Regulation, resistance, re-appropriation; rethinking Johnson and French lexicography

The popular rhetoric of Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary of the English Language*, both during and after its composition, can posit a distinctively adversative model of Anglo-French relations. 'JOHNSON, well-arm'd like a hero of yore/ Has beat forty *French*, and will beat forty more', as David Garrick famously declared in 1755, evoking a war of words in which Johnson had, single-handedly, trounced the collective endeavours of the 'Immortels' of the Académie Française by dint of his recently published work.[1] 'Would we alter the boast from the sword to the pen,/ The odds are still greater still greater our men!', Garrick added with patriotic fervour. Johnson might have been commissioned to craft a new dictionary of English which, in various ways, replicated the regulative linguistic ideals already adopted by the Continental academies of Italy and France. But a trenchant adherence to 'the spirit of *English* liberty', and a parallel rejection of the kind of subordination whereby the British might come to 'babble a dialect of *France*' (courtesy of 'the license of translators') were equally plain in Johnson's accompanying 'Preface'.[2] Languages, Johnson claimed, are 'the pedigree of nations'.[3] His *Dictionary*, as Robert DeMaria notes, is, in popular comment, often made to index a form of 'triumphant Anglicity' in which French resistance, alongside Johnson's committed nationalism, are constitutive features of his life and work.[4]

Nevertheless, as so often with Johnson, reality is more complex than this populist rhetoric might suggest. As DeMaria also attests, for example, Johnson's Europeanism is a further and striking facet of his lexicographical work. Johnson has always 'one foot in Europe', he argues; rather than insularity, Johnson reveals a close familiarity with classical and European cultural heritage, and with models of knowledge which range far outside the academy discourses already mentioned.[5] Johnson's early ambition to experience European centres of learning for himself ('I'll go and visit the universities abroad. I'll go to France and

---

[1] David Garrick, '*Upon* JOHNSON's *Dictionary*', *Gentleman's Magazine* xxv (1755), 190.
[2] Samuel Johnson, *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* (London: J. and P. Knapton, T. and T. Longman, C. Hitch and L. Hawes, A. Millar, and R. and J. Dodsley, 1755), C2^{v}.
[3] Cited in James Boswell, *Boswell's Life of Johnson; Together with Boswell's Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides and Johnson's Diary of a Journey into North Wales*, ed. George Birkbeck Hill, rev. and enlarged L. F. Powell, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 5, 7.
[4] Robert DeMaria, *The Life of Samuel Johnson: A Critical Biography* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), xii.
[5] DeMaria, *Life of Samuel Johnson*, xiii.

Italy. I'll go to Padua')[6] were, for various reasons, to remain unrealized but this, too, sits uneasily against the kind of popular stereotyping in which he is routinely rendered an Anglocentric (and Gallophobic) 'John Bull'. That Johnson was a translator, especially from French, long before he was a lexicographer is equally significant, as is his self-acknowledged 'zeal for Languages'.[7] More specifically, as this chapter will explore, Johnson's engagement with French and French lexicography presents not only a critical response to the remit of the Académie Française, and the normative enterprise it embraced but can also be seen as a contribution, if on English soil, to the 'querelle des dictionnaires' by which Antoine Furetière's *Dictionnaire Universel* (1690) spurred very different trajectories within lexicographic practice and the nature (and range) of linguistic representation. As Roy-Garibal has stressed, fundamental questions of liberty and authority, usage and the collective, were all reflected in these divergent approaches to recording the native tongue.[8] Directly and indirectly, thinking of this kind is explored in Johnson's work.

From precedent to praxis in Johnson's *Dictionary*

'*Nous vivons dans un siecle que l'on peut appeller le siecle des Dictionnaires. Jamais on ne vit tant de ces sortes d'Ouvrages*', wrote Augustin Calmet in 1722 in the opening 'Epitre' to his *Dictionnaire Historique, Critique, Chronologique, Géographique et Littéral de la Bible*. Writing to Samuel Richardson in 1754, Johnson made a similar observation for English, too.[9] Often celebrated as the 'father of the English dictionary', he had some 500 predecessors whose work served, in various ways, to document the vernacular. For the consortium of booksellers who, in 1746, commissioned Johnson's lexicographic work, there was nevertheless a self-evident gap. Hitherto absent, for example, was the selective remit and the discourse of regulative control that had inspired the productions of national academies elsewhere. An English dictionary of this kind, as the bookseller Robert Dodsley argued, was 'a Work which of all others we most want'.[10]

---

[6] Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, I, 73.

[7] On Johnson as translator, see further pp.**, and also James Gray, 'Arras/Hélas! A Fresh Look at Samuel Johnson's French'. In *Johnson After Two Hundred Years*, ed. Paul Korshin (Philadephia: University of Philadelphia Press 1986), 79–98; on his 'zeal for Languages', see Samuel Johnson to William Drummond, 13 August 1766, *The Letters of Samuel Johnson* ed. Bruce Redford (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), I, 270.

[8] Marine Roy-Garibal, *Le Parnasse et le Palais: l'oeuvre de Furetière et la Genèse du Premier Dictionnaire Encyclopédique en Langue Française (1649–1690)* (Paris: Champion, 2006), 19.

[9] Samuel Johnson to Samuel Richardson, 28 March 1754, *Letters of Samuel Johnson*, I, 79.

In principle therefore, Johnson's lexicographic enterprise was firmly directed to this end. Lord Chesterfield, secured by Dodsley as patron for Johnson's work, was, as by David Mallet, recognized as a quasi-Richelieu whose 'academy for the *French* tongue …still flourishes to the advantage of his country, as well as to the peculiar honour of his own name'.[11] Meanwhile, in a 'puff' that Chesterfield produced for Dodsley's journal *The World* in 1754, Johnson was duly positioned as dictator, implementing a 'lawful standard of our language' and ruling over a world of English words. 'Good order and authority are now necessary', Chesterfield proclaimed. Linguistic democracy was, he added, rightly ceded in political modelling of this kind: 'I hereby declare that I make a total surrender of all my rights and privileges in the English language, as a free-born British subject, to the said Mr. Johnson, during the term of his dictatorship'.[12] French, as Chesterfield also noted, had hitherto 'spread … over most parts of Europe' – a process 'always reckoned among the glories of the reign of Lewis the fourteenth'.[13] English, granted a new and regulative control courtesy of Johnson's work, was, he suggested, poised to secure similar advance. Here, too, discourses of nation, language, and power visibly intersect.

