

**Palimpsests of Knowledge, Feast of Words:
Antoine Furetière's *Dictionnaire universel***

by
Kathryn A. Hoffmann

Les temps de foi aveugle sont passés sans retour;
on ne croit plus que sous bénéfice d'inventaire. Mais
comment se diriger dans cet effroyable dédale de toutes
les connaissances humaines?

Grand dictionnaire universel du XIX^e siècle (Préface, LXV)

Antoine Furetière, in his long battle with the French Academy over the right to publish his *Dictionnaire universel*, made the rather surprising assertion, for the seventeenth century, that language belonged to all men, that the exclusive *privilège* held by the Academy constituted a monopoly: "Croit-elle en venir à bout par un vrai monopole, en s'attribuant la propriété des paroles qui appartiennent à tous les hommes?" (*Recueil des Factums* I: 311). He insisted that the public had an intrinsic right to a language that belonged to it as much as the elements: «Mais enfin il y a des Privileges qui sont tout-à-fait injustes et odieux, comme sont les monopoles par lesquels un particulier se veut attribuer à lui seul le profit et le commerce d'une chose qui appartient au Public: tel que seroit celui d'un Marchand qui seul voudroit acheter tous les grains d'une Province, ou qui ôteroit au peuple la liberté de puiser de l'eau dans les rivières. Tel est celui de l'Academie qui veut ôter au Public la liberté du langage et la permission d'en écrire, parce que la parole appartient autant au peuple que l'usage des élémens». Within Furetière's argument there arose the portrayal of the Academy as a seigneur exercising rights it did not have, a criticism of ownership of knowledge that was unjust in its deprivation of individual rights. Furetière declaimed: "Qui est-ce qui les a constituez Juges en Israël? Par quelles Patentes se sont-ils rendus maîtres et propriétaires de mots communs de la Langue, et des Proverbes?" (I: 237; I: 347). The project of the *Dictionnaire universel* wrote itself within a reverie of liberation from the monopolies of old.

Furetière proposed, as many lexicographers would after him, that knowledge would grow as texts multiplied, that the public was to choose the sources of knowledge it preferred, that public judgment was inextricably interwoven in the amelioration of human knowledge. He wrote: "Si la coutume étoit venuë d'obtenir des privileges exclusifs pour traiter quelque science ou quelque art particulier, on ne verroit plus une multiplicité de livres sur un même sujet;

ils sont pourtant nécessaires, non seulement pour les avoir à meilleur prix, mais aussi pour faciliter l'intelligence des Auteurs, et dans la diversité de leurs opinions pouvoir choisir la meilleure" (*Recueil des Factums* I: 7). He declared that multiple projects would make language "riche et abondante" instead of "pauvre et disetteuse" (I: 11). He offered the public the power of its approbation: "ils [the academicians] ont cherché de la protection chez les puissances, qu'ils ne devoient chercher que dans l'approbation publique" (I: 166). He also offered the public the power to transmit itself to the future. Furetière claimed that the *Dictionnaire universel* would "conserver la Langue toute entière à la posterité, et sauver du naufrage le rebut de l'Academie" (I: 16). Unlike the Academy's dictionary, choosing only the words the academicians deemed correct, Furetière's dictionary would pass the full language of the century on to posterity. Furetière claimed, in his first circulated factum against the Academy, that his dictionary was "plus ample et plus instructif qu'aucun autre qui ait paru jusques à présent" (1: 2). Instruction, according to Furetière, rose from plenitude. The full dictionary, like the full plate, offered the seductions of completion and satiety. The Academy's dictionary was incomplete and thus unsatisfying, Furetière claimed, a project interminably prolonged like the beard that eluded the efforts of Martial's sluggish barber.¹ Not offered up to the public for the pleasure of consumption, it remained private and unused, a scripting in silence for the perverse pleasure of the academicians. His own dictionary, public and full of the noise of its formation, was both useful and pleasurable, a scripting for public amusement and instruction, full of noises that the Academy's dictionary had attempted to silence. Implicit in Furetière's dictionary was not only a criticism of corporative ownership of language by the Academy, but a project of knowledge set up as public feast, a celebration of knowledge and its power, served up in the tracings of lexicography.

