, Solemnities, Divinations, Auguries, Oracles, Hieroglyphicks, and many other curious Matters, necessary to be understood, especially by the Readers of English POETRY. To which is added, An additional Collection of proper Names of Persons and Places in


\(^{237}\) J. K., ibid., 6.

\(^{238}\) Twenty-eight editions and re-issues of Bailey’s *An universal etymological English dictionary* were published in 1721, 1724, 1726, 1728, 1731, 1733, 1735, 1737, 1740, 1742, 1745, 1747, 1749, 1751, 1753, 1755, 1757, 1759, 1761, 1763, 1764, 1766, 1770, 1773, 1775, 1776, 1782, 1783, 1789, 1790, 1794 and 1800. Alston, *A bibliography of the English language, Volume 5: The English dictionary*, 16-22.
Great Britain, & with their Etymologies and Explications. The Whole digested into an Alphabetical Order, not only for the Information of the Ignorant, but the Entertainment of the Curious; and also the Benefit of Artificers, Tradesmen, Young Students and Foreigners. A WORK useful for such as would UNDERSTAND what they READ and HEAR, SPEAK what they MEAN, and WRITE true ENGLISH.

Bailey starts his dictionary preface by discussing how the English language was comprised of a number of ancient Languages, such as British, (Welsh) Saxon, Danish, Norman and modern French, Latin and Greek. Having discussed the Anglo-Saxon influenced he proceeded to note the Norman attempts to eradicate

To them succeeded the Normans, who industriously laboured to eradicate the Saxon Language, and establish the French in its Stead and by this Means, the present common Speech of England is for the greatest part of a Saxon and French Original.239

He noted the role that trade had played in the introduction of foreigns word and that ‘by Commerce and Converse, introduced many Words from the French, Danes, Germans, Italians, &c.’240 This introduction of foreign words, he argues, has enriched the English language and meant that it could in fact be favourably compared to the French:

By this Coalition of Languages, and by the daily Custom of Writers to introduce any emphatical and Significant Words, that by Travels or Acquaintance with foreign Languages they find, has so enriched the English Tongue, that it is become the mod copious in Europe; and I may (I believe) venture to say in the whole World: So that we scarce want a proper Word to express any Thing or Idea, without a Periphrasis, as the French, &c. are frequently obliged to do, by reason of the scantiness of their Copia Verborum.241

His preface praised both the ‘Copiousness of the English Tongue’ and the ‘Genius of the English Tongue’.242

---
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5.10 Samuel Johnson, *A dictionary of the English language* (1755)\(^{243}\)

Perhaps the best-known dictionary of early modern England, Samuel Johnson’s dictionary was first published in 1755. Its first title page read as follows:

A Dictionary Of The English Language; In Which The Words are deduced from their Originals, And Illustrated in their Different Significations By Examples from the best Writers. To Which Are Prefixed, A History of the Language, And An English Grammar.

Samuel Johnson was particularly critical of the incorporation of ‘Gallicisms’ into the English language, both in terms of vocabulary and phraseology. In the *Preface* to the first edition of his *A dictionary of the English language* (1755) he warned that

our language, for almost a century, has, by the concurrence of many causes, been … deviating towards a Gallick structure and phraseology, from which it ought to be our endeavour to recal it, by making our ancient volumes the ground-work of stile….\(^{244}\)

Under the spell of what Charles Barber (1997) terms ‘the classical fallacy’, Johnson desired a return to a purer English of earlier times, an English ‘undefiled’ by foreign loanwords and phrases. In compiling his dictionary, he had thus

studiously endeavoured to collect examples and authorities from the writers before the restoration, whose works I regard as the wells of English undefiled, as the pure sources of genuine diction.\(^{245}\)

He would therefore be extremely selective as to the inclusion of what he considered newer additions to the English vocabulary,

admitting among the additions of later times, only such as may supply real deficiencies, such as are readily adopted by the genius of our tongue, and incorporate easily with our native idioms.\(^{246}\)

Any other loanwords ‘which our authours have introduced by their knowledge of foreign languages, or ignorance of their own, by vanity or wantonness, by compliance with fashion, or lust of innovation’, in a spirit of inclusiveness, he would still register ‘though commonly

---

\(^{243}\) Johnson’s dictionary was published in multiple editions and formats, including abridged editions. Alston lists seven, eight, eleven and twelve different editions in folio, quarto, octavo and miniature formats, respectively, published between the years 1755 (1st folio edition) and 1800 (12th miniature edition). Folio editions were published in 1755, 1755-56, 1765, 1773, 1784, 1785 and 1786. Alston, *A bibliography of the English language*, Volume 5: The English dictionary, 30-33.

\(^{244}\) Johnson, Preface to *A dictionary of the English language* (1755). URL: http://johnsonsdictionaryonline.com/

\(^{245}\) Johnson, ibid.

\(^{246}\) Johnson, ibid.
only to censure them’. He was the first lexicographer to use labels to highlight abuses of language, of which he considered there were four: French influence, high society, low society and commerce. According to Geoffrey Hughes, Johnson acted out his hostility to French terms by excluding several of them from his dictionary. He indicates these words alongside their first OED citation:

corsage, sou, bourgeois, esprit, unique, spa, hauteur, concierge, façade, champagne, faux pas, cortege, contretemps, picturesque, casserole, cutlet, meringue, envelope, riposte, debris, clique, beau monde, reconnaître, bouquet, roulette, vampire and coterie.

Johnson drew on the imagery of transformation, in which French words were depicted as displacing rather than enriching the English language. Words were personified as citizens of the state, leaving Johnson to ‘warn others against the folly of naturalizing useless foreigners to the injury of the natives’ just as the French Du Bellay had declared in his Deffense that foreign words ‘seront en notre langue comme étranger dans une cité’. For Johnson the incorporation of foreign terms was often an illicit affair and the art of translation was one of the most insidious ways of corrupting the English language:

The great pest of speech is frequency of translation. No book was ever turned from one language into another, without imparting something of its native idiom; this is the most mischievous and comprehensive innovation; single words may enter by thousands, and the fabric of the tongue continue the same, but new phraseology changes much at once; it alters not the single stones of the building, but the order of the columns.

If a regulatory body equivalent to the Académie Française were to be formed (of which Johnson expressed no desire), they should take as task not the compilation of grammars and dictionaries (which might rival Johnson’s own), but rather

endeavour, with all their influence, to stop the licence of translatours, whose idleness and ignorance, if it be suffered to proceed, will reduce us to babble a dialect of France.
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6 Representations of French linguistic borrowing in the works of Restoration playwrights

Following the return of the English court from exile in 1660, theatres once more opened to the public. The Restoration court brought with it French courtly language and manners and, as Görlach points out, much of the criticism against loanwords in this period was specifically directed towards the affected use of French loanwords, inspired by the cultural influence of la grande nation and its ‘courtly language’. Such language was satirised in the works of Restoration playwrights. This chapter examines the caricatures of the effeminate Frenchified courtier with his pretentious jargon and affected persona that are found in a large number of Restoration plays. Section 6.1 considers the Frenchified fop as a staple figure of Restoration comedy while Section 6.2 examines the Frenchified fops of the following four Restoration plays: Howard’s The English Mounsieur (1663, 1674), Dryden’s Marriage à la Mode (1673), Wycherley’s Gentleman dancing-master (1673) and Etherege’s Man of Mode (1676).²⁵³

6.1 The staple figure of the Frenchified fop

The excesses of French affectation and effeminacy were most effectively captured in the staple figure of Restoration drama: the Englishman who, returning from abroad, reinvents himself as a Frenchified fop. In his epigram ‘On English Mounsieur’, published in 1616, Ben Jonson had already satirised Englishmen’s desire to emulate French fashions. Here Jonson ridicules the English Mounsieur who, despite never having travelled to France nor ever spoken a word of French himself, insists on dressing in the latest French fashion and imitating stereotypical French manners:

Would you beleeue, when you this Movnsievr see,
That his whole body should speak french, not he?
That so much skarfe of France, and hat, and fether,
And shoee, and tye, and garter should come hether,
And land on one, whose face durst neuer bee
Toward the sea, father then halfe-way tree?
That he, vntrauell’d, should be French so much,
As french-men in his companie, should seeme dutch?
Or had his father, when he did him get,
The french disease, with which he labours yet?
Or hung some Movnsievr picture on the wall,
By which his damme conceiu’d him clothes and all?
Or is it some french statue? No: ’T doth moue,
And stoupe, and cringe. O then, it needs must proue

²⁵³ Görlach, Introduction to early modern English, 168.
The new french-taylors motion, monthly made,
Daily to turne in PAVLS, and helpe the trade.254

His epigram draws on common early modern themes, playing on the double understanding of the French disease as the coveting of all things French, but also as the venereal disease syphilis, popularly attributed to French licentiousness. Donne’s first satire (ca. 1593) had made similar allusions. To one courtier’s praise that another ‘doth seem to be Perfect French, and Italian’, Donne quickly retorted ‘So is the pox’.255 Such language of disease, infection and corruption would also feature in debates surrounding the introduction of French loanwords into English throughout the early modern period. The term ‘Frenchified’ in A New Dictionary of the Terms Ancient and Modern of the Canting Crew (1699) was not only defined as ‘in the French Interest or Mode’, but was also taken to mean ‘Clapt or Poxt’, again drawing analogies between affecting French manners and being afflicted with the French disease.256 Jonson’s ‘On English Mounsieur’ was one of the first of many satirical depictions of the Frenchified fop, of which the following century would produce a great deal more. Though this particular English Monsieur was all the more ridiculous for having no French vocabulary, his successors would be satirised for having too much of it.