The extent to which Johnson's *Dictionary* really resembled the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Françoise* (1st edn. 1694) is, however, an interesting question. Both are reference works, interested in codification and a quality of linguistic precision applied to meaning and the use of words. Johnson's title-page formally draws attention to the usage of the 'best writers'; the *Dictionnaire* is distinguished by its determined selectivity, and informed both by its commitment to 'pur' usage and the Académie's stated desire to 'nettoyer' French. The *Dictionnaire*, however, in its first edition of 1694, also aimed to remove forms indicative of ordinary and popular use from representation. Authority – and a desire to consolidate (and fix) a legitimate language – were moreover validated by the 'Immortels' rather than empirical scrutiny. As Considine observes, the *Dictionnaire* registered 'good usage known to the academicians …even if no evidence for it was to be found in approved authors'.[14]

---

[10] [Robert Dodsley], 'Review of *The Plan* of a DICTIONARY of the English Language', *The Museum: Or, the Literary and Historical Register* 3 (1747), 389.
[11] David Mallet, *Amyntor and Theodora: or, the Hermit* (London: Paul Vaillant, 1747), iii.
[12] [Philip Dormer Stanhope, Lord Chesterfield]. Letter to *The World* No.100, 28 November 1754, 601-2.
[13] Ibid., 602.
[14] John Considine, *Academy Dictionaries 1600-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 32. On the early history of the *Dictionnaire*, see Michael Fitzsimmons, *The Place of Words: The Académie Française and Its Dictionary during an Age of Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

Meanwhile, agreed areas of omission centred on words or meanings judged to be regional, archaic or obsolete, or connected with 'low' registers such as trade and commerce, as well as those betraying undue foreign influence. Science was another area of targeted omission. 'Bon usage' had a cultural as well as normative base.

Johnson, in his *Plan of a Dictionary*, dedicated to Chesterfield, and published in 1747, can undoubtedly reveal some of these same aspirations. Nevertheless, in principle and in praxis, we can also detect a rather different stance in which a characteristic Johnsonian 'doubleness' – marked by what Parker describes as an equally characteristic capacity for 'sceptical thinking' -- comes into play.[15] The 'chief intent' of Johnson's *Dictionary* might therefore be acknowledged as 'to preserve the purity and ascertain the meaning of the English idiom'. Its subsequent description as a process that 'seems to require nothing more than that our language be considered so far as it is our own' is, however, on closer reading, charged with doubt rather than certainty.[16] Doubleness attends both 'intent' (a quality Johnson defines as 'Anxiously diligent' in ways which do not necessarily augur success) and 'seem', a word freighted with its own epistemic distancing, and further reified by the conspicuous shift into the subjunctive that Johnson also makes at this point ('seems to require nothing more than that our language be considered' or, likewise, that 'the words and phrases …found in the works of those whom we commonly stile polite writers, be selected'). An iterated tension in the *Plan* between what one might 'hope' or 'wish', versus what one might legitimately expect, serves the same purpose. 'To correct the language of nations by books of grammar, and amend their manners by discourses of morality, may be tasks equally difficult; yet as it is unavoidable to wish, it is natural likewise to hope, that your Lordship's patronage may not be wholly lost', Johnson writes, directly addressing Chesterfield while drawing attention to the national remit of his stated task. We might, he states, indeed 'wish' that words as the 'fundamental atoms of our speech might obtain the firmness and immutability of … constituent particles of matter, that they might retain their substance while they alter their appearance, and be varied and compounded, yet not destroyed'. Yet, as Johnson also makes plain, 'this is a privilege which words are scarcely to expect; for, like their author, when they are not gaining strength, they are generally losing it'. Language, in this light, is

[15] Fred Parker, *Scepticism and Literature: An Essay on Pope, Hume, Sterne, and Johnson* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 232.
[16] Samuel Johnson, *The Plan of a Dictionary of the English Language; Addressed to the Right Honourable Philip Dormer, Earl of Chesterfield* (London: J. and P. Knapton, 1747), 4.

quintessentially bound to mutability rather than stasis. It is, he states, ‘the work of man, of a being from whom permanence and stability cannot be derived’.[17]

As here, prescriptive desiderata affirmed by the Académie are both evoked and undercut while principles of inclusion and underlying methodologies intriguingly echo not those favoured by the Académie Française but critical aspects of those affirmed – and adopted – by Furetière and his lineal successors in the *Dictionnaire Universel* (*DU*).[18] Even Johnson’s early modelling of his projected work confirms, for example, a conscious problematization of the role, and methods, he will assume. ‘When I first conceived the design of compiling a new Dictionary of the English Language, ~~the first question~~ Words ~~to be considered~~ is it did not appear by what rule or by what marks of Distinction the words are to be chosen’, an extant manuscript draft of the finished *Plan* affirms. ‘Whether the work is to comprise only those words which are used in the general intercourse of Life, and which are to be found in the writings of Orators, Historians and those ~~such~~ authours which ~~as~~ are usually … termed polite or whether it should take in the Language of particular professions, which generally derive their terms as with their arts from other nations?’, is identified as a further quandary that he faced.[19] Other versions, marked by their own patterns of revision and elision, depict the dictionary-maker as poised, Janus like, between conflicting routes into knowledge. In one, as the ‘slave of science’, he is shackled, bound to evidence of usage, and the factual investigation of words and meaning. In the other, his ‘shackles’ shed, he is at liberty to pursue the ‘phantoms of desire’ by which language might indeed be subject to his will, and statis secured by prescriptive control.[20]

Johnson’s finished *Plan* (alongside the *Dictionary* itself) offers a reprise of these dilemmas, alongside certain aspects of their resolution. An ‘exact and pure idea of a grammatical dictionary’ is, he acknowledges, one that, on the model of the Académie, privileges ‘the works of those whom we commonly stile polite writers, without including the terms of particular professions’.[21] Nevertheless, for Johnson, as for Furetière, questions of

---

[17] Johnson, *Plan*, 18.

[18] Antoine Furetière, *Dictionnaire Universel, contenant generalement tous les Mots Francois tant Vieux qui Modernes, & les Termes des Sciences & des Arts*. 2 vols. (Rotterdam: La Haye, 1690). Henceforth *DU*.

[19] Samuel Johnson, ‘A Short Scheme for Compiling a New Dictionary of the English Language’, in Samuel Johnson, *Johnson on the English Language*, eds. Gwin J. Kolb and Robert DeMaria, Jr. (Yale: Yale University Press, 2005), 379.

[20] Johnson, *Johnson on the English Language*, 461-2.

