

**NICOLAS-ANTOINE BOULANGER'S *DICTIONNAIRE HEBREU-FRANÇAIS* (MID-18<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY) OR  
DECIPHERING THE ACCULTURATED VISAGES OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE**

Though a dictionary may not constitute the most agreeable reading, Boulanger's lexicon offers its reader its share of surprises. Through its pages, Boulanger's associations of Hebrew words with French idioms trace surprising linguistic genealogies from the Mesopotamian shores to the Seine River. The dictionary constitutes a window into Boulanger's (and, to some extent, into French intelligentsia's) imagination and representation of Biblical Hebrew language and culture. Every translation stands as a door-bridge between two worlds. In contextualizing the singularity of Boulanger's contribution to Hebrew lexicography in the age of the Enlightenment, the following paper hopes to articulate the bridge between 18<sup>th</sup>-century France and the Hebrew language as exemplified in Boulanger's lexicon. Through references to the Greek, Aramaic, French and Celtic languages, the dictionary carries an implicit thesis and shapes the acculturated visage of the Hebrew language.

One first faces a question of method: how should one read a dictionary. To J. Considine, dictionaries may be read as a novel, for "the history of lexicography is not the history of a series of texts reproducing each other and registering vocabulary in inhuman silence. It is, rather, a history of human activity."<sup>1</sup> He further argues that, "dictionaries have the sort of imaginative qualities that characterize poetry or fictional narrative" and invites to "look at the place of early modern dictionaries in the imaginations of their makers and readers (...) ask why lexicography was a heroic matter to a number of its practitioners (...) to think about the kinds of anxiety and pride and imagination and love that inform dictionaries."<sup>2</sup>

Thus is the route that this paper will follow in highlighting first the place of the *Hebrew-to-French Lexicon* in Boulanger's personal ideology. Secondly, the investigation will draw on the context of modern Hebrew lexicography to measure the singularity and contribution of Boulanger's work. Finally, moving to a more precise scale of analysis, one will investigate the linguistic imagination at play in the dictionary.

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Considine, "The History of Lexicography," in J. Considine (ed.), *Adventuring in Dictionaries: New Studies in the History of Lexicography*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010, p. xi.

<sup>2</sup> J. Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe. Lexicography and the Making of Heritage*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, p. 4-5.

## I. Reading the *Lexicon* in Light of Nicolas-Antoine Boulanger Philosophical and Scientific Writings

### *Modesty and Secrecy: the Life of a Quiet Philosopher*

The name of Nicolas-Antoine Boulanger is only remembered by specialists of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, P. Sadrin laments in his biography of the timid French philosopher to whom we owe the lexicon.<sup>3</sup> For the man who undertook the herculean task of collecting the translations of Hebrew words into French was not one prompt to reveal himself in public. Was it due to his modest origins? P. Sadrin writes,

It could hardly be said that he was born with a silver spoon in his mouth. His origins were so humble (his father was a paper merchant in the rue Saint-Denis in Paris) that little is known of him except the details in the short biography that Diderot devoted to him (*Extrait d'une lettre écrite à l'éditeur sur la vie et les ouvrages de m. Boulanger*): he was ugly, sickly and, in his early years, little inclined to study.<sup>4</sup>

Still,

after he left the Collège de Beauvais (...) Boulanger taught himself mathematics, architecture, and several ancient languages. By 1743, his knowledge was wide enough for the baron the Thiers to appoint him as his private engineer, entrusting him with the task of building the earthworks at the siege of Freiburg im Breisgau during the War of the Austrian Succession. In 1745, Boulanger joined the Corps des Ponts et Chaussées.<sup>5</sup>

Thus, one must imagine the philosopher carrying out his lexicographical work in the remaining time alongside his position as an engineer.<sup>6</sup> The fact that the dictionary never was printed is no surprise for a philosopher who was reluctant to publish (it seems that at the moment of this death, the majority of his works remained unpublished).<sup>7</sup> He unfortunately did not learn his lessons until

---

<sup>3</sup> P. Sadrin, *Nicolas-Antoine Boulanger (1722-1759) ou avant nous le déluge*. Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century 240. The Voltaire Foundation at the Taylor Institution, Oxford, 1986, p.1. P. Sadrin describes him as « un homme timide et secret. Il n'a laissé ni mémoires ni correspondance, et ses traités philosophiques ne font aucune place à la confidence. On est réduit, pour reconstituer l'histoire de sa vie, à quelques rares documents officiels et aux témoignages. »