The term fop was long synonymous with fool. Early seventeenth-century lexicographers such as Bullokar (1616), Cawdrey (1617) and Cockeram (1623) all defined ‘Foppe’ as ‘a Foole’ and ‘Fopperie’ as ‘Foolishnesse’.257 Heilman, in his article on ‘Some fops and some versions of foppery’, enumerates the wide variety of characters referred to as fops in seventeenth-century drama. From these he infers two commonalities: first, that the use of the term fop always implied a judgment on a person’s inferior ‘mode of being’; and second, that the fop, while often reproachable, was never dangerous.258

From the Restoration onwards, however, the term fop took on a more specialised meaning associated with affectation and dandyism. The conspicuous vocabulary used to

---
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describe foppism during the Restoration (fop, coxcomb, foppish, foppery and the later addition in the 1690s of the term beau), Heilman argues, now also specifically referred to:

The hyper-fashionable man about town, attitudinizing and often more mannered than well-mannered, a coterie type, flourishing an ostentatious with-it-ness, is set off from the rather large and amorphous society of persons who are called stupid and silly because they are so, or are thought so.²⁵⁹

Such a change in specificity was recorded in subsequent early modern English dictionaries. In his *Universal etymological English dictionary* (1737), Nathan Bailey thus no longer retains the simple explanation of ‘fool’, but defines fop as:

a whimsical foolish empty fellow, one whose mind is totally taken up with modes and fashions and by the effeminateness of his behaviour, comes nearer to a woman than a man

and records foppish as meaning ‘vainly affected, fantastical in dress, speech, behaviour’.

His definitions epitomised the Restoration character of the Frenchified fop.

6.2 Frenchified fops in Restoration drama

The Frenchified fops represented on the Restoration stage not only promoted French customs and manners, but regularly and eagerly interspersed their (at times broken) English with French accents, words and phrases. One of the earliest examples of the Frenchified fop is Mr Frenchlove, the principal character in James Howard’s *The English mounsieur* (1663, 1674).²⁶¹ Feeling that he is at heart a Frenchman, Frenchlove complains both of his home nation being England and his birth to English parents. As such, Warneke argues, Frenchlove is the embodiment of ‘the culturally disloyal traveller’.²⁶²

Not only does Frenchlove criticise English food (‘the very sound of an English supper, takes away the stomach of a person that’s well bred’), English music (‘the scraping of English Fidlers’) English dress and English manners, but he also disparages English women. When Welbred offers him a location from which to enjoy the sight of English beauties, Frenchlove declines:

²⁵⁹ Heilman, ibid., 365.
²⁶¹ While first performed in 1663, the play was not published before 1674. Stedman, *Cultural exchange in seventeenth-century France and England*, (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2013), 129.
Sir, I thank you, but you must pardon me; if the memory of French Ladies be so fresh in me, that I doubt I shall hardly esteem the English women equal to them.  

This very vocal disparagement provides the impetus for one of the play’s main subplots, in which the widow Mrs Crafty, fearing being jilted by the play’s handsome rake Welbred, is determined to trick Frenchlove into marrying her. She thus decides to ‘affect the garb’ of a French woman, pay a visit to one of Frenchlove’s favourite French shops and denigrate all things English in an aim to garner his attention. Her ruse is successful as Frenchlove immediately identifies her as someone who ‘must be some person of Quality that has been in France, from her despising the English women’ and falls madly in love. The contrast between Frenchlove’s expectations and Mrs Crafty’s intentions is echoed throughout the play in a series of asides, as Mrs Crafty continues her endeavours to ‘snap wise Mr. Frenchlove in an English trap’.

The English mounsieur’s love of French manners and taste is taken to such lengths that Frenchlove even claims to have killed a fellow Englishman for defending English food:

Frenchlove: In short sir, I can only tell you that I had once a Dispute with a certain Person in this kind, who defended the English way of eating: whereupon I sent him a challenge, as any man that has been in France would have done, we fought, and I kill’d him, and where about d’e guess I hit him?

Vaine: I warrant you in the small guts.

French: I run him through his mistaken pallat, which made me think the hand of Justice guided my sword.

Throughout the play the title character professes his love for all things French, notably claiming to have an ear that can only follow French time.

Much of the comedy is physical, such as when Frenchlove in stage directions is said to ‘make[s] two or three ridiculous legs’, leaving Lady Wealthy to comment:

Look how he throws his legs as if he would fain be rid of them—what distance there is between ‘em—I believe there are not a pair of legs in the whole Town so great strangers one to another as his.

The difference between the Frenchman and the Englishman is thereby embodied through French extravagance and English demureness. Such physicality is also apparent in the play’s final scene, when Mrs Crafty, having managed to wed her rich Mr Frenchlove, is asked by her
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husband to demonstrate in dance ‘the difference of the French Movement’. As she acquiesces, Frenchlove is left with the horrific realisation that ‘Diabol, you Dance like an Englishwoman too’; a realization that is comically echoed in the ensuing stage directions that restate: ‘She Dances like an English woman too’.  

Frenchlove’s language is full of French words and expressions. His first sentence upon entering with his attending lackeys is a case in point:

*Frenchlove*: Hei Lacquies go to Le Fronys and bespeak for my supper a Pottage, a Frigacie, and some lardid Patridge, Attande vous.

*Lacquies*: Ovy Mon—

He intersperses his speech with French culinary, sutorial and sartorial terms, as well as a number of French interjections. Examples include: Attande vous, Curre ill Mont, Diabol!, eh bein

The familiar national characterisations are upheld within the comedy: thus Frenchlove rails against the English love of beef.

French loan-words are employed not only by Mr Frenchlove himself and Mrs Crafty in her attempts to seduce him, but also by the characters when describing him. When asked about Frenchlove’s composition since his travels, Comely retorts: ‘that he is absolutely composed of Frigaces and Essences.’ The characters praise Frenchlove to his face, only to ridicule him once he has departed. Lady Wealthy admires his Frenchified nature on their first meeting:

*Lady Wealthy*: Sir, you are come to run the hazard of English women falling in love with you, and that we are apt to do with persons so much Frenchified as your self

Then colludes with Wealthy to play sport with him:

*Lady Wealthy*: Mr. Welbred, I confess you are not worse Then your word in shewing us this Monsieur

*Mr Welbred*: Madam the reason why London is more pleasant to live in, Then the Countrey is because all sorts of fools come to it.

*Lady Wealthy*: Indeed I think this fellow not inferior to any kind of Ass, that ever yet I saw—pray let’s make good use of him.

---
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Their dialogue exemplifies the role that the Frenchified fop often played in Restoration comedy; generally duped by his fellow English protagonists, his use of French linguistic practices, both verbal and non-verbal, are not so much a matter of concern, as a cause of great amusement.

For John Dryden, the excessive incorporation of French loanwords and phrases was a corruption of the English language. In his *Defence of the Epilogue* (1672) he reproved: ‘For I cannot approve of their way of refining, who corrupt our English Idiom by mixing it too much with French: that is a Sophistication of Language, not an improvement of it: a turning English into French, rather than a refining of English by French.’ Like the French humanist Henri Estienne had previously ridiculed French courtiers’ use of Italianisms to demonstrate worldliness, Dryden satirised the deliberate and ostentatious incorporation of French terms in his plays. For him such use was indicative of linguistic ignorance: ‘We meet daily with those Fopps, who value themselves on their Travelling, and pretend they cannot express their meaning in English, because they would put off to us some French Phrase of the last Edition: without considering that, for ought they know, we have a better of our own’. Like many before him, he underlined the ‘masculine vigour’ of English compared to French. It is to Dryden that we owe the creation of Melantha, one of the rare Frenchified female fops on the Restoration stage.

Melantha is a town woman, who, aspiring to become part of the court circle, is drawn to the French language and culture that she believes is required there. When Melantha is first introduced in the play by her lover Rodophil, he laments both her obsession with the court and her penchant for French vocabulary:

*Rodophil:* No Lady can be so curious of a new Fashion, as she is of a new French-word; she’s the very Mint of the Nation; and as fast as any Bullion comes out of France, coins it immediately into our Language.

When Palamede in turn attempts to win over Melantha, he himself is witness to her weakness for French expressions. Having eloquently expressed his desire for her favour, she responds with a flurry of Frenchisms:

---
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Melantha: Let me die, Philotis, but this is extremely French; but yet Count Rhodophil--- A Gentleman, Sir, that understands the Grand mond so well, who has hanted the best conversations, and who (in short) has voyag’d, may pretend to the good graces of any Lady.