[21] Johnson, *Plan*, 4.

wider utility (and readership) repeatedly intervene. ‘The value of a work must be estimated by its use’, Johnson stresses: ‘It is not enough that a dictionary delights the critic, unless at the same time it instructs the learner’.[22] Notion of cultural elitism are undercut by a further metaphor: ‘it is to little purpose, that an engine amuses the philosopher by the subtilty of its mechanism, if it requires so much knowledge in its application, as to be of no advantage to the common workman’. As in the *DU*, mines, shops, and manufacture are all presented as spaces that can and should claim linguistic attention. ‘It seems necessary to the completion of a dictionary design’d not merely for critics but for popular use, that it should comprise, in some degree, the peculiar words of every profession’, Johnson states, here in a form of inclusivity (and commitment) that clearly runs counter to the principles of the Académie.[23] Lexicography on this model, he elaborates, hence requires ‘that the terms of war and navigation should be inserted so far as they can be required by readers of travels, and of history; and those of law, merchandise and mechanical trades, so far as they can be supposed useful in the occurrences of common life’. Johnson’s *Dictionary* is marked by its extensive use of field labels in a breadth of reference that reaffirms the consonance of language and knowledge, wherever this might be located. Register attributions (‘in architecture’, ‘in heraldry’, ‘in chymistry’, ‘in printing’, among many others) accompany both entries and sense-division. If Johnson’s ‘Preface’ of 1755 regretfully confirms that he had not been able systematically to represent terms of ‘art and manufacture’, it nevertheless remained true that ‘what favourable accident, or easy enquiry brought within my reach, has not been neglected’.[24]

Johnson’s practice in relation to the diction of science and technology effects other forms of critical distance. The fact that the ‘academicians of France’ had ‘rejected terms of science…in their first essay’ is, for example, adduced only to confirm Johnson’s diametrically opposed course. ‘It would’, he adds, ‘surely be no proof of judgment to imitate them in an error which they have now retracted, and deprive the book of its chief use by scrupulous distinctions’.[25] *Scrupulous*, as in his *Dictionary*, deftly directs attention to that which is ‘nicely doubtful’ if ‘hard to satisfy in determinations of conscience’. It is that ‘given to objections’ and, as such, merely ‘captious’ (‘given to cavils’ or, as Johnson elucidates under *cavil*, to ‘false and frivolous objections’).

---

[22] Johnson, *Plan*, 5.
[23] Johnson, *Plan*, 7.
[24] Johnson, ‘Preface’, C1^{v}.
[25] Johnson, *Plan*, 5-6.

Other pragmatic concerns intervene in relation to loanwords and the borders of inclusion. 'If foreign words' are excluded, Johnson warns, the resulting dictionary will sacrifice utility such that it can 'be little regarded, except by critics, or those who aspire to criticism'.[26] Academies, as his 'Preface' of 1755 confirms, might indeed 'have been instituted, to guard the avenues of language' from unwarranted incursions of this kind. But, as he concludes, 'their vigilance and activity have hitherto been vain'. Rather than being fixed, Johnson makes plain, French itself has 'visibly changed under the inspection of the academy', a fact confirmed by the second edition of its *Dictionnaire* in 1718.[27] Even as a dictionary 'hastens to publication', as he observes, language – whether French or English -- is always 'budding' and 'falling away' – an itself an image which, in its comparison of the speed of language change with that of lexicographical composition, provides its own echoes of Furterière.[28] Garrick's rhetorical excursus on the Académie Française can, in this light, seem strikingly misplaced. Johnson had, in effect, triumphed only in that he had produced a dictionary that was, in practice and design, distinct from that of the 'Immortels' in fundamental ways.

Johnson and the 'Dictionaria Gallica'

Johnson's knowledge of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Françoise*, in its various editions, is evident across the *Plan* of 1747 (and its antecedent drafts), as well as the completed *Dictionary* of 1755. Particularly interesting in this respect, however, is the evidence that can also be garnered of Johnson's reading within French lexicography of the late 17TH and 18TH centuries, and its own processes of dissent (and resistance) in relation to the Académie's remit of purism and control. Johnson had, for example, ample opportunity to scrutinize the second edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Françoise* (1718) in working on the catalogue of the Harley collection during the 1740s (immediately before he began work on his own lexicographic project). As Korshin notes, Johnson's work on the Harliean collection produced what was 'probably the most important library catalogue of the eighteenth century',[29] a five-volume conspectus of published scholarship deriving from the vast library

[26] Johnson, *Plan*, 5.
[27] Johnson, 'Preface', C2^{r}.
[28] Johnson, 'Preface', C2^{v}. On possible antecedent images, see Furetière's discussion of the shaving speed of Martial's barber whose clients were shaved so slowly that the hair on one side of the face had regrown before the second side was completed.

[29] Paul Korshin, 'Johnson and the Renaissance Dictionary', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 35 (1974), 301.

of Edward Harley, second Earl of Oxford, which had been purchased by the bookseller, Thomas Osborne in 1742.

Osborne's decision to publish a critical and 'uncommon' catalogue, written by Johnson and the bibliographer (and antiquarian) William Oldys,[30] has, in this, its own significance. Work on the catalogue clearly facilitated, for Johnson, an intimate knowledge of 'an international sea of books'-- including a vast collection of some 345 dictionaries, spanning the early Renaissance to the early 18TH century.[31] As Johnson's *Proposals* for the catalogue stressed moreover, comparative reading was integral to the organizational principles which were to be adopted. 'Books shall be distributed into their distinct Classes, and every Class ranged with some regard to the Age of the Writers [such] that every Book shall be accurately described', he stated in 1742: 'the peculiarities of Editions shall be remarked, and Observations from the Authours of Literary History occasionally interspersed, that, by this catalogue, we may inform Posterity, of the Excellence and Value of this great Collection, and promote the Knowledge of scarce Books, and elegant Editions'. The *Catalogue*, Johnson hoped, was not merely a list, but would ''be purchased as a Record of this great Collection, and preserved as one of the Memorials of Learning'.[32]

While the final *Catalogue* fails in a number of ways to live up to the 'promise, large promise' that Johnson sets out in the *Proposals*,[33] it does nevertheless indubitably place him in the company of what he described as 'the best and scarcest dictionaries and lexicons', comprising a diverse conspectus of methodologies and approaches, modern and classical, British and European. His preference for studying rather than merely cataloguing the books in the Harley collection has, for example, become a set piece in Johnsonian biographies. Chastised by Osborne for his misplaced diligence, Johnson is reputed to have retaliated using a handy folio as weapon – variously identified as the *Biblia Graeca Septuginta* or, as in the

---

30 [Samuel Johnson], *Proposals for printing, by subscription, the two first volumes of Bibliotheca Harleiana: or, A catalogue of the library of the late Earl of Oxford. Purchased by Thomas Osborne, bookseller, in Gray's-Inn* (London, 1742), i.