To look at the politics, the methodology and the pleasures of education in language offered by the *Dictionnaire universel*, I will concentrate here on one definition. It is that of a newly popular and exotic drink from the New World, that in seventeenth-century France, was causing consternation on fast days.

CHOCOLATE. s. m. Confection ou mélange de drogues dont on fait un breuvage, & même un remede, qui nous est venu des Espagnols, qui l'ont apporté des Mexicains, chez lesquels ce mot de chocolate signifie simplement *confection*. D'autres disent que c'est un mot Indien composé de *latté*, qui

signifie de l'eau, & de *choco*, mot qui est fait pour exprimer le bruit avec lequel on le prepare, comme témoigne Thomas Gage. Sa base ou principale drogue est le *cacao*, fruit d'un arbre du même nom. Anthoine Colmenero de Ledesma Chirurgien Espagnol en a fait un Traitté, & voicy la composition qu'il en fait, qui est la plus usitée.

Sur un cent de cacao on mesle deux grains de chile ou poivre de Mexique, ou en sa place du poivre des Indes, une poignée d'anis, de ces fleurs qu'on appelle petites oreilles, ou dans le pays *vinacaxtlides*, & deux autres qu'on nomme *mecachusie*, ou au lieu de celles-cy, la poudre de six roses d'Alexandrie, appellées *roses pâles*, une gousse de campesche, deux drachmes de canelle, une douzaine d'amandes & autant de noisettes d'Inde, & la quantité d'achiotte qu'il faudra pour luy donner couleur. Toutes ces plantes sont decrites par de Laët. On broye le tout, on en fait une paste ou conserve avec de l'eau de fleur d'orange, qui le durcit fort; & quand on en veut prendre, on le delaye dans de l'eau bouillante avec un moulinet.

Il n'en faut pas boire durant les jours Caniculaires, ni de celuy qui est frais fait depuis un mois. Le Pere Escobar dit qu'étant pris en liqueur, il ne rompt point le jeusne, quoy que ce soit un mets tres-nourrissant. Le Cardinal François Marie Brancaccio en a fait un Traitté particulier pour soustenir la même opinion, quoy que Stabbe Medecin Anglois ait fait un autre Traitté qui montre qu'on tire plus d'humeur nourrissante d'une once de *cacao*, que d'une livre de bœuf, ou de mouton. Il est si commun en la nouvelle Espagne, qu'il consume par an plus de 12 millions de livres de sucre. Les Espagnols estiment que la derniere misere où un homme puisse estre réduit, c'est de manquer de *chocolate*, car c'est leur boisson ordinaire. Ils ne la quittent que quand ils peuvent avoir quelque autre boisson qui enivre. On dit qu'il aide à la digestion, qu'il rafraischit les estomacs trop chauds, & qu'il eschauffe ceux qui sont trop froids. Mr. Du Four a aussi fait un Traitté du *Chocolate*, du Thé & du Caffé. Barthelemy Maradon Medecin Espagnol a condamné l'usage du *chocolate*. Chaque

livre de *chocolate* vaut à Mexique 52 s. (*Dictionnaire universel*, 1690 ed.)

The definition is hybrid; of the type often found in Furetière's compendium of words and things, histories and curiosities, texts and opinions. Not only an inventory of words and their explanations, origins, derivations, arrangements and usages, Furetière's work is an encyclopedic revelry around the *thing*. The dedicatory epistle to a later edition explained the slip away from the realm of language: "Comme on a pris à tâche d'expliquer les termes de tous les Arts et de toutes les Sciences, on a eu soin en expliquant ces termes d'éclaircir ce qu'il y a de plus curieux et de plus utile dans les Sciences et dans les Arts mêmes; en sorte que cet ouvrage est une vraie Encyclopedie, digne de porter le titre de *Dictionnaire universel*" (1727 ed.). In the definition of chocolate, jumbled together in the knots of the lexicographic net and lying beside the definition and the etymologies are the fragments of chocolate's extra-linguistic existence: its history and usage, a recipe, a summary of medical opinion on its nutritive value, remarks on its use on fast-days and the attendant religious controversy that was causing Jesuit ink to flow. Even the cost of chocolate and the significant economic impact of its consumption on the country of Spain are indicated. Through them a referent comes into view, dragged up from the far away shores of Mexico and brought across the border from Spain; an exotic being caught in the net of the encyclopedic dictionary, held by the hook of its word-signifier.