Palamede: (aside) Hay day! Grand mond! conversation! voyag’d! and good graces! I find my Mistris is one of those that run mad in new French words.276

She proceeds to interrogate him on his latest Tour, on the plays currently in vogue and the best dancers of the ballet, allowing him no time to respond, so that in desperation he concludes that ‘to be shut up in a bed with her … humanity cannot support it.’277

The Englishman who embraces French fashion and language is also at the heart of Wycherley’s The gentleman dancing-master. The 1673 edition’s character list describes Mr Parris or Monsieur de Paris as ‘a vain Coxcomb, and rich City-Heir, newly returned from France, and mightily affected with the French Language and Fashions’.278 Wycherley’s Englishman, whose real name is Mr Nathaniel Parris, insists throughout the play on being addressed as Monsieur de Paris and is conspicuous in his Francophilia. Having spent only three months in Paris, he has returned to England with Frenchified manners, attire and speech.

The play’s plot centres on the sequestered fourteen-year-old Hippolita, whose father is determined to marry her to his nephew Nathaniel. Hippolita, however, refuses to be matched with such a Frenchified fop and sets her heart instead on the libertine Englishman Gerrard who Monsieur de Paris reproves: ‘can’t dance a step nor sing a French song nor swear a French Oate nor use the polite French word in his conversation’.279 When caught with Gerrard, she manages to fool her father into accepting her secret meetings with her English suitor, under the premise that he is in fact a dancing-master who is teaching her the intricacies of French dance in preparation for her impending marriage.

Politics of language are thematised within the play, with Monsieur de Paris asserting with confidence that ‘tis… ill breeding now to speak good Englis’. Drinking at a French house with Gerrard, he looks to his companion for confirmation of his Frenchness:

Monsieur: But have I the Eyrè Francèz?
Gerrard: As much as any French-Footman of ‘em all.
Monsieur: And do I speak agreeable ill Englis’ enough?
Gerrard: Very ill.
Monsieur: Veritablemènt!
Gerrard: Veritablemènt.280
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While the excesses of Monsieur de Paris’ French affectations are exemplified throughout the play, the French themselves are also satirised, with Gerrard concluding that ‘to be a perfect French-man, you must never be silent, never sit still, and never be clean.’

Sir Fopling Flutter, the title character of Etherege’s *The man or mode; or, Sir Fopling Flutter*, is perhaps the most memorable of the Restoration fops. Before Sir Fopling even enters the stage the audience is informed of his recent arrival ‘piping hot from Paris’ and of his ‘pretty little lisp’ ‘that he affects in imitation of the people of quality of France’. While Sir Fopling is convinced that he is the ‘pattern of modern gallantry’, the male rake Dorimont assures us that he is instead ‘the pattern of modern foppery’ (I.i.410-424). Indeed Dorimont later complains that Sir Fopling: ‘has no more excellence in his heels than in his head. He went to Paris a plain, bashful English blockhead, and is returned a fine undertaking French fop’ (IV.1.343–346).

Throughout the play the penchant for French affectation is satirised, such as when Medley speaks of the recent conduct manual:

*The Art of Affectation*, written by a late beauty of quality, teaching you how to draw up your breasts, stretch up your neck, to thrust out your breech, to play with your head, to toss up your nose, to bite your lips, to turn up your eyes, to speak in a silly soft tone of a voice, and use all the foolish French words that will infallibly make your person and conversation charming.

These stage depictions of the Frenchified fop and their ‘Arts of Affectation’ not only served to entertain Restoration and eighteenth-century audiences with a familiar trope, but were also commentaries on social realities. In the *Epilogue* to his *The Tender Husband* (1705) Richard Steele has Mr Estcourt rail against the presence of foreign languages on the English stage:

Britons, who constant War, with factious Rage,
For Liberty against each other wage,
From Foreign Insult save this English Stage.
[...]
Arise, for Shame, ye Conqu’ring Britons rise;
Such unadorn’d Effeminacy despise;
[...]
Let those Derision meet, who would Advance
Manners, or Speech, from *Italy* or *France*
Let them learn You, who wou’d your Favour find,
And English be the Language of Mankind.284

---
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He was particularly critical of Etherege’s *Man of mode* and addressed its shortcomings at length in the 65th edition of *The Spectator* (May 15, 1711). In response to this, John Dennis published a pamphlet praising the character of Sir Fopling and emphasising the importance of ridiculing the ostentatious affectation of French mannerisms. The ridicule inherent in the character of Sir Fopling, he argued, was the very reason that Etherege’s play was so apt to ‘instruct and please’ its audience:

> What true *Englishman* is there, but must be pleas’d to see this ridiculous Knight made the Jest and the Scorn of all the other Characters, for shewing, by his foolish aping foreign Customs and Manners, that he prefers another Country to his own? And of what important Instruction must it be to all our Youth who travel, to shew them, that if they so far forget the Love of their Country, as to declare by their espousing foreign Customs and Manners, that they prefer *France* or *Italy* to *Great Britain*, at their Return, they must justly expect to be the Jest and the Scorn of their own Countrymen.

Thus while addressing concerns about the impact of the ‘Grand tour’ and its noisome effects on English language and manners, Dennis maintains the effectiveness of ridiculing such affectations on stage. The co-author of the *Spectator*, Addison, took another view, writing in the 45th edition (April 21, 1711) that the solution was instead to prevent such mannerisms entering England altogether: ‘For the Prevention of these great Evils,’ he informed his readers, ‘I could heartily wish that there was an Act of Parliament for Prohibiting the Importation of French Fopperies’.

The Restoration plays ridiculed the Frenchified mannerisms of the Restoration fops who were often manipulated by their English counterparts to the delight of stage audiences. In these plays the exaggerated mannerisms, lisping pronunciations and multiple French linguistic borrowings inspired the laughter of both the English stage protagonists and the Restoration public. There was a clear sense that such Frenchified characters were no match for witty English rakes and wily English females; they could therefore, in the words of Mrs Crafty, easily be snapped into their ‘English traps’. While some authors warned against increasing the exposure of the public to such French linguistic borrowings, most Restoration playwrights considered French loanwords as harmless comic devices which were the source of rich entertainment. For pamphlet authors such as John Hare and Marchamont Nedham, however, the imitation of French words was not such a laughing matter.

---

7 Representations of French linguistic borrowing in early modern political tracts, pamphlets and periodical essays

This chapter discusses the depiction of French borrowings in pamphlets published during the English Civil Wars (1642-1651), as well as in pamphlets and periodical essays published following the Restoration (1660), the Glorious Revolution (1688) and the Acts of Union (1707). Section 7.1 considers the Saxonist account of the Leveller John Hare and his use of the language of captivity in depicting French words. Sections 7.2 to 7.4 focus on responses to the emulation of French fashion, manners and language in the pamphlets of Marchamont Nedham (1678), John and Mary Evelyn (1690 and 1691) and the anonymous *Satyr of the French* (1691). Here the emphasis is on the French language of fashion. Finally, in Section 7.5 the relation between language and nation and the French vocabulary of war is reflected in the discussions of French linguistic borrowing in Joseph Addison’s and Richard Steele’s periodical, *The Spectator* (1711-1714).

7.1 ‘The Fetters of our Captivity’: The political pamphlets of John Hare (1647)

In 1647 the Leveller and Saxonist John Hare published a series of pamphlets which raged against the Norman yoke and lamented its effects on the England’s language, laws and titles. The first of these pamphlets was entitled:

St. Edwards ghost: or, Anti-Normanisme: being a patheticall complaint and motion in the behalfe of our English nation against her grand (yet neglected) grievance, Normanisme.

The second pamphlet:

Plaine English to our wilfull Bearers with Normanisme; or, some Queries propounded to and concerning the Neglectours of Englands grand Grievance and complaint lately published under the title of Anti-Normanisme. Wherein is undeniably demonstrated, that while this Nation remains under the Title of the (pretended) Conquest, She and every Member of her are not other then Slaves properly so called; And moreover, that (while she retaines the same Title) all her and her Representators contending with their Prince for ungranted priviledges, upon any pretence whatsoever, is unwarrantable and seditious.

And the third pamphlet, variously dated to 1647 and 1648, was entitled:
Englands Proper and onely way to an Establishment in Honour, Freedome, Peace and Happinesse. Or, The Normane Yoke once more uncased, and the Necessity, Justice, and present seasonablenesse of breaking it in pieces demonstrated, in Eight most plain and true Propositions with their Proofs. By the Author of Anti-Normanisme, and of the Plain English to the neglectors of it.

Hare’s treatises are filled with the language of war and conquest. He writes of ‘the Normane and French invasion’ of the English language and of freeing the English laws ‘imprisoned’ in the Frenchified language of their enemies. He also draws on images of purity and cleansing: the English language should be ‘cleared of the Normane and French invasion upon it’ and ‘purg[ed] of all words and termes of that descent’. The familiar trope of language as clothing appears in his desire that ‘our Lawes be devested of their french rags’.