31 DeMaria, *Life of Samuel Johnson*, 97.

32 [Johnson], *Proposals*, 8.

33 See e.g. Alex Wright, 'From Francis Bacon's Historia Literarum to Samuel Johnson's Literary History The *Catalogus Bibliothecae Harleianae* (1743–1745)', in *Libraries, Books, and Collectors of Texts, 1600-1900*, ed. Annika Bautz, James Gregory (New York: Routledge, 2018), 139. On the 'promise, large promise' of advertising, see Samuel Johnson, *The Idler*, Saturday, 20 January 1759, in *The Idler and The Adventurer*, eds. W. J. Bate, John M. Bullit, and L. F. Powell, 2nd edn. (Yale: Yale University Press, 1970), 125.

Donald and Mary Hyde Collection, as the *Tēs theias graphēs* (a work that does, however, have the advantage of a direct provenance in the Harley collection).[34] Johnson's familiarity with Estienne's *Dictionnaire François-Latin, autrement dit les Mot François* (Paris, 1549), as Considine argues, begins at this point.[35] Johnson would, Korshin notes, also have encountered e.g. Constantine's *Lexicon Graecolatinum* (1592) in which quotations (and the salience of evidence) already confirm key aspects of the methodologies that Johnson would adopt in making his own work.[36]

Of particular interest for the present chapter, however, is Johnson's reading and construction of the list of 'Dictionaria Gallica' presented in Volume II of the *Catalogue.*[37] Here, for example, is the work of Bayle and Nicot, Richelet and Abel Boyer (whose *Dictionnaire Royale Français et Anglais* (1st edn. 1699) was used extensively by Johnson in his early work as a translator).[38] It documents, too, the *Nouveau Dictionaire de l'Académie* Françoise (Paris, 1718) – a work that is duly placed alongside the *Dictionnaire Universel, contenant generalement tous les Mots Francois tant Vieux qui Modernes, & les Termes des Sciences & des Arts, reccuelli & compilé par Antoine Furetière,* published in three volumes in 1701 and revised, and 'augmentée', by Henri Basnage de Beauval (henceforth *DU* 1701). The 'Dictionaria Gallica' include, too, the *Dictionnaire Universel Françoise & Latine, autrement appelle de Trevoux* (in five volumes in an edition dated 1721, henceforth *DU* 1704), as well as, say, Jaques Savary de Bruslons and Louis-Philemon Savary's *Dictionnaire Universel de Commerce, d'Histoire Naturelle & des Arts & Métiers* (in the first edition published in Paris in 1723) – and another text that Johnson clearly found of interest as a

---

[34] See Paul Korshin, 'The mythographies of Johnson's *Dictionary*', in *Anniversary Essays on Johnson's Dictionary* ed. Jack Lynch and Anne McDermott (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), The copy in the Hyde Collection includes the inscription "This is the identical book with which Dr. Johnson knock'd down Osborne the bookseller & bought by me at Harleian sale". See https://library.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/static/onlineexhibits/johnson/books/6_4.html.

[35] John Considine, 'The Lexicographer as Hero: Samuel Johnson and Henri Estienne' *Philological Quarterly* 79 (2000), 205–24.

[36] Korshin, 'Johnson and the Renaissance Dictionary', 304.

[37] Samuel Johnson and William Oldys, *Catalogus bibliothecæ Harleianæ, in locos communes distributus cum indice auctorum.* Vol.II. (London: Thomas Osborne, 1743), 990-92.

[38] On Johnson's use of Boyer, see Samuel Johnson, *A Commentary on Mr. Pope's Principles of Morality, or Essay on Man* ed. O. M. Brack (Yale: Yale University Press, 2004), xliii.

source in his own work.[39] English lexicons within the Harley collection -- such as Ephraim Chambers's *Cyclopaedia: or, An Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*, the title of which (as well as the preface, and methodology) made plain his own debts to Furetière, or John Harris's similarly encyclopaedic *Lexicon Technicum* (likewise sub-titled *An Universal Dictionary of the Arts and Sciences*)[40] -- provided other models. 'I come, like an heir, to a large patrimony, gradually raised by the industry and endeavours of a long race of ancestors', Chambers declared of the collective industry displayed by his predecessors on both sides of the Channel. No lexicographer, he argued, worked in isolation. 'The French and Italian academists, the abbe Furetiere, the editors of Trevoux, Savary, Chauvin, Harris, Wolfius, Daviler, and others' have, he added, all 'contributed their share'.[41]

Chambers was, in his own right, an important part of Johnson's intellectual 'patrimony'; the 1741 edition of the *Cyclopaedia* recorded in the Harleian catalogue, is, we might note, that which Johnson subsequently deployed as a source-text in the *Dictionary* (see e.g. Johnson's entries for *architecture*, *arithmetic*, or *astrolabe* in which attributions to Chambers are made overt). Nevertheless, Johnson's reading at this point also constructs a 'patrimony' in which 'patrie' includes France as well as Britain, alongside a visible commitment to words 'tant vieux que modernes', alongside those deriving from 'les sciences' and 'les arts', as well as colloquial and everyday usage, on the liberal principles affirmed by Furetière in 1690 and in Basnage's expanded *DU* of 1701. Chambers's own opposition to the restrictive nature of academy discourses has, of course, its own significance. 'How many Years were the *French* Academists, to the Number of Forty the choicest Wits in *France*, in composing their Dictionary? How often did they alter the Plan of it; and yet, when finish'd how many Faults did Furetière find in a single sheet publish'd as a Specimen', as Chambers declared in his *Considerations* of 1733.[42] Nevertheless, the direct acquaintance with Basnage's text, facilitated for Johnson during his work on the Harliean collection, is equally suggestive. Like its own lineal ancestor, this stressed the salience of 'abondance' rather than selectivity, and polysemy rather than fixity across a range of registers; as for Furetière, 'bon Francois' demonstrably comprises not merely elite writers but, say, the terms of law or

---

[39] See further pp.**.
[40] The Harleian library contained the second revised edition (1710) of Harris's *Lexicon Technicum*, and the revised 5th edition of Chambers's *Cyclopaedia* published in 1741.
[41] Ephraim Chambers, *Cyclopædia: or, an Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*. 5th edn. (London: James and John Knapton, 1741), ii.
[42] Ephraim Chambers, *Some Considerations Offered to the Publick, Preparatory to a Second Edition of Cyclopaedia: or, An Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences* (London: 1733), 3.

architecture, travel or that of the 'homme de guerre'. Basnage's engagement with discourse across a range of levels, with usage labels applied accordingly, is equally interesting. As Basnage stated within his 'Preface', 'On a cru que pour bien remplir le titre de *Dictionnaire universel*, il fallait qu'on y pût apprendre à parler poliment, aussi bien qu'à parler juste, & dans les termes propres à chaque Art'.[43] Lexicography, seen in this light, might be made 'universel' in its range of reference, alongside the forms of knowledge it sought to represent, but guidance on polite use was not excluded. What was important was that usage and meaning should be seen as contextual rather than absolute.