The fragments of the chocolate-referent are not, significantly, dragged in alone. Furetière's definition is also a bibliography, its revelation of knowledge an exercise in palimpsestic lexicography. Colmenero de Ledesma, Gage, Escobar, Brancaccio, Stubbe, Dufour and Marradon: every major contributor of the period to the historical, medical and religious discussion of chocolate is called overtly to sight in this writing around the word-thing. In the act of lexicographic net-tossing, other nets are dragged into view as well; those of authorities and of compilers of curiosities whose texts already enveloped the referent in their own entangled networks of knots. Knowledge, in France's first encyclopedic dictionary, slid in among the layerings of texts. The *Dictionnaire universel* probed the texts of others to glean its substance, guarantee its history, confirm the testimony of its own scriptings.

It takes only a brief detour along the strands of the net of texts on chocolate to catch the points where scriptings crossed and

knotted. Colmenero de Ledesma, claiming to have seen nothing ever published on chocolate, except something by an anonymous physician of Marchena (presumably Marradon) on its noisome digestive effects, published his *Curioso Tratado de la Naturaleza y Calidad del Chocolate* in Madrid in 1631, to, as he put it in the English translation: “defend this *Confection*, with Philosophical Reasons, against any, whosoever will condemne this Drinke, which is so wholesome, and so good, knowing how to make the paste in that manner, that it may be agreeable to divers dispositions, in the moderate drinking of it” (2). With its discussion of the origin and history of the chocolate, its use in the Indies, its attributes in the system of humoral medicine and a recipe for the preparation of the increasingly fashionable drink, Colmenero’s book gained a wider popularity as the century progressed, translated into English in 1640, French in 1643, Latin in 1644 and Italian in 1667, with repeated English, French and Italian editions variously in 1652, 1671, 1678, 1685, and 1694.

The following scriptor on chocolate was Thomas Gage, the voyaging Englishman who had been clandestinely trained as a Jesuit but taken his vows as a Dominican and then converted to Puritanism before he published his *The English-American his Travail by Sea and Land: or a New Survey of the West-Indias*, in 1648. Popular in England, with second, third and fourth editions in 1655, 1677 and 1699, it was translated into French and appeared under the titles *Nouvelle relation contenant les voyages de Thomas Gage dans la Nouvelle Espagne* (1663), *Nouvelle relation des Indes Occidentales* (1677, 1699) and as *Histoire de l’Empire mexicain représentée par figures. Relation du Mexique ou de la Nouvelle Espagne, par Thomas Gages [sic]* in 1663, 1696 and 1699. Inserted in the tale of a voyage to the New World as a Dominican, spiced with stories designed to show the depravity of the Catholics, were two sections on chocolate. One, in the chapter “Describing the Country of Chiapa” contained a lively tale of chocolate and ladies, interrupted Church services and a possibly murdered bishop, a story of which Gage claimed first-hand knowledge and which has since become a favorite among historians of gastronomy. I will return to it later. The other section, Chapter 11, entitled “Concerning two daily and common drinks or potions much used in the Indias, called chocolate and atole” is of more immediate interest, for it maintains a rather strange familiarity with Colmenero’s treatise.

Gage introduced his chapter with a tip of the hat towards Colmenero: “Chocolate being this day used not only over all the

West Indias, but also in Spain, Italy, and Flanders, with approbation of many learned doctors in physic, among whom Antonio Colmenero of Ledesma, who lived once in the Indias, hath composed a learned and curious treatise concerning the nature and quality of his drink, I thought fit to insert here also somewhat of it concerning my own experience for the space of twelve years” (151).² Yet Gage’s “somewhat” is misleading, for large sections of the chapter are only an unrevealed quotation from the 1640 English translation of Colmenero. Whole passages from Colmenero flood the English-American unchanged and without quotation marks. In a text preserved as history of experience, as vision of the New World scripted for the eyes of the old, an anterior text slides into sight, visible yet hidden by the voice of Gage. The eyes of the reader see Gage’s voyage through the text of Colmenero and unwittingly, read Colmenero in the presumed real experiences of the voyage. Knowledge that seems first hand is second-hand; history is an only partially revealed scripting of text on text. And reading follows the confusing lines of a doubled text.