Ideas of the national identity are visibly important in Hare’s *St. Edwards Ghost, or Anti-Normanism*. Indeed ‘nation’ occurs seventy-eight times within the twenty-three pages of the pamphlet. The nation is both personified and identified with the English people. Thus Hare speaks both of ‘us the nation’ and ‘we her sons’. England is the ‘mother nation’, it is the descended from the great Teutonick state that remains the ‘heart and maine body of Europe’. Hare goes to great lengths to emphasise that England owes its origins to the great Teutonic nation. The English are ‘the children of her body’, ‘true inheritors and partakers’, ‘flesh of flesh’ and ‘bone of bone’. Englishmen are not only the ‘progeny’ of the Saxons, but they belong to ‘the most ancient and noble of the tribes’.

There is no shortness of superlatives to describe the greatness of the Teutonick Nation from which Hare traces England’s genealogy. The Teutonick Nation’s greatest virtue, however, was

... her unconquerednesse, her untainted virginity and freedome from forraine subjection, which from her first foundation and Cradle, she hath so conserved and defended, that none can truly boast to have bin her ravisher...289

He argues that as the descendents of such an illustrious nation, England to was entitled to reconquer France. In order to free the English nation from the ‘fetters of her [Norman] captivity’, Hare declared five essential measures:

1. That *William* surnamed the Conquerour be stript of that insolent Title (which himself scarce ever assumed after his victory, much lesse pretended to before, but haveth beene sitthence imposed on him by Normane arrogance and our servile flattery) and that he be either reputed among our lawful Kings by force of Saint *Edwards* legacy, or adjudged an usurper; however, that he may no longer stand for the Alpha of our Kings in the Royall Catalogue.

289 Hare, *St. Edwars ghost: or, Anti-Normanisme*, 8.
2. That the Title to the Crowne bee ungrounded from any pretended Conquest over this Nation, and that his Majesty bee pleased to derive his right from Saint Edwards legacy, and the bloud of the precedent English Kings* to whom hee is the undoubted heire; and that he restore the ancient English Armes into the Royall standard.

3. That all the Normane Nobility and Progeny among us, repudiate their names and titles brought over from Normandy, assuming others consistible with the honour of this Nation, and disclaime all right to their possessions here as Heyres or Successors to any pretended Conquerours.

4. That all Lawes and usages introduced from Normandy, be ( eo nomine) abolished, and a supply made from St. Edwards lawes or the Civil, and that our Lawes be devested of their french rags, (as King James of worthy memory once Royally motioned) and restored into the English or Latine tongue, unlesse perhaps it may seem honourable for English men to be still in the mouth of their owne Lawes no further free then Frenchified, and that they only of all mortell men should imprison their Lawes in the Language of their enemies.

5. That our Language be cleared of the Normane and French invasion upon it, and depravation of it, by purging it of all words and termes of that descent, supplying it from the old Saxon and the learned tongues, and otherwise correcting it, whereby it may be advanced to the quality of an honourable and sufficient Language, then which there is scarce a greater point in a Nations honour and happinesse.  

For Hare the presence of French linguistic borrowings in the English language and in English laws pointed to a type of slavery to which a great nation, such as England, should never submitted. He therefore called for the immediate removal of all such instances of linguistic borrowing from the English language.

7.2 Marchamont Nedham, *Christianissimus Christianandus* (1678)

While the French tongue may have received a kind reception in certain circles, the cultural and linguistic emulation of France naturally provoked patriotic pamphleteers. The author of the anonymous 1678 pamphlet *Christianissimus Christianandus*, since attributed to Marchamont Nedham, complained that Englishmen were obsessed with all that was French:

> we (such is the fondness of our Nation!) are bewitched with an affectation of French Commodities, though but meer Baubles and Gugaws […] we must have all French about us; their Behaviour, their Fashions, their Garb in wearing them […] French Musick, French Dancing-Masters, French Air in our very Countenances,

---
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French Grimaces; only we have not so frequent the French shrug of the shoulder, because we are not generally so low– and itchy.\textsuperscript{291}

He cautioned against the lure of the French language and warned against its incorporation into English, arguing that to take on another nation’s language was only to pave the way for the downfall of one’s own:

Any thing that speak French is our delight; and such is the Witchcraft also upon the other Nations of Europ, that having made the French Language and Humors Universal, I cannot but look on it as a sad Omen of Universal Slavery; for as much as both Divines and Politicians have, by the course of God’s Providence, and Revolutions past in the World, observed, that a Nations taking of Language from another Nation, and preferring it before their own, hath usually bin a fore-runner of, and prepared the way for its Conquest.\textsuperscript{292}

The willing incorporation of French vocabulary and phrases would merely prove a stepping stone on the way to France achieving its ultimate goal of universal monarchy and universal trade. The pamphlet warned that doting on all things French would only encourage French efforts at hegemony. It was only by maintaining English manly traditions that such a threat might be countered:

No marvel then that France is carried on and elevated with the Ambition and belief of Conquering All, when they see all so fancifully dote upon their more effeminate Language, Fashions, and People. Therefore ‘tis high time that we return to our Old English Spirit and Humor, which naturally is more grave, manly, and Martial, and by its native courageous Temper sufficiently enabled (as of old) to cure their hot fits, and cudgel them out of their disciplinary, artificial Conduct and evaporating Valour.\textsuperscript{293}

Here the pamphleteer draws on the popular portrayal of French fashion, manners and language as both effeminate and seductive, and thus a menace to the natural virility of the English people.

7.3 French fashion worlds: Mundus Muliebris (1690) and Mundus foppensis (1691)

In 1690 appeared a thin quarto pamphlet entitled Mundus muliebris, or, The ladies dressing-room unlock’d, and her toilette spread in burlesque.\textsuperscript{294} It is attributed to diarist John Evelyn’s

\textsuperscript{291} Marchamont Nedham, Christianissimus Christianandus, or, Reason for the reduction of France to a more Christian state in Europ, (London: Printed by Henry Hills, 1678), 36-37.

\textsuperscript{292} Nedham, ibid., 37.

\textsuperscript{293} Nedham, ibid., 37-38.

\textsuperscript{294} Mary Evelyn, Mundus muliebris, or, the ladies dressing-room unlock’d, and her toilette spread in burlesque: together with the fop-dictionary, compiled for the use of the fair sex. London: Printed for R. Bentley in Russel-Street in Covent Garden, 1690.
daughter Mary, who had died of smallpox at the age of nineteen five years earlier, while its preface was penned by her father. The pamphlet is comprised of a preface, a poem entitled ‘A voyage to Maryland; or, the ladies dressing-rom’ and a ‘Fop-dictionary’ which the title-page announces is ‘compiled for the use of the fair sex’.

The preface is addressed to the as yet untravelled young master who, having finished his university studies, is set to enter the world of courtship. Having emphasised the refined ladies’ expectations of being courted in ‘the Forms and Decencies of making Love in Fashion’, the author warns the young master ‘how the Stile and the Method of Wooing is quite changed as well as the Language, since the days of our Fore-Fathers’. Follows a long listing of the virtues and modesty of earlier times ‘when things of use were natural, plain and wholesome’, men demonstrated ‘true Piety, Loyalty, Justice, Sobriety, Charity’, women were ‘obsequious, and helpful to their Parents’ and diversions consisted of ‘Devout and Religious Books’. In those happy days, the author proceeds, ‘Perjury, Suborning Witnesses, Alimony, Avowed Adulteries, and misses (publicly own’d) were Prodigies’.

The corrupting practices currently observed were to be attributed to foreign influence and travel. Indeed, the author explains, ‘the World is alter’d among us, since Foreign Manners, the Luxury [...] has universally obtain’d among us, corrupting ancient simplicity.’ Those that travelled abroad had brought home ‘the Sins of other Nations’. Thus the author argues that in earlier days ‘the Scurvy, Spleen, & c. were scarce hear of, till Foreign Drinks and Mixtures were wantonly introduc’d’ and the ladies ‘knew not so much as the Names of [the card games] Ombre, Comet and Basset’. The succeeding poem would not only illustrate the extent of such corruption but also demonstrate with ‘what extravagant Form’ the young suitor is now expected to court and address the fairer sex.

Appended to the pamphlet Mundus muliebris was the The Fop-Dictionary. Presented as being compiled ‘for the use of the fair sex’ on the pamphlet’s title-page, the fop-dictionary was introduced by a separate title-page which read in full:

The Fop-Dictionary. Or, An Alphabetical Catalogue of the hard and foreign Names, and Terms of the Art Cosmetick, &c. together with their Interpretations, for Instruction of the Unlearned

---
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The dictionary counted 68 entries, of which almost the entirety was taken from the French:

**Attaché.** Any thing which fastens to another, &c.

**Bas de soye shot through.** Silk Stockings with Gold, or Silver thread wove into the Clock.

**Berger.** A plain small Lock (*a la Shepherdess*) turn’d up with a Puff.

**Bourgoigne.** The first part of the Dress for the Head next the Hair. *Branches.* Hanging Candlesticks, like those used in Churches.