Further innovations centred, for Basnage, on the use of illustrative citations against the unspecified but autocratic 'bel usage' of the Académie. 'Je les cite tous également', he writes of his chosen authorities in his 'Preface'. As Williams contends, Basnage was 'clearly less interested in the 'excellency' of the quoted authors, than in their efficiency in illustrating a semantic nuance' within a given context or register, whether technical or that pertaining to ordinary, and indeed, colloquial, use.[44] Furetière's holistic approach to the language available for record ('Les termes des Arts et des Sciences sont tellement engagés avec les mots communs de la Langue …il n'est pas plus aisé de les separer que les eaux des deux rivières à quelque distance de leur confluent') was thereby both validated and extended. Seen in this light, being 'universal' could, for Johnson, present a range of interesting propositions in relation to the source texts one might use, the borders of inclusivity (and exclusivity) one might observe, as well as the state of language that might duly emerge from approaches of this kind. Basnage's emphasis on the location (and diversity) of authority within the supporting evidence he provided in his entries was, for example, undeniably impressed on Johnson. 'Enfin mon livre (si j'ai quelque droit de l'appeller ainsi) est beaucoup plus sçavant que moi', Basnage stated with marked humility in his 'Preface'. 'Perhaps I may at last have reason to say, after one of the augmenters of Furetier, that my book is more learned than its author', Johnson echoed in his *Plan* of 1747.[45]

Johnson's related comment that 'I have determined to consult the best writers for explanations real as well as verbal' is, in this, equally worthy of note.[46] The distinction that

---

[43] Antoine Furetière, *Dictionnaire Universel, Contenant Generalement tous les Mots François tant Vieux que Modernes, & les Termes des Sciences et des Arts* (Rotterdam: La Haye, 1701), n.p.

[44] Geoffrey Williams, Ioaana Galleron, Clarissa Stincone, 'Announcing the Dictionary: Front Matter in the Three Editions of Furetière's *Dictionnaire Universel*', Proceedings of the XIXth EURALEX Congress 2021, Democritus University of Thrace (2020), 395.

[45] Johnson, *Plan*, 21.

[46] Johnson, *Plan*, 21.

Johnson adduces between ‘explanations real’ and ‘explanations … verbal’ presents a further affirmation of his interest in ‘universal’ models of lexicography in which things as well as words receive attention. Chambers, as we have seen, is regularly appropriated as one such source for ‘explanations real’, particularly in the early sections of Johnson’s *Dictionary*. So, too, however, as the final part of this chapter will explore, are a range of French sources, including what Johnson variously labelled as the ‘*Trevoux*’, or the *D. Trevoux*, or the *Trev. Dict*., or the contracted (and clearly familiarised) ‘*Trev*.’. As Grimes notes, ‘Trevoux’ serves as a quasi-generic signifier or ‘common name’ in Johnson’s *Dictionary*.[47] Reference spans, as we will see, Furetière’s original text to a range of later editions. It appears, however, within over fifty entries, in ways that signal a striking integration of French authority in Johnson’s work, in relation to citation, defintion, and etymology. The *Dictionnaire de l’Académie Françoise* can, we might note, play a similar role. But this is, in practice, limited to a single entry – that for *virelay* or ‘A sort of little ancient French poem, that consisted only of two rhymes and short verses, with stops’ as Johnson explains, duly crediting ‘*L’Acad.*’ (even if the ‘stops’ identified as a characteristic feature suggest perhaps an imperfect rendering of the original French: ‘Sorte d' ancienne petite poësie Françoise qui est toute sur deux rimes, & de vers courts avec des refreins’).

Johnson and the register of words

Johnson’s interest in encyclopaedism, in practice as well as theory, is, in this respect, a significant factor. As he indicates, he was formally committed to a dictionary ‘common or appellative’, one which excluded, by design, proper names (an important departure from e.g. the methodology espoused in the 1704 ‘Trevoux’, or in British predecessors such as Nathan Bailey’s *New Universal Etymological English Dictionary* (1721) where entries for e.g. *Abingdon* or *Carfax* recorded place names amid the features of local geography and habitation. In principle, the entries in Johnson’s *Dictionary* were to ‘limit every idea by a definition strictly logical’, such that the intellectual history of a subject was omitted, while verbal illustration took precedence over the visual illustrations that were preferred e.g. by Harris. Nevertheless, as Lynch notes, ‘hundreds of entries are longer than simple definition

[47] [Brian Grimes], ‘Samuel Johnson Dictionary Sources’. See https://www.sjdictionarysources.org/trevoux-dictionnaire-de-trevoux.html. Accessed 22 November 2021.

demands'; as such, they are, he adds, 'more in keeping with our notion of an encyclopaedia than a dictionary'.[48]

As Lynch records, many of these drew on Johnson's reading of English sources such as Chambers's *Cyclopaedia*, or Harris's *Lexicon Technicum*, or Phillip Miller's *Gardeners Dictionary: Containing the methods of cultivating and improving the kitchen, fruit, and flower-garden, as also the physic-garden, wilderness, conservatory, and vineyard* (in its 3rd edition by 1748), or Joseph Moxon's *Mechanick Exercises: or the Doctrine of Handy-Works*, the source of evidence within entries for words such as *doorcase* and *handvice,* or *iron*, *jack*, and *jamb*. All were part of a wider process by Johnson adapted and appropriated information from a diverse range of texts while reshaping it for the circumstances, and readers, envisaged for his own work. Chambers, as source text, appears almost 200 times. Harris's evidence appears on over 250 occasions. 'Johnson's *Dictionary* was among the most encyclopedic of English dictionaries because many of his definitions are themselves encyclopedic', Lynch concludes.[49]