As the man to whom Furetière refers as Du Four enters the scene, the scripting embeds itself further. His *Traitez nouveaux et curieux du café, du thé et du chocolate* appeared in 1671 in French and reappeared in 1685 with Latin and English translations in 1688, 1693 and 1699. Following in the tradition of Furetière’s dictionary, a treatise bearing the name “Dufour,” and several centuries of French and American catalogers who have accepted him as “Dufour, Philippe Sylvestre,” I will refer to the author of the treatise on chocolate as “Dufour” as well. Dufour is however, only a palimpsest of nomination. The British catalog him as “Sylvestre Dufour, Philippe, pseud. [i.e. Jacob Spon].” Dufour/Sylvestre Dufour/Spon writes over the traces of his name, his text writes unabashedly over the scriptings of Gage and Colmenero. The *Traité du chocolate* borrows so heavily from Colmenero in fact that the British Library cross-references several editions under Colmenero’s name, with the cataloger’s careful annotation “The treatise on chocolate compiled principally from the work of A. Colmenero de Ledesma.” Dufour himself was explicit. Mentioning his debt to Colmenero, Gages [sic] and Barthelemy [i.e. Bartolomeo] Marradon whose translated “Dialogue du Chocolate” he included at the end of his treatise, he added: “Je ne prétens pas d’encherir beaucoup sur ce qu’en ont dit ces messieurs qui paroissent en avoir été tres-bien informez. Je me contenteray d’être comme leur Echo ou leur Truchement, sans m’arrêter pourtant scrupuleusement à leurs termes, quand je croiray d’en avoir trouvé de plus expressifs, et

sans me rendre esclave de leurs sentimens, lors que des raisons fortes m'en detacheront" (307-8). Dufour's *Traité du chocolate* is a doubled text; the image of other texts is called to sight, enclosed in the treatise's mirror, made to reverberate within the confines of the printed page. Unlike Gage's scriptophagic text which devoured Colmenero's without the masks of passage-presence, Dufour often includes the telltale quotation marks. The marks border the texts of Colmenero and Gage, trailing alongside them for pages, containing and displaying the bordered text.

The *Traité* is not only carrier of other texts, but translator, interpreter, spokesman. Dufour's voice shuttles back and forth among the scriptings, *entremetteur* of texts at whose borders he will not be held. "Without however confining myself scrupulously to their terms": quotation gives way to paraphrase and to dissension; to the voice of the quoter interfering in the text, supplementing and altering, adding terms, refusing the slavery of intentionality. The echoing script will, when the sentiments of the author do not correspond with those of his source, detach itself from the earlier scriptings; elide the scriptings of old and substitute its own. It will form a true palimpsest on the page erased and cleared of former texts, write the law of its own presence on an eroded body now transformed into absence. The processes of quotation, paraphrase and revision share shifting borders where display and elision, grafting and amputation, metamorphosis and obliteration blend their conflicting processes.

Thus knowledge traced its strangely-convoluted paths. It followed the swirlings of a layered palimpsest, where the continual movement of pens over the same surface simultaneously obscured and revealed each other. It settled among the confused and intertwined lines where original traces were exposed or disappeared under the swirlings of the new; where hypertexts (the term is Genette's) parasited their predecessors or lost their own equilibrium, joined and fused with their models. As the *Dictionnaire universel* unabashedly revealed its sources, collecting, combining, paraphrasing, and distilling the curiosity of chocolate-truth, the reality of the referent became implicated in the continual crossing of the traces.