**Brasier.** A large Vessel, or moving-Hearth of Silver for Coals, transportable into any Room, much used in *Spain.*

**Calumbuc.** A certain precious Wood, of an agreeable Scent, brought from the *Indies.*

**Campagne.** A kind of narrow picked Lace. *Casset.* A Dressing Box.

**Cassolet.** Perfuming Pot or Censer.

**Choucr.** The great round Boss or Bundle, resembling a Cabbage, from whence the *French* give it that name.

**Coffre-fort.** A strong Box of some precious or hard wood, &c. bound with gilded Ribs.

**Colbertine.** A Lace resembling Net-work, of the Fabric of Monsieur *Colbert,* Superintendent of the *French* Kings Manufactures.

**Collaret.** A sort of Gorget.

**Commode.** A Frame of Wire, cover’d with Silk, on which the whole Head-Attire is adjusted at once upon a *Bust,* or property of Wood carved to the Breasts, like that which Perruque-Makers set upon their Stalls.

**Confidants.** Smaller *Curles* near the Ears.

**Cornet.** The upper *Pinner,* dangling about the Cheeks, like *Hounds Ears.*

**Cosmeticks.** Here used for any Effeminate Ornament, also artificial Complections and Perfumes.

**Crevecœur.** Heart-breakers, the two small curl’d Locks at the Nape of the Neck.

**Crochet.** The Hook to which are chain’d the Ladies Watch, Seals, and other *Intaglias,* &c.

**Cruches.** Certain smaller Curles, placed on the Forehead.

**Cuppée.** A kind of Pinner.

**Echelles.** A Pectoral, or Stomacher lac’d with Ribbon, like the rounds of a Ladder.

**Engageants.** Deep double Ruffles, hanging down to the Wrists.

**Favorites.** Locks dangling on the Temples.

**Ferula.** An Instrument of Wood us’d for Correction of lighter faults, more sensibly known ot School-Boys than to Ladies.

**Fil-grain’d.** Dressing-Boxes, Baskets, or whatever else is made of Silver Wire-work.

**Flandan.** A kind of Pinner joyning with the *Bonnet.*

**Firmament.** Diamonds, or other precious Stones heading the *Pins* which they stick in the *Tour,* and Hair, like Stars.

**Frelan.** *Bonnet* and Pinner together.

**Font-Ange.** The Top-Knot, so call’d from *Mademoiselle de Fontange,* one of the *French* King’s Mistresses, who first wore it.

**Gris.** The Grey Furr of Squirrels bellies.

**Iaponian.** Any thing Varnish’d with *Laccar,* or *China* Polishing, or that is odd or fantastical.

**Jardinée.** That single *Pinner* next the *Bourgogne.*

**Loo Mask.** An half Mask.

**Martial.** The Name of a famous *French* Perfumer, emulateing the *Frangipani* of *Rome.*

**Miroir.** In general, any Looking-Glass; but here, for the Table, Toilet, or Pocket *Sprunking-Glass.*

**Molionet.** The Instrument us’d to mingle *Chocolate* with the Water.

**Monte la haut.** Certain degrees of Wire to raise the Dress.
Mouchoir. It were Rude, Vulgar, and Uncourtly, to call it Handkerchief.
Mouches. Flies, or, Black Patches, by the Vulgar.
Meurtrieres. Murderers; a certain Knot in the Hair, which ties and unites the Curls.
Palatine. Formerly call’d Sables, or Tippet, because made of the Tails of that Animal.
Palisade. A Wire sustaining the Hair next to the Dutchess, or first Knot.
Passagere. A Curl’d Lock next the Temples.
Pennačhe. Any Bunch or Tassel of small Ribbon.
Rare, le Best, and most Excellent; but in Language de beau, rare & le meilleures, happily
meilleureurs. ryming with Mont pellier.
Rayonné. Upper Hood, pinn’d in Circle, like the Sun-Beams.
Rouleau. Is Forty Nine Guineas, made up in a Paper Roll, which Monsieur F—Sir I—and
Father B—lend to losing Gamesters, that are good Men, and have Fifty in Return.
Ruffles. By our Fore-fathers call’d Cuffs.
Settée. The double Pinner.
Sorti. A little Knot of small Ribbon, peeping out between the Pinner and Bonnet.
Spagnolet. A kind of narrow-sleev’d Gown, a la Spagnole.
Sultane. A Gown trimm’d with Buttons and Loops.
Surtout. A Night Hood covering the entire Dress.
Toilet. Corruptly call’d the Twilight, but originally signifying a little Cloth.
Tour. An artificial Dress of Hair on the Forehead, &c.
Tré fine. Langage de Beau. Extreamly fine, and delicate, cum multis aliis.

The supplied list was by no means exhaustive, the author informed his readers, as besides the
vocabulary listed ‘there are a world more, as Assasin, or Venez à moy, A certain Breast-knot,
as much as to say, Come to me, Sir, &c. However, many of these were obsolete, and the
author had chosen to ‘confine our selves to those in Vogue. The dictionary concluded with
a commentary on the role of French borrowings in the realm of fashion, couched in the
language of empire and tyranny:

To conclude, Those who have the curiosity, by comparing these Terms with the
Ancients, thereby to inform themselves, how this Elegant Science is improv’d,
especially since we have submitted to, and still continue under the Empire of the
French, (for want of some Royal or Illustrious Ladies Invention and Courage, to
give the Law of the Mode to her own Country, and to vindicate it from Foreign
Tyranny) may for Divine History consult Isaiah 3d. ch. ver. 16, &c. and for
Prophane, read Plautus his Poenulus, Act. 1. Scen. 2. and his Aulularia, Act. 3.
Scen. 5.

In 1691 an anonymous rebuttal of Mundus muliebris (1690) was published under the title:

Mundus Foppensis: or, the Fop Display’d Being the Ladies Vindication, in Answer
to a late Pamphlet, Entituled, Mundus Muliebris: Or, the Ladies Dressing-Room

---
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Unlock’d, &c. In Burlesque. Together with a short SUPPLEMENT to the Fop-Dictionary: Compos’d for the use of the Town Beaus. 303

It has since been attributed to John Evelyn. The pamphlet took the female gender in defence and enumerated the many extravagancies of their male counterparts. It emphasised the current trend to bring home French fashions and modes, but also French disease:

So strangely does Parisian Air
Change English Youth, that half a year
Makes ‘em forget all Native Custome,
To bring French Modes, and Gallic Lust home;
Nothing will these Apostates please,
But Gallic Health, and French Disease.

It also emphasised the extent to which this Parisian youth drew on French linguistic borrowing:

In French their Quarrels, and their Fears,
Their Joys they publish, and their Cares;
In French they quarrel, and in French
Mon coeur, they cry, to paltry Wench.

It make references to the French loanwords in both early modern dictionaries:

What though the Names be new, and such
As borrow from the French and Dutch?
Or strain’d from the Italian Idiom,
Rather from hence I take the Freedom,
To praise their Care, thus to enrich
And fructifie our barren Speech,
We owe to their Vocabulary,
That makes our Language full and airy,
Enlarging Meige’s Dictionary.

Sure then ‘twas some ill-natur’d Beau,
To persecute the Ladies so;
For peopling, of their own accord,
Phillip’s English World of Words:

And also to the Frenchified fops of Restoration dramas:

Add but to this the Flanty-Tant
Of Fopling Al-a-mode Gallant;
Why should not Gris, or Jardine,

303 Anon., Mundus foppensis: or, the fop display’d Being the ladies vindication, in answer to a late pamphlet, entituled, Mundus muliebris: or, the ladies dressing-room unlock’d, &c. In burlesque. Together with a short supplement to the fop-dictionary: comos’d for the use of the town-beaus. London: printed for John Harris at the Harrow in the Poultry, 1691. A facsimile of the copy in the Clark Library (Shelf Mark: *PR1195/S353) is included in Michael S. Kimmel, History of men: essays on the history of American and British masculinities, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), 143-169.
The fashionable nature of such borrowings was ridiculed:

Be as well allow’d as *Bien gaunte*;
Cloaths is a paltry Word *Ma foy*;
But Grandeur in the French *Arroy*.
Trimming’s damn’d English, but *le Grass*
Is that which must for Modish pass.
To call a Shoe a Shoe, is base,
Let the genteel *Picards* take Place.
Hang *Perriwig*, ‘tis only fit
For Barbers Tongues that ne’er spoke Wit;
But if you’d be i’th’ Fashion, choose
The far politer Term, *Chedreux*
What Clown is he that proudly moves,
With on his hands what we call Gloves?
No Friend, for more refin’d converse
Will tell ye they are *Orangers*.