It is, however, equally plain that French source texts could, for Johnson, perform the same function. Like the evidence he redeploys from Chambers's *Cyclopaedia*, there is a tendency for these to predominate in the opening sections of the alphabet – a point at which Johnson was, among other things, less impacted by the pressures of space that later informed the need to 'clip close' or compress the source texts he chose to include.[50] The *Dictionnaire Universel de Commerce* by Jacques Savary des Bruslons and Louis-Philemon Savary-- a work 'in high Reputation throughout all Europe', as Postlethwayt affirmed[51] -- is, for example, the source of nine entries which appear under the first two alphabetic divisions of Johnson's *Dictionary*. All were nouns, predominantly deriving from the natural world and understanding of this (*acacia*, *alabaster*, *aloes*, *amethyst*, *ammoniac*, *anchovy*, *bezoar*, and *bitumen*). As Lynch confirms, Johnson's embedded encyclopedic material tends to cluster in three main categories: a) those which, in various ways, provide an explanation of 'complicated artifacts' such as *air pump* or *orrery*; b) those which elucidate 'natural objects and phenomena'; c) those which deal with words pertaining to human institutions and fields

---

[48] Jack Lynch, 'Johnson's encyclopedia', in *Anniversary Essays on Johnson's Dictionary* ed. Jack Lynch and Anne McDermott (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 129.
[49] Lynch, 'Johnson's encyclopedia', 135.
[50] On Johnson's 'clipped' texts, see Lynda Mugglestone, *Samuel Johnson and the Journey into Words* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 88-9.
[51] Malachy Postlethwayt, *The Universal Dictionary of Trade and Commerce Translated from the French of the Celebrated Monsieur Savary* (London: John and Paul Knapton, 1751), 'Dedication'.

of learning.[52] *Bilander* (< *bélandre*), referring to a sailing vessel and also taken from the *Dictionnaire Universel de Commerce*, might therefore be an outlier in relation to Johnson's other importations from this text but it, too, resonated with other forms of practical and geographic knowledge that readers might find of use.

Postlethwayt's translation of the *Dictionnaire du Commerce* appeared mid-way through Johnson's work on his own *Dictionary* but Johnson's preferred source text was clearly the original French. As for *bilander*, for example, Johnson's definition ('A small vessel of about eighty tons burden, used for the carriage of goods. It is a kind of hoy, manageable by four or five men, and has masts and sails after the manner of a hoy. They are used chiefly in Holland, as being particularly fit for the canals') draws closely on Savary's phrasing ('Petit bâtiment de mer, du port d'environs 80 tonneaux, qui sert au transport des marchandises. C'est un espèce de heu, qui se conduit par quatre ou cinq hommes seulement ….'), rather than the expansiveness and amplification that Postlethwayt reveals. Johnson's use of Antoine Calmet's *Dictionnaire Historique* can reveal related patterns. A translation, by Samuel D'Oyly and John Colson, was published in 1732. 'We, who think we cannot do him too much Honour, believe we cannot pay a greater Compliment to him, than by introducing him into our Country', Colson and D'Oyly declared: he 'has, for some years, made so considerable a Figure in the Common-Wealth of Learning. His Reputation is as universal as his Genius'.[53] Johnson clearly agreed. Encyclopaedic entries such as *bat* and *bath* (sense 4) show a close resemblance to D'Oyly and Colson's work. The latter is, for example, identical in both ('A sort of Hebrew measure, containing the tenth part of an homer, or seven gallons and four pints, as a measure for things liquid; and three pecks and three pints, as a measure for things dry'), as is, say, *catholick* (sense 4). Entries such as those for *blessing* (sense 5), *euroclydon* ('A wind which blows between the East and North, and is very dangerous in the Mediterranean. It is of the nature of a whirlwind, which falls suddenly on ships, makes them tack about, and sometimes causes them to founder, as Pliny observes'). and *swan* conversely derive from the original French, having been omitted from the translated text. Johnson was, in reading for the *Dictionary*, engaged in a work that, as he declared, based on 'English literature' and 'English words'. But, he was, for the same purposes, also reading in French, and collecting French evidence accordingly.

---

[52] Lynch, 'Johnson's encyclopedia', 137.

[53] John Colson and Samuel D'Oyly, *An Historical, Critical, Geographical, Chronological, and Etymological Dictionary of the Holy Bible*. 3 vols. (London: J. J. and P. Knapton, 1732), 'Dedication'.

‘The importance of translation in Johnson’s scheme to establish himself as a man of letters can hardly be stressed too much’, writes Kaminski.[54] Chambers, as his title-page confirms, had made use of texts ‘in several languages’, duly transposing such material into English in the interests of increasing knowledge within the native tongue. Johnson, in effect, followed the same procedure. Johnson’s use of French translation within the *Dictionary* might hitherto have been neglected but, as Kaminski stresses, translation was a longstanding aspect of his authorial practice, evident in his earliest publications such as *A Voyage to Abyssinia* (1735), which drew on Joachim Le Grand's *Relation Historique d'Abissinie*, or the translation of Jean Pierre de Crousaz's *Commentaire sur la traduction en vers de M. Abbé Du Resnel, de l'Essai de M. Pope sur l'homme*, published as *A Commentary on Mr. Pope’s Principles of Morality, or Essay on Man* in 1742.

Significant, too, however, are the working methods of compression, adaptation, and abridgement that such translations reveal. For Johnson, methods of this kind were long-established. As his work on the *Gentleman’s Magazine* from the late 1730s confirms, he routinely translated and abridged work published in Europe (including in French. Johnson’s earliest lexicographic work -- assisting Robert James in the *Medicinal Dictionary, including Physic, Surgery, Anatomy, Chymistry, and Botany, together with a History of Drugs* that was published by Thomas Osborne in 1743-45 – provides similar evidence. As Kaminski observes, this onsists ‘largely of translations, abridgements, and extracts from the best-known medical tracts of the day’, including, for example, the encyclopedic *Histoire de la Médecine* by Daniel le Clerc, published in the Netherlands in 1723.[55] In ‘contracting arguments, relations, or descriptions, into a narrow compass’, as Johnson wrote in the *Gentleman’s Magazine*, abridgements ‘benefit mankind by facilitating the attainment of knowledge’. Compression can be a virtue, such that, he adds, instruction is facilitated, without ‘fatiguing the attention’ while wider understanding is enhanced via ‘the easier propagation of knowledge’.[56]

Johnson’s use of French and French sources within his *Dictionary* consolidates, and extends, these ideas. Lynch observes, for example, that Johnson’s encyclopedic borrowings ‘were rarely mechanical’. Instead, he notes, Johnson ‘selected and reworked his material

[54] Thomas Kaminski, *The Early Career of Samuel Johnson* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 81.
[55] Kaminski, *Early Career*, 173.
[56] Samuel Johnson, ‘Considerations [by the late Dr. Samuel Johnson] on the Case of Dr. T[rapp’s] Sermons, Abridged by Mr. Cave’ (1739), *Gentleman’s Magazine* VLVII (1787), 556.