The encyclopedic dictionary was not, as a twentieth-century work on dictionaries declared, an affair of objectivity: "Les dictionnaires donnent une information objective d'intérêt général qui a valeur de vérité dans le système sémio-culturel des lecteurs" (Rey-

Debove 23). “Truth” might perhaps be seen as localizable, an effect of knowledge-power within a developed, pervasive and dominant conceptual framework in a given society. “Objectivity,” product of the dissimulation of personal intention and involvement, has always been the ruse of lexicography. It has entailed the artistic “revelation” of the referent as outside language, and, as centuries progressed, the progressive dissimulation of anterior works from which the lexicographer’s knowledge was gleaned. As if the information presented itself to the lexicographer lucidly, without intermediary, and as if the act of compiling in itself were not transformative and sense-producing. Yet the ruse is only at its inception in the seventeenth century. The *Dictionnaire universel* folds back the edge of its scripting to reveal the paths of its knowledge and the writers who scripted it. In the description on chocolate it allows for conflict of opinion not only on the etymology of the word, but on the nutritive value and appropriateness of the thing itself at fast-time. It blends fact (“il est si commun en la nouvelle Espagne qu’il consume par an plus de 12 millions de livres de sucre”) with popular stereotypes (“Les Espagnols estiment que la dernière misère où un homme puisse être réduit, c’est de manquer de chocolat”), gastronomical myth (“Il n’en faut pas boire durant les jours Caniculaires”) with ecclesiastical dispute (“Le Père Escobar dit qu’étant pris en liqueur, il ne rompt point le jeûne. . . . quoy que Stabbe Médecin Anglois ait fait un autre Traité qui montre qu’on tire plus d’humeur nourrissante d’une once de cacao, que d’une livre de bœuf ou de mouton”)³. Chocolate had, as yet, no objective truth, no sure etymology, no universally-accepted social or medical status. Object of exotic curiosity, the dictionary allowed the meanderings of scriptings on chocolate to be seen crossing the desk of the lexicographer. It allowed “truth” to slip in and out among the overlapping and dissenting voices of the authorities.

This is not to say that the *Dictionnaire universel* did not have rather distinct leanings on the notion of chocolate. As the palimpsests crossed and overlapped, some traces deepened and gained emphasis while others faded increasingly from sight. The *Dictionnaire universel* defined chocolate as a “confection ou mélange de drogues”. Although the translated term “confection” is from Colmenero, the definitional palimpsest is not a mere affair of textual tracings. In the definition of chocolate as confection or drug made into drink or remedy, the seeker of lexicographic “truth” enters into the seventeenth-century debate between Jansensists and Jesuits on fasts and dispensations. Furetière, by defining chocolate as a mixture of drugs, subtly endorsed the rulings of casuists who

proposed that food that was taken as medicine, rather than for the simple pleasures of the belly, would not break the fast. The act of lexicographic net-tossing caught the peculiar tracings of a socio-politics of eating.

What was barred, erased, and left unseen under the scripting of the definition was equally significant. Furetière merely mentioned, at the end of his definition, that Marradon had condemned its usage. What Furetière mentioned but elided was a popular seventeenth-century myth of chocolate as a drink of sensuality, of diabolism and of death. Bait of the devil, Gage called it, recounting a fascinating tale of a dispute between the chocolate-quaffing ladies of Chiapa and a Dominican Bishop who threatened them with excommunication, if they again had their favorite drink brought into his Church. The Bishop saw his Cathedral fill with swords as the gentlemen of Chiapa defended their ladies' rights to their chocolate against the hands of the priests and prebends. His church and then his coffers emptied as the insulted congregation took their cups and their purses to the cloister churches where nuns and friars were more accommodating to their tastes. Eventually, the obstinate Dominican found himself dead, killed, it was whispered, by a cup of the very chocolate which he had anathematized, for it could not agree with his body. His tale concluded: "The women of this city are somewhat light in their carriage and have learned from the Devil many enticing lessons and baits to draw poor souls to sin and damnation, and if they cannot have their wills, they will surely work revenge either by chocolate or conserves, or some fair present, which shall surely carry death along with it" (Gage 145). Aphrodisiac, useful prescription for "amorous conflicts," Stubbe thought it possible to deduce: "As for chocolate, how effectual it may be herein, I understand not by experience; but since the most amorous nations in the world drink it, it is very possible it may conduce thereunto much. It be the design of Physick to preserve nature and free her from superfluous collections of Humours; and nothing doth that better then [sic] Chocolate, as far as Venery is but the collection and ejection of a superfluity gathered in, and about the Testicles; without a doubt Physicians cannot decline to recommend it" (141). As an aphrodisiacal drink served to Montezuma before he crossed the threshold of his harem, as mysterious plant dominating the mythic terrestrial paradise of the New World, or as tool of the necromancers and the sorcerers, the cup of chocolate carried with it for centuries the complicitous odors of the boudoir and of hell; of dangerous pleasures succumbed to instead of deferred.⁴ Not surprisingly, Gage's name, and with it the trace of the scandalous