The pamphlet included a supplement to the Fop-dictionary, which the author had ‘compos’d for the use of the Town-beaus’ and which addressed the foreign borrowings regularly employed by gentleman. Its twenty-six entries were comprised of the following:

*Adieu donc me Cheres.* Farewell my dear Friends.
*Arroy.* A Suit of Cloaths.
*To adjust a Man’s self.* That is, to dress himself.
*Beau.* A Masculine French Adjective, signifying fine but now naturaliz’d into English to denote a sparkish dressing Fop.
*Beaux Esprits.* A Club of Wits, who call’d themselves so.
*Bachique.* A Drinking Song or Catch.
*The Brilliant of Language.* Sharpness and witiness of Expression.
*A Brandenburgh.* A Morning Gown.
*To Carine a Perriwig.* That is, to order it.
*Chedreux.* A Perriwig.
*Correct.* The same as Carine.
*Deshabille.* Undrest, or rather in a careless Dress.
*En Cavalier.* Like a Gentleman.
*Esclat.* Of Beauty, or the Lustre of Beauty.
*Eveille.* I observ’d her more *Eveille* than other Women; that is, more sprightly and airey.
*Equipt.* That is, well furnish’d with Money and Cloaths.
*Gaunte Bien Gaunte.* Modish in his Gloves.
*Grossier.* The World is very Grossier; that is, very dull, and ill bred.
*Levee and Couchee.* Is to attend a Gentleman at his rising or going to Bed.
*Le Grass.* The furniture of a Suit.
*Orangers.* The Term for Gloves scented with Oranges.
*Picards.* Shoes in downright English.
*Pulvillio.* Sweet Powder for the Hair.
*Rolls.* A sort of Dress for the Knees, invented as some say by the Roman Catholicks, for the conveniency of Kneeling, but others ascribe the lucky Fancy to Coll. S----.
*A Revoir.* Till I see you again.

74
The great Coat which covers all.

Again the majority of terms were drawn from the French and the author refers his reader to ‘the Dilucidations of the Alsatian Squire’ for further terms.304

7.4 ‘The noisie, fluttering, empty French’: *A satyr against the French* (1691)

The dedicatory epistle of the 1691 pamphlet *A satyr against the French* was addressed ‘to the admirers of the French’ and took a stand against their insidious influence.305 The French had only managed to attain so great a reputation in England, the author claimed, for ‘with the Gentlemen they can Insinuate, and Flatter the Ladies’ and ‘by these various Arts of Flattery, the French are grown into Esteem’.306 The pamphleteer felt compelled to rise up against the recent tendency to vilify his English countrymen, being ‘something mortified, to see Quality doat upon a Dressing, Cringing, Complementing Monsieur’.307

The succeeding poem satirises the food, the manners, the language and the attitudes of the French. To criticise the French requires boldness, the author accedes, being against the ‘Tide of Custom’ (‘Who dares affirm, that Oysters are not Fish? / Or that Fry’d Frogs make not a dainty Dish?’308), but in such times ‘when the Sword is drawn’, the pen could not lie idle and it was ‘the Duty of every Man to arm against the Common Enemy’.309 This common enemy being:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Those who are now the Plagues of Christendom,} \\
&\text{And scatter Mischief wheresoe’er they come;} \\
&\text{Whom angry Nature seem’d to have design’d} \\
&\text{To be the common Pest of Humane Kind;} \\
&\text{The noisie, empty, fluttering French I mean,} \\
&\text{Who should have justly our Aversion been;} \\
&\text{Whom yet we fondly Cherish and Embrace,} \\
&\text{Pleas’d with their modish Shrugs, and damn’d Grimace.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Throughout the poem the familiar trope of the simian Frenchman is echoed. Thus the author writes the following:

---

305 Anon., *A satyr against the French*, Licens’d, December 6, 1690. London: Printed, and are to be Sold by Randal Taylor, near Stationers Hall, 1691.
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Who dares find fault with any Lap-dogs Features? / Or say that Monkeys are not pretty Creatures?\textsuperscript{311} 

These Apes, these Echo’s, and these shews of Men, / Shall be the present Subject of my Pen.\textsuperscript{312} 

Their Modes so strangely alter humane Shape, / What Nature made a Man, they make an Ape.\textsuperscript{313} 

The pamphlet draws attention to the gesticulating nature of Frenchmen and their ‘Distortions of Body’, for, the author notes, ‘the French, like the Sea, are perpetually in Motion’.\textsuperscript{314} The imposition of their language upon the English affected both their words and their body:

As half a dozen Frenchmen when they meet,  
Their Tongues not only wag, but Hands and Feet,  
Each part about them seems to move and walk;  
Their Eyes, their Noses, Nay their Fingers talk.  

In satirising the Frenchman and his habits, the author exposes his audience to a number of French words and simulates the French accent so often ridiculed in Restoration comedy:

\begin{verbatim}
Methinks I hear a Voice, cry – Gardez vous,  
Begar me quickly make you shange your Note,  
You write ’gainst me, Begar me cut your Troat
\end{verbatim} 

Thus when writing of the ‘various Motions of a French Man’s mind’, he reflects on the Frenchman’s fickleness who one moment is all ‘Rage and Fury’ and the next ‘his whole Discourse/Is of Intrigue, Appointments and Amours’.\textsuperscript{315} French words abound in the next section’s criticisms of the Frenchman’s dress. Thus the pamphlet speaks of men appearing ‘en Chavalier’, wearing a ‘cherdreux Periwig’, strutting in ‘Pantaloons’ and looking as fierce as ‘French Dragoons’. The women would only wear ‘gloves from Blois’, ‘French Point and Colbertine’ lace, ‘Shooes Campaign’. The author references the French royal court and acknowledges the roles that Louis XIV’s famous mistress Angelique de Fontanges and Madame de Maintenon had had on English fashions:

Top-knots were first invented by Frontange.  
The Ribband which is call’d the Maintanon  
Was by an old French Mistress thought upon;

\textsuperscript{311} Anon., ibid., 1.  
\textsuperscript{312} Anon., ibid., 3.  
\textsuperscript{313} Anon., ibid., 5.  
\textsuperscript{314} Anon., ‘The Epistle Dedicatory’ in A Satyr Against the French (1690), n.p.  
\textsuperscript{315} Anon., A Satyr Against the French (1690), 4.
Indeed the French origins of foppish fashions and attire are illustrated through the satire, as can be observed in the examples below:

Tis to that Foppish Nation that we owe
Those antick Dresses that Equip a Beau [...] 
All the fantastick Arts of Dress we know
Did first from France, that impure Fountain, flow [...] 
A Dress thought Ominous in former Time,
Till a French Patent authoriz’d the Crime [...] 
But tawdry Stuff in Paris made [...] 
The Ladies too are much obliged to France, 
For all their Modes and Fashions come from thence

7.5 Periodical essays: The Spectator (1711-1714)

The Spectator was a periodical launched on March 1, 1711 by Joseph Addison (1672-1719) and Richard Steele (1672-1729). Its issues numbered approximately 2500 words and comprised essays, commentaries on manners and fashions, religious pieces and literary criticism. The Spectator was published daily except for Sundays and ran for a total of 555 issues until December 6, 1712.316 It was revived on June 18, 1714 and ran for a further 80 issues until the 635th issue on December 20, 1714. Linguistic issues were discussed in a number of Addison’s and Steele’s essays in The Spectator.

On June 28, 1711, Steele republished a sermon by the late Archbishop of Canterbury, John Tillotson (1630-1694), in which the increasing presence of flattery in speech was greatly criticised. The Archbishop pointed to the current mode of complements, dissimulation and lack of sincerity as illustrations of ‘the great Corruption and Degeneracy of the Age wherein we live’. Lamenting the loss of ‘The old English Plainness and Sincerity, that generous Integrity of Nature, and Honesty of Disposition’, he argued that the artifices of vanity and compliment had been imported from abroad:

There hath been a long Endeavour to transform us into Foreign Manners and Fashions, and to bring us to a servile Imitation of none of the best of our Neighbours in some of the worst of their Qualities. The Dialect of Conversation is now-a-days so swelled with Vanity and Compliment, and so surfeited (as I may say) of Expressions of Kindness and Respect, that if a Man that lived an Age or two ago should return into the World again he would really want a Dictionary to help him to understand his own Language, and to know the true intrinsec Value of the Phrase in Fashion.317
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While Tillotson’s sermon focused on the foreign transformation of English manners and fashions, Addison desired to prevent the imitation of French words and phrases. Just as he had earlier wished for an Act of Parliament to ‘Prohibit [...] the Importation of French Fopperies’, he recommended protective measures to hinder French linguistic borrowing, which he depicted in monetary terms:

I have often wished [...] certain Men might be set apart as Superintendants of our Language, to hinder any Words of a Foreign Coin from passing among us; and in particular to prohibit any French Phrases from becoming Current in this Kingdom, when those of our own Stamp are altogether as valuable.318

In his essay ‘On the English language’, which was published on August 4, 1711, Addison reflected on the close relationship between languages and people. The English language, he maintained ‘shows the genius and natural temper of the English, which is modest, thoughtful, and sincere’.319 The nature of a people, he argued, was reflected in their language, so that if one were to ‘carry the same Thought into other Languages’ one might ‘deduce a greater Part of what is peculiar to them from the Genius of the People who speak them’.320 He then went on to describe the peculiarities of the French by drawing on metaphors of disease:

It is certain, the light talkative Humour of the French has not a little infected their Tongue, which might be shown by many Instances.321