meticulously and with the needs of the common reader in mind'.[57] As in the examples from Savary and Calmet already discussed, patterns of adaptation and compression are conspicuous. Matter judged extraneous to Johnson's purposes is excised, entries are routinely shortened, while definition is adjusted to the contextual demands of Johnson's text. Selections from the 'Trevoux' are similar. Johnson's entry for *brugion* (< Fr. *brugnon*) contains, for example, an imported definition credited to 'Trevoux' ('A sort of fruit between a plum and a peach'), but the underlying text, identical in both *DU* 1701/ 1704 ('…Fruit à noyau qui est une espece de pêche, qui a une peau rouge et deliée, qui a la chair pleine d'eau, & qui est d'un goût exquis. Il meurit au mois de Septembre…') has been condensed to its essentials. Similar is e.g. Johnson's entry for *ermine* (< *hermine*). The fact, given alike in *DU* 1701/1704, that 'Pline dit que c'est la depouille d'un rat du terroir de Pont en Asie' is omitted. Meanwhile, other aspects are given in full in ways that attest Johnson's close dependence on his stated source: 'An animal that is found in cold countries, and which very nearly resembles a weasle in shape; having a white pile, and the tip of the tail black, and furnishing a choice and valuable fur. The fellmongers and furriers put upon it little bits of Lombardy lambskin, which is noted for its shining black colour, the better to set off the whiteness of the ermine'.[58] As in the *Considerations* Johnson crafted for the *Gentleman's Magazine*, knowledge is facilitated but the 'narrow compass' required by a dictionary is carefully observed.

Johnson and the Dictionnaire Universel

With the exception of *pennached* (an adjective, Johnson explains, 'applied to flowers when the ground of the natural colour of their leaves is radiated and diversified neatly without any confusion', and based on a more expansive entry for *panacher* in the *DU* 1701/1704), Johnson's importations from the 'Trevoux', are, like those from Savary and Calmet, all nouns. They fall, in similar ways, into the categories that Lynch observes. Entries such as that for *agouty* (defined as 'an animal from the Antilles'), *amber*, and *ambergris* denote aspect of the natural world as do e.g. imported entries for *curlew*, *morel*, and *scammony* (< *scammonée*), defined as 'A concreted resinous juice, light, tender, friable, of a greyish-brown

[57] Lynch, 'Johnson's encyclopedia', 138.
[58] 'Animal qui se trouve dans les pays froids, qui approche de la figure d'une bellette, & dont le poi lest blanc, & le bout de la queue noir, & qui founit une fourriture precieuse …Les Pelletiers & Fourreurs la mouchettent & tavellent de petits morceaux d'agneaux de Lombardie renommez par leur noir luisant, pour faire paroistre advantage la blancheur de l'*hermine*' (*DU*, 1701/ 1704).

colour, and disagreeable odour. It flows upon incision of the root of a kind of convolvulus, that grows in many parts of Asia'.[59] Other entries pertain to human institutions and learning, and draw on terms reflective of literature, the arts, and architecture. 'Il est certain qu'un Architecte parle aussi bon François, en parlant de plintes et de stilobates, et un homme de guerre, en parlant de casemates, de merlons et de sarrasines; qu'un Courtisan en parlant d'alcoves, d'estrades et de lustres', as Furetière had declared, setting out a mission statement in defense of inclusivities of this kind.[60] Here, too, Johnson clearly agreed. An entry for *alcove* (defined as 'A recess, or part of a chamber, separated by an estrade, or partition of a column, and other correspondent ornaments; in which is placed a bed of state, and sometimes seats to entertain company') again overtly draws on the stated authority of 'Trevoux'. Nevertheless, while a number of its defining elements can be found e.g. in *DU* 1704 ('C'est la partie d'une chambre qui est separée par une estrade, & par quelqes colonnes, ou ornemens d'Architecture; on y place d'ordinaire le lit ou des sieges'), the latter's emphasis on an *alcove* as 'un lieu retiré' (shared also by Basnage in *DU* 1701) reveals an obvious difference from Johnson's text. Instead, as comparative reading confirms, it is Johnson's reading of Furetière's work (in which an *alcove* is a location '…ou on place d'ordinaire le lit, ou des sieges pour recevoir une compagnie') which underpins the phrasing that is, in translation, replicated in Johnson's chosen definition.

In Johnson's *Dictionary*, entries for *rotundo* and *lunette* document other architectural terms, while *rondeau* and *roundelay* derive from literature, *massicot* and *bistre* from art ('terme de Dessinateur' writes Furetière for the latter, in another definition closely echoed in Johnson's text).[61] Meanwhile, entries such as *treillage* and *trellis* derive from gardening, and mathematical and scientific terms are evident in e.g. *circle*, *rhomb*, *tangent*, and *sursolid* ('The fourth multiplication or power of any number whatever taken as the root', Johnson writes, providing an attribution to 'Trevoux' while subjecting the corresponding entry to considerable economies of form). Meanwhile *comet* (<*comete*) derives from astronomy, and words such as *plastron* from fencing (here in a definition in which the challenges of

[59] The underlying entry in the *DU* (1701/1704) is, however, markedly more expansive.
[60] Antoine Furetière, *Receuil dea Factums* ed. Chalres Assselineau (Paris: Oulet-Malassis et la Broise, 1859), 1, 188.
[61] *Massicot*: 'ceruss calcined by a moderate degree of fire; of this there are three sorts, the white, the yellow, and that of a golden colour, their difference arising from the different degrees of fire applied in the operation. White massicot is of a yellowish white, and is that which has received the least calcination; yellow massicot has received more, and gold-coloured massicot still more; all of them should be an impalpable powder, weighty and high-coloured: they are used in painting'.

translation are overt): ‘A piece of leather stuffed, which fencers use, when they teach their scholars, in order to receive the pushes made at them’ (compare DU 1690: ‘…ces cuirs rembourrez, dont les Maîtres d'escrime se servent, quand ils donnent leçon, pour recevoir les bottes qu'on leur porte’).

As this suggests, Johnson’s textual practices are complex, drawing on a range of editions that were available to him and his amanuenses in work in Gough Square. Furetière’s original text of the *DU* does not, for example, contain entries for *agouty*, *armardillo*, or, e.g. *benzoin* (<*benjoin*), though Johnson’s entry for the latter replicates – in English – Basnage’s revised text of 1701 and its own replication in the ‘Trevoux’ of 1704, while *armadillo* closely echoes the entry for *armadelle* in *DU* 1704, rather than Basnage’s 1701 entry for *tatou*. A new entry for the word *furbelow* (< *falbala*) which appears in the fourth edition of Johnson’s *Dictionary* (1773) serves moreover to confirm his enduring engagement with the *DU* as source text in his work, and the practice – and precedent – for definition that this provides. Johnson’s explication might be condensed in relation to the French original, but its critical stance is retained: ‘A piece of stuff plaited and puckered together, either below or above, on the petticoats or gowns of women. This, like a great many other words, is the child of mere caprice’.