myth, the hint of desire and of the diabolic arrayed at the feast-table of the human collectivity, disappeared from the 1727 edition of the *Dictionnaire universel*, under the correcting eyes of the Jesuits of Trévoux.

So it was that the *Dictionnaire universel* treated its public to a feast of texts, to a spectacle of palimpsests embroidered over each other; some lines fusing and deepening in the repeated tracings of pens that wrote over each other, other lines erased or growing invisible when authority would no longer support them as truth. Knowledge was an affair of the consumption and the (in)digestion of scriptures, an affair of cuts, truncations, elisions, coverings, revelations, solderings, fusions, unions, furrows and spaces. It was an abominable scriptophagy, the Academy declared in its case against the *Dictionnaire universel*. They claimed it was based on their own work, stolen by Furetière from the home of a dead academician, combined with the manuscript of a dictionary by a certain lawyer Margane. It was a scriptophagy that had almost slipped into France in printed form because, the Academy suggested, Furetière must have left a blank space in the documents he had presented for the Academy's approval. He had gained his publishing rights fraudulently, they claimed, in the place of the parchment prepared for writing again. His dictionary, they said, was built in the illegal space of the palimpsest.⁵

The project of the *Dictionnaire universel* exposed the essential problematics of knowledge and its transmission to the public. Did knowledge lie in section and authority, in cuts and violence made to the scriptings of old; in the establishment of a final truth that was only a lie of power? Such was Furetière's depiction of the Academy's project. Or did it rise in convivial layerings where traces intersected and blended, lost their way in the heated overlappings and bifurcations, until strange hybrid monsters were born? So the Academy seemed to decry the *Dictionnaire universel*. Did these strange monsters please at the expense of the truth of authorship? Was the palimpsest a filthy beast, writhing on its belly, covering the scriptings of old with its own movements, mixing the traces, losing the way in the monstrosity of the combined present/absent trace? Such was the continual problem of knowledge formed in the overlapping place of the text.

Furetière and his dictionary were stationed at the doorstep of the bourgeois era. Finding the way through the labyrinth of human knowledge was the project the bourgeoisie would set for itself. It

would be in the realm of knowledge that the bourgeoisie would see its liberation from its tainted non-aristocratic past, and seek the logic of what it would transmit to the future. Implicit in the bourgeois development of knowledge was the solution to the bourgeoisie's irreparable lack of noble blood. Knowledge, for the bourgeoisie, would come to tie past and future, replacing noble blood, circulating through the social body. The eighteenth-century *Encyclopédie* would depict knowledge and virtue combined in an imagery of inheritance: "En effet, le but d'une Encyclopédie est de rassembler les connaissances éparses sur la surface de la terre, d'en exposer le système général aux hommes avec qui nous vivons, et de le transmettre aux hommes qui viendront après nous: afin que les travaux des siècles passés n'aient pas été des travaux inutiles pour les siècles qui succéderont; que nos neveux, devenant plus instruits, deviennent en même tems plus vertueux et plus heureux, et que nous ne mourions pas sans avoir bien mérité du genre humain" ("Encyclopédie"). By the next century, the break with the ideology of the past would become explicit. From the *Grand dictionnaire universel du XIX^e siècle*: "Nous l'avons déjà dit, tout le monde à notre époque, veut apprendre, connaître, savoir, juger, se rendre compte; on n'accepte plus les opinions toutes faites, qui se transmettaient, autrefois, comme un héritage, d'une génération ou d'une classe d'individus à l'autre; les préjugés ont cédé la place au raisonnement et à la critique, et, en toute chose, chacun veut exercer son propre contrôle, guidé par l'étude directe des faits et des doctrines" (LXV). Knowledge, the banisher of prejudices, the route to control, was to be the liberator from the plague of the Third Estate. "Vulgarisation," by the time of the 1866 *Grande Encyclopédie* would become a virtue, the sharing of knowledge with all: "*La Grande Encyclopédie* est une œuvre de haute vulgarisation. Elle se propose de constater l'état actuel de la science moderne, de dresser l'inventaire des connaissances humaines à notre époque" (i). In the world of the bourgeoisie rising to dominance, knowledge would be the province of a class that wrote a new myth of its own power. The contamination of base commodities would disappear in the swirlings of knowledge. Jourdain, in Molière's *Bourgeois gentilhomme* had claimed he would willingly be whipped for knowledge. At the doorstep of the bourgeois era, knowledge became a family history, a father written and transmitted, in the encyclopedias, to an ever more virtuous future.