In an essay published a year later, inspired by the vison of a female equestrian dressed in male attire, Addison brought up the image of French infection once again. Speaking of the immodest ‘mixture of two sexes in one person’, he reflected:

I must observe that this Fashion was first of all brought to us from France, a Country which has Infected all the Nations of Europe with its Levity.322

Indeed, he admitted, given the ‘folly, caprice and extravagance of the present age’, he felt a responsibility to report and warn against the ridiculous affectations currently in mode:

318 Addison, *The Spectator*, no. 165, Saturday, September 8, 1711.
320 Addison, ibid. See also Aitken, ibid., vol. 2, 258.
For I look upon myself as one set to watch the Manners and Behaviour of my Countrymen and Contemporaries, and to mark down every absurd Fashion, ridiculous Custom, or affected Form of Speech that makes its Appearance in the World, during the Course of these my Speculations.323

The degenerative effect of French loanwords on the English language was further elaborated upon in Addison’s essay of September 8, 1711. His reflections echo both the pamphleteer Hare and the lexicographer Phillips when he comments that:

The present War has so Adulterated our Tongue with strange Words that it would be impossible for one of our Great Grandfathers to know what his Postery have been doing, were he to read their Exploits in a Modern News Paper. Our Warriors are very industrious in propagating the French Language, at the same time that they are so gloriously successful in beating down their Power.324

The irony of a conquering army, taking on the language of its conquered enemies is apparent:

They want Words in their own Tongue to tell us what it is they Atchieve, and therefore send us over Accounts of their Performances in a Jargon of Phrases, which they learn among their Conquered Enemies.325

While Addison admitted to making allowances for the descriptions of fortifications (as being foreign inventions they ‘abound[ed] in foreign terms’), he saw no reason for using French terms to describe English victories:

But when we have won Battels [which] may be described in our own Language, why are our Papers filled with so many unintelligible Exploits, and the French obliged to lend us a Part of their Tongue before we can know how they are Conquered?326

The current fashion of newspapers to recount the events of the war in an altogether impenetrable language was not only unnecessary, but worthy of criticism:

I do not find in any of our Chronicles, that Edward the Third ever reconnoitred the Enemy, tho' he often discovered the Posture of the French, and as often vanquished them in Battel. The Black Prince passed many a River without the help of Pontoons, and filled a Ditch with Faggots as successfully as the Generals of our Times do it with Fascines. Our Commanders lose half their Praise, and our People half their Joy, by means of those hard Words and dark Expressions in which our

News Papers do so much abound. I have seen many a prudent Citizen, after having read every Article, inquire of his next Neighbour what News the Mail had brought.  

In his essay, Addison includes his own version of a Frenchified ‘inkhorn’ letter, supposedly penned by a young gentleman in the army to his father. The unfortunate father, who upon reception finds the letter unintelligible, brings it to the curate of the parish, who naturally is equally unable to make sense of it. (Frenchified terms included Morass, Reconnoitre, Hauteur, Defiles, Gasconade, Fossé, Chamade, Charte Blanche, Cartel, amongst others). Addison’s ‘inkhorn letter’ is incorporated below:

SIR, Upon the Junction of the French and Bavarian Armies they took Post behind a great Morass which they thought impracticable. Our General the next Day sent a Party of Horse to reconnoitre them from a little Hauteur, at about a [Quarter of an Hour’s] distance from the Army, who returned again to the Camp unobserved through several Defiles, in one of which they met with a Party of French that had been Marauding, and made them all Prisoners at Discretion. The Day after a Drum arrived at our Camp, with a Message which he would communicate to none but the General; he was followed by a Trumpet, who they say behaved himself very saucily, with a Message from the Duke of Bavaria. The next Morning our Army being divided into two Corps, made a Movement towards the Enemy: You will hear in the Publick Prints how we treated them, with the other Circumstances of that glorious Day. I had the good Fortune to be in that Regiment that pushed the Gens d’Arms. Several French Battalions, who some say were a Corps de Reserve, made a Show of Resistance; but it only proved a Gasconade, for upon our preparing to fill up a little Fossé, in order to attack them, they beat the Chamade, and sent us Charte Blanche. Their Commandant, with a great many other General Officers, and Troops without number, are made Prisoners of War, and will I believe give you a Visit in England, the Cartel not being yet settled. Not questioning but these Particulars will be very welcome to you, I congratulate you upon them, and am your most dutiful Son, &c.  

The periodical essays of Addison and Steele, published in the years after the Acts of Union (1707) and during the midst of Anglo-French conflict in the War of Spanish Succession (1702-1713) echoed the Restoration focus on imitation and affectation, but also drew attention the idea of that nations might be conquered by words rather than by arms, earlier emphasised by authors such as Hare and Phillips. In their essays, Addison and Steele reflected on the relationship between language and nation and warned of the transformative and corrupting effects of French imitation on the English language and its people.
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Discussion

Debates about the influence of French linguistic borrowing in early modern England were peppered with dichotomies, many of which were clearly associated with either the English or the French. Such dichotomies included amongst others: grave, manly and martial versus effeminate, artificial and evaporating; English virtue versus French licentiousness; essential versus remote; foundation versus superstructure; naturally unaffected versus affected style. Others included purity and corruption; plain words and hard words; mould and gold; outlandish speech and mother tongue; overseas language and King’s English; country speech versus court speech amongst other.

The dichotomies found within the writings of lexicographers, playwrights, pamphleteers and essayists formed part of the othering of France that paved the way for what scholars have argued was the forging of an English, manly, polite national identity in opposition to the effeminate artificiality of French manners and language. Anglo-French relations were fraught with political, religious and cultural concerns and attitudes to French linguistic borrowing reflected such concerns. Calls for the rejection of foreign words were clearly associated with xenophobia and questions of national identity. The following discussion presents some of the main themes of representation in the depictions of French linguistic borrowing within the writings of lexicographers, playwrights, pamphleteers and periodical essayists examined in this thesis, considers the interrelations between the portrayals of French linguistic borrowing between the different genres and the role of such depictions in the construction of English national identity.

The language of purity and corruption pervades all of the three domains of discourse examined in this thesis. Lexicographers spoke of the purity of an ‘original’ English language. Ancient writers, argued Phillips, had written in the ‘purest and most genuine Language’ (see 5.5) while Johnson considered the writings from before the Restoration as the ‘wells of English undefiled’ and ‘the pure sources of genuine diction’ (see 5.10). The purity of such language was contrasted to the corruption of loanwords of French origin. Phillips complains that the English language had been ‘injured’, ‘vitiated’, and ‘corrupted’; Hogarth speaks of his native language ‘so strangely corrupted through Time’ (see 5.7); Dryden warns against those ‘who corrupt our English Idiom by mixing it too much with French’ (see 6.2) while the Satyr against the French rails against ‘France, that impure Fountain’. There were calls for such corruption to be remedied, thus John Hare urges that the English language should be ‘cleared of the Normane and French invasion upon it’ and ‘purg[ed] of all words and termes of that
descent’. Such language of purity and corruption was also closely associated with the language of disease. Johnson referred to translation as a ‘pest of speech’ while Addison maintained that the light talkative humour of the French had ‘infected their tongue’ (see 7.5).

A running theme in Restoration drama was the Frenchified fop’s predilection for all things French, including fashion, manners and language. There are multiple references to imitation and affectation throughout the plays: thus Monsieur de Paris was ‘mightily affected with the French Language and Fashions’ and Dorimont speaks of Fopling’s ‘pretty little lisp’ that ‘he affects in imitation of the people of quality of France’ (see 6.2). Indeed Bailey’s very definition of foppery was to be ‘vainly affected, fantastical in dress, speech, behaviour’ (see 6.1). The language of imitation was also apparent in the common trope of the ‘French Ape’ and the multiple references to the ‘noise, empty, fluttering French’ portrayed in the pamphlet Satyr against the French (see 7.4).

The language of imitation was also present in the writings of early modern lexicographers. Coles remarks on how, following the forced ‘Communication with France’, ‘our Genius is wrought into some resemblance of theirs: and (to imitate them) we bring home fashions, terms and phrases’ (see 5.6). Criticisms of the affecting of new words were voiced by Cawdrey (‘banish all affected Rhetorique’), Blount (‘affect novelty in speech’) and Phillips (who desired his readers to beware of affected style and forced neologisms), (see 5.1, 5.4 and 5.5). The pamphlets Mundus muliebris and mundus foppensis, with their incursions into the bedrooms of both female and male fops, focus particularly on French linguistic borrowings related to fashion and the desire to emulate the French beau monde. Imitation was the specific focus of Samuel Butler’s ‘Satire upon our ridiculous imitation of the French’ (see 4.3.5) who lamented the English trend of studying all the French ‘Tricks and Fashions, With epidemic Affectations’ (see 4.3.5). Likewise Nedham extended the language of affectation beyond the Restoration stage when he lamented that the English were ‘bewitched with an affectation of French Commodities’ (see 7.2).