Textual status varies in other ways, too. Dictionaries, writes Luna, ‘are by their nature structure-rich’ such that they require and deploy ‘a repertoire of typographic presentations’ which ‘map on to commonly-found structural elements’.[62] Italicization in Johnson’s *Dictionary*, for example, routinely conveys additional aspects of signification and use. Applied to headwords, it marks out words that are considered unnaturalized; ‘It will be proper to print those which are incorporated into the language in the usual character, and those which are still to be considered as foreign, in the Italick letter’, Johnson writes.[63] Patterns of this kind duly attend his imported ‘Trevoux’ entries for e.g. *trellis* and *treillage*, *massicot* and *lunette* while the ‘usual character’ confirms assimilation in other French-derived entries from the same source, as e.g. for *harlequin* and *rondeau*.

Italicization can, however, reveal other interesting patterns. As already indicated, for example, entries for e.g. *alcove* or *rotundo* exhibit what are, in essence, transplanted

---

[62] Paul Luna, ‘Not just a pretty face: the contribution of typography to lexicography’, *Proceedings of the 11th EURALEX International Congress, 6-10 July 2004, Lorient, France,* ed. Geoffrey Williams and Sandra Vessier (Université de Bretagne-Sud: Faculté des lettres et des Sciences Humaines, 2004), 847-58.

[63] Johnson, *Plan*, 7.

definitions which, via translation – whether by Johnson or his amanuenses – perform the same explanatory role in Johnson's work as they had done in the *DU*. In similar ways, the 'petit animal de la Virginie' in *DU* (1701)/(1704) -- absent from *DU* 1690 -- reappears in Johnson's entry for *assapanick* as 'A little animal of Virginia, which is said to fly by stretching out its shoulders and its skin, and i**s** called in English the flying squirrel. *Trevoux*'. If the relevant mechanism of flight differs by accident or design ('On dit qu'il vole en étendant ses jambes & sa peau', the *DU* affirms), it remains, in Johnson's work, the sole explication on which readers must rely. Translated authorities can, as this entry attests, reveal varying competencies; *camelopard*, another exotic attributed to 'Trevoux', clearly occupies a no-man's land between French and English while suggesting perhaps the intervention of one's of Johnson's dictionary assistants ('An Abyssinian animal, taller than an elephant, but not so thick. He is so named, because he has a neck and head like a camel; he is spotted like a pard, but his spots are white upon a red ground. The Italians call him *giaraffa*', rendering 'Animal qui se trouve dans l'Abyssinie. Il n'est pas si gros que l'élephant, mais il est beaucoup plus haut. On l'appelle ainsi à cause qu'il a la tête & le cou comme les chameaux, & qu'il est tacheté ainsi que les leopards…' (*DU* 1701/1704).

Other embedded (and translated) extracts attributed to 'Trevoux' can, however, display a different sort of authority in Johnson's text. Johnson's attention to 'authority', and his embedding of illustrative evidence to support the uses he describes, remains an important aspect of his work, while his attention to typographic structuring meant that definitions and illustrative uses are distinct. The former are typically unindented, either following (on the same line) the headword and etymology, or following a numbered sense-division. In contrast, evidence used as an illustrative authority within an entry is distinguished textually (a) by the lay-out (citations are always indented) and (b) by the italics which, within each citation, draw attention to uses of the relevant word or sense such that e.g. an extract from Shakespeare's *Othello* illustrates *cinder* ('I should make very forges of my cheeks,/ that would to *cinders* burn up modesty') while one from *Measure for Measure* illustrates *cipher* ('Mine were the very *cipher* of a function'). Nevertheless, it is perhaps surprising to find extracts attributed to 'Trevoux' serving the same function, complete with indentation and italicized use of the relevant headword. As in Johnson's entry for *civet*, defined as 'A perfume from the civet cat', it is the *DU* which provides the supporting illustrative ('The *civet*, or *civet* cat, is a little animal, not unlike our cat, excepting that his snout is more pointed, his claws less dangerous, and his cry different…'). Similar is e.g. *libration* where the selected (and indented) extract

amplifies meaning alongside its italicized illustrations of use (‘*Libration* is the balancing motion or trepidation in the firmament, whereby the declination of the sun, and the latitude of the stars, change from time to time…These kinds are called, the one a *libration* in longitude, and the other a *libration* in latitude. Besides this, there is a third kind, which they call an apparent *libration*…’). Yet such samples of usage have their being only via a translation into English, from an underlying French text, crafted for the purposes of the *Dictionary*, and written by an intermediary – whether Johnson or one of his assistants.

Evidence of this kind offers, in effect, an intriguing form of trans-national hybridity – a paradoxical authority of usage in which French has, for the purposes of Johnson’s text, become English in form, while retaining the illustrative force of the original text. Similar images of trans-nationalism, we might note, also attend Johnson’s intricately blended entries in which, for the purposes of lexicography, the evidence of the *DU* might, as under *rhomb* or *bivouac* be fused with information taken from the corresponding entry in Harris’s *Lexicon Technicum*, with both texts credited accordingly. Chambers serves a similar function under *comet* or *amonum*, in forms of patrimony (and unwitting collaborative endeavor) crafted for the purpose of Johnson’s text. The intermingling of different French texts – such that Savary and the *DU* are combined in Johnson’s crafting of evidence in e.g. *ammoniac* and *acacia* is equally worthy of note. As Allen Reddick has argued, to think of lexicography in terms of an ‘exclusive focus upon single authorship denies the true nature of the creation of works. Instead, he contends, ‘they should be more accurately described as social, communal, dynamic, the result of a process of exchange’.[64] Knowledge and its transmission has, in this sense, no borders, in ways of which Furetière would undoubtedly approve. For Johnson, French, and French texts, are thereby repeatedly granted authority across the *Dictionary*, while the authority of the *DU* (in a range of editions) can inform etymology, the extrapolation of meaning, or usage itself. While this provides additional testimony for Johnson’s processes of reading and collection of evidence, it offers further confirmation of the needful displacement of the partisanship, and French resistance, that popularly informs comment on his work. Instead, evidence of this kind suggests a number of intriguing counter-narratives which warrant further investigation and research.

[64] Allen Reddick, ‘Revision and the limits of collaboration: hands and texts in Johnson’s *Dictionary*’, in *Anniversary Essays on Johnson’s Dictionary* ed. Jack Lynch and Anne McDermott (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 212.