University of Hawaii-Manoa

NOTES

¹ “Mais comme les Langues vivantes changent perpetuellement, il lui arrivera le même inconvenient que celui du barbier de Martial qui était si lent à faire la barbe, que tandis qu’il rasoit un côté, elle avoit le loisir de croître de l’autre.” See *Recueil des Factums*, I: 16.

² Unfortunately, Gage’s work has been modernized and expurgated, with several chapters and many of what the editor felt were “crude and offensive slanders of Roman Catholic priests and friars” deleted so as not to offend the sensibilities of Catholics (XVI). Luckily, chapter 12 is the only chapter to appear with at least its original sentence structure and grammar intact.

³ “Stabbe” is actually Henry Stubbe. His treatise was *The Indian Nectar, or a Discourse Concerning Chocolate*. In the U.S. he is generally catalogued as Stubbs.

⁴ All these myths were still told in the 19th century. Cf. art. “chocolat” in Pierre Larousse, *Grand dictionnaire universel du XIX^e siècle*.

⁵ For the full story of the Academy’s complaint, see “Lettre de l’abbé Tallement l’aîné, de l’Academie Française, sur le différent de Furetière avec cette Académie,” in *Recueil des Factums*, II: 347-60.

Works cited or consulted

- Colmenero de Ledesma, Antonio. *A Curious Treatise of the Nature and Quality of Chocolate*. Put into English by Don Diego de Vades-forte. London: J. Okes, 1640.
- Dufour, Philippe Sylvestre [ie. Jacob Spon]. *Traitez nouveaux et curieux du café, du thé et du chocolate*. 2e édition. Lyon: Jean Baptiste Deville, 1688.
- Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts, et des métiers*. Nouvelle impression en facsimilé de la première édition de 1751-1780. Stuttgart: Friedrich Frommann Verlag, 1966.
- Furetière, Antoine. *Dictionnaire universel*. 3 vols. La Haye and Rotterdam, 1690; rpt. Paris: SNL-Le Robert, 1978.
- _____. *Dictionnaire universel*. 4 vols. Corrigé et augmenté par Basnage de Beauval; revu, corrigé et considérablement augmenté par Brutel de la Rivière. La Haye: Pierre Husson et al., 1727.
- _____. *Recueil des Factums d’Antoine Furetière de l’Academie Française contre quelques-uns de cette academie*.

- Introd. Charles Asselineau. 2 vols. Paris 1858; rpt. England: Gregg International Publishers, 1971.
- Gage, Thomas. *Thomas Gage's Travels in the New World*. Ed. J. Eric S. Thompson. Norman: Univ. of Oklahoma Press, 1958.
- Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1982.
- Grand dictionnaire universel du XIX^e siècle*. Paris: Librairie Classique Larousse et Boyer, 1866 [-90].
- La Grande Encyclopédie, inventaire raisonné des sciences, des lettres et des arts*. Paris: H. Lamirault et Cie, [1886-1902].
- Larousse. *Grand Dictionnaire universel du XIX^e siècle*. Paris: Administration du grand dictionnaire universel, 1874; rpt. Geneva: Slatkine, 1982.
- Rey-Debove, Josette. *Étude linguistique et sémiotique des dictionnaires français contemporains*. Hague: Mouton, 1971.
- Stubbe, Henry. *The Indian Nectar, or a Discourse Concerning Chocolate*. London: Andrew Cook, 1662.