Metaphors of clothing to describe linguistic borrowing are present throughout the different types of texts. French words were likened to different types of clothing from the ‘rags’ of E. K. and Hare to the ostentatious clothing featured in the fop dictionaries of Mundus muliebris and Mundus foppensis. The assimilation of language and clothing is upheld by Johnson who speaks of the ‘fabrick of the tongue’, while Phillips voices concerns that the tyranny of Strangers might ‘apparel our very thoughts’. Ideas of imitation and deception also underline cosmetic metaphors.
The language of war and conquest was prominent in Hare’s depiction of the Norman French incursion into the English language. His pamphlets are filled with warring imagery. Englishmen continued to speak in the ‘Conquerours Language’ and the presence of the French loanwords in English, he argued, were ‘the still visible fetters of our captivity’. Hare speaks of the invasion of the French language, of Norman-French words as ‘chains’ and ‘fetters’ and of the enslavement of the English people (see 7.1). Likewise, Nedham saw the use of French as ‘a sad Omen of Universal Slavery’ and argued that taking another nation’s language and preferring it to one’s own ‘hath usually bin a fore-runner of, and prepared the way for its Conquest’. He thus drew on the language associated with depictions of the Norman Yoke (see 7.2).

This language of conflict can also be observed in the rhetoric of certain lexicographers. Thus Phillips likens the addition of foreign loanwords into a language to ‘an invasion of strangers’ where the Saxon words, or old inhabitants, were ‘either slain, or forced to fly the land’ when such strange words were introduced. He acknowledges the commixture of languages caused by the presence of a ‘bordering or invading Nation’. Indeed the subversion of a nation would lead to a total subversion of its language as ‘where the Conquerours over-power the former inhabitants in multitude, their language also by little and little prevails over that of the Countrey’ Phillips wrote of his happiness ‘that being a terror to other nations, we are now free from invaders that formerly altred our Language’ (see 5.5).

The language of conflict was thus closely related to the language of transformation. Hare laments that ‘if wee survey our Language, we there meet with so much tincture of Normanisme, that some have esteemed it for a dialect of the Gallick’, just as Dryden had warned against ‘a turning English into French, rather than a refining of English by French.’ Johnson warned of the need to protect the English language and save it from ‘deviating towards a Gallick structure and phraseology, from which it ought to be our endeavour to recal it’. It was imperative to stop the license of translators, ‘whose idleness and ignorance, if it be suffered to proceed, will reduce us to babble a dialect of France’ (see 5.10). Addison desired an Act of Parliament to prohibit the ‘Importation of French Fopperies’ (see 6.2).

A different take on the incorporation of French loanwords was offered by those that recognised that such terms had once been foreign, but underlined the capacity of English to take possession of such words and transform them to their own nature. These words were no longer intruders, but had been appropriated to the English language, thereby showing its superior capacity. Writers could therefore speak of ‘denizens naturalised’ and foreign terms ‘made to speak English’. Phillips argues that these foreign words ‘though of a different
nature, [they] are made fit and adapted by long use’. As long as such linguistic borrowing was not imposed but desired, the interspersing of foreign terms might ‘not onely not deprave, but, refine a Language’ and lead to the sweetening and smoothing of harsh and rough accents. As a result, Phillips argued, seventeenth-century English was ‘much more smooth, and gratefull to the ear’ (see 5.5).

Another familiar trope in the examined texts is the language of origins and distance, which can be observed in the writings of lexicographers, pamphleteers and playwrights. Such writers spoke of far-fetched words as opposed to Saxon homebred words and of the ‘proper fountains’ of words (see 5.6). Likewise figurative language related to the language of economy and mercantilism is found in all the texts. Lexicographers, playwrights and pamphleteers spoke of ‘coining new phrases’, of enriching the language, of minted words, of ‘good Bullion stampt and well minted’ (see 5.5).

While a number of metaphors, tropes and themes are common to the representation of French linguistic borrowing in all three domains of discourse examined (dictionaries, Restoration drama and satire and political writings), there are also notable differences, both between the different genres and within the genres. A notable trend in the representation of French linguistic borrowing in the Restoration plays and the satirical pamphlets published during the Restoration is the focus not only on verbal but also on non-verbal forms of communication. Thus the Frenchified fops borrowed not only French words, but also French body language. The gesticulating nature of the French is emphasised and Frenchified fops are shown to wag, to grimace and to ‘make ridiculous legs’ across the Restoration stage. Or to repeat the words of *A satyr against the French* (1690):

> Their Tongues not only wag, but Hands and Feet,  
> Each part about them seems to move and walk;  
> Their Eyes, their Noses, Nay their Fingers talk. (see 7.4)

As Gerrard argued in *The gentle-man dancing master* (1673), ‘to be a perfect French-man, you must never be silent, never sit still’ (see 6.2). Likewise there is a focus on not only words, but on non-lexical features such as their ‘pretty little lisp’.

Restoration satire sought to ridicule such ostentatious copying of French language and mannerisms. There is no sense in these plays of the danger of French hegemony, or the notion of conquering Frenchmen. Indeed in none of the Restoration plays examined here does the Frenchified fop have the upper hand. The English rakes and the female protagonists are always certain of their own superiority and French borrowings of any kind are clearly
ridiculed. Frenchlove is snapped in an English trap, the French tailors are forced to sell the English tailors’ goods and Monsieur de Paris is fooled into losing his betrothed.

Within each domain of texts, there are also internal differences. Thus while French loans are discussed by all the lexicographers, the treatment of them varies. While some overtly criticise such loans, like Cawdrey (1604) and Johnson (1755), others aim to elucidate them, responding to a pedagogical concern of increasing the understanding of the less educated. Others still, such as Cockeram (1623) and Coles (1676), were held responsible for disseminating otherwise unknown borrowings. The pamphlets of Hare and Nedham were both influenced by political events such as the Civil Wars and Anglo-Dutch Wars, while the pamphlets *Mundus muliebris*, *Mundus Foppensis* and *A Satyr against the French* reflected the concerns of Restoration playwrights on the excessive emulation of French fashion, manners and language.

Common to all these representations, however, is the interrelation between language and nation. Both Phillips and Coles are persuaded of the relation between the climate of a Nation and its language, with Coles arguing that the various climates of the world have influenced the natures of the inhabitants and that their ‘speeches bear some proportion of Analogy with their Natures’ (see 5.6). This is also a point made by Addison and Steele in their essays. Increasingly, authors show great pride in both the English nation and its language. Hare emphasises the importance of language when he argues that ‘there is scarce a greater point in a Nations honour and happinesse’ than a pure and national language (see 7.1). Johnson and Bailey speak of the ‘genius of our tongue’. Phillips praises the virtues of the English nation, its authors and the native glories of its language and compares the English language favourably to those of other nations when he claims: ‘for elegance, for fluency, and happinesse of expression, I am perswaded it gives not place to any Modern Language, spoken in Europe; scarcely to the Latin and Greek themselves’ (see 5.5).

Finally, ideas of linguistic purity and resistance to foreign borrowings were tied to ideas of religion and politics. Hare thus argued for a return to Saxon words, likening the presence of Gallicisms in the English language to the domination of the Anglo-Saxons by the Normans.
9 Conclusion

This thesis has examined the attitudes towards and representations of French linguistic borrowing in early modern England, especially with respect to the fluctuating Anglo-French relations of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It has analysed the portrayal of French loanwords in the texts of lexicographers, playwrights, pamphleteers and essayists writing in three different domains of discourse, and considered whether such representations differed both between and within the three different domains explored.

The language used to depict French linguistic borrowing in early modern England was rich in metaphorical and figurative language. In describing the borrowing of French words and French linguistic practices, the authors of dictionaries, plays and political writings drew on the language of purity and corruption, of imitation and affectation, of war and conquest, of origins and distance. They emphasised the language of transformation, exploited disease metaphors and drew on sartorial and monetary expressions. Words were personified as citizens or foreigners, who could be naturalised or ejected from the body politic. The writings of these authors illustrated the strong association between language and national identity. Their descriptions were filled with dichotomies; dichotomies which were placed on each side of Anglo-French divide.

There were however differences between the representations in the different domains which reflected the purposes of their writers. The fact that compilers of hard-word dictionaries based their dictionaries on the need to explicate foreign borrowings naturally influenced the manner in which they choose to speak of them. In the writings of Restoration playwrights and pamphleteers there was an increased association of French linguistic practices with courtly affectation, but also an emphasis on the bodily aspects of French communication. Representations of French borrowing also differed internally within the genres. Cockeram, who in his three-volume dictionary not only disseminated existing Latinate loans but created his very own neologisms, emphasised the copiousness and variety that such terms added to the English language. Cawdrey, a school master with a desire for pedagogical purism, disparaged both use of such terms and their very existence, underlining the necessity that speakers be understood by a less educated public.

Common to all these depictions however was their close relation with the religious, political and socio-cultural context, especially as it pertained to Anglo-French relations. The growing criticism of French linguistic borrowing following the Restoration thus reflected an
increasingly unified resistance to France’s perceived attempts at political, cultural and linguistic hegemony.
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