<sup>4</sup> P. Sadrin, Boulanger, Nicolas-Antoine, in A. C. Kors (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Enlightenment*, vol.1, Oxford University Press, 2003, p.170.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Boulanger may have been exhausted both by his position and his studies. In his biographical account, Diderot narrates how he had been forced to retire from the Ponts et Chaussées in 1758. See his *Extrait d'une Lettre écrite à l'Editeur sur la vie & et les ouvrages de Mr. Boulanger*, p. xii, cited in P. Sadrin, *Nicolas-Antoine Boulanger (1722-1759) ou avant nous le déluge*, p.4.

<sup>7</sup> P. Sadrin, *Nicolas-Antoine Boulanger (1722-1759) ou avant nous le déluge*, p. 10.

he had to defend his ideas upon geological formations when they had been stolen by other, bolder, French thinkers of the time.<sup>8</sup>

*Writing Against the Current?*

Though Boulanger embodies the search for scientific accuracy typical of the Enlightenment, he represents a singular move from the period's attempt to "ruin the sacred character of Judeo-Christian religion by taking as their reference the relativism of opinions and manners and by spotting the tiniest inconsistencies in the mythologies in order to ridicule the proofs of God's existence through *consensus omnium*."<sup>9</sup> On the contrary, Boulanger "endeavored to show that this belief, like all others, was a product of the natural elements and of terror."<sup>10</sup> This view reflects a catastrophe theory of history that is the foundation of Boulanger's historical thinking. Though it may first appear naïve, it exemplifies Boulanger's eagerness to reason as a historian and a literary scholar. This eagerness surfaces in his lexicon especially when he comments upon Hebrew words in an ideological manner.<sup>11</sup>

*Boulanger's Article in the Encyclopédie*

Boulanger's devotion to reason further materializes in his article on the Hebrew language in the *Encyclopédie*. Though it is unfortunate that no absolute proof may demonstrate that the article is from Boulanger, P. Sadrin offers convincing clues that enable to draw connections between the article and one of his major works, *L'Antiquité dévoilée*.<sup>12</sup> The insistence upon the division of the history of mankind in two periods of time, ante-diluvium and post-diluvium, already appears in *L'Antiquité*. Man is nothing but a miserable animal, terrified by the memory of the Flood and driven by the necessity of survival.<sup>13</sup> Thus, the development of language itself bears the consequences of the punishments of Providence that may extinguish humanity in the blink of an

---

<sup>8</sup> P. Sadrin recalls the unfortunate scandal that made known the name of Boulanger to the French audience in May 1753. The publication in the *Mercure de France* of a letter from Mussard (a friend of Rousseau) makes use of Boulanger's geological theory. Surprised of not even being quoted and certain that the theory is his invention, Boulanger responds to the *Mercure* in a letter in June 1753. For the full narration of the episode, see P. Sadrin, *Nicolas-Antoine Boulanger (1722-1759) ou avant nous le déluge*, p.7-10.

<sup>9</sup> P. Sadrin, *Boulanger, Nicolas-Antoine*, p. 170.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> While translating לְיָפֵי, he associated the idea of beauty to that of perfection and completion. But, other examples could be found in the lexicon.

<sup>12</sup> Boulanger, Nicolas-Antoine, *L'Antiquité dévoilée par ses usages* [...], ed. P.Sadrin, t.ii (introduction, notes, bibliographies, index nominum, variantes), Paris, 1978.

<sup>13</sup> « (...) l'homme échappé au cataclysme n'est qu'un misérable, réduit à la condition animale, terrorisé par le souvenir de ses malheurs et tout entier occupé par les soins que lui impose la simple nécessité de survivre. » See P. Sadrin, *Nicolas-Antoine Boulanger (1722-1759) ou avant nous le déluge*, p.28-29.

eye. Boulanger thus writes in ‘Langue hébraïque’ that the Hebrew language must have evolved only after the earliest renewed ages of humanity, though the survivors of the destruction might have had a richer and more sophisticated language, itself a memory from the ante-diluvium world.

S’il étoit permis cependant d’hazarder quelques conjectures raisonnables, fondées sur l’antiquité même de cette langue & sur sa pauvreté, nous dirions qu’elle n’a commencé qu’après les premiers âges du monde renouvelé ; qu’il a pû se faire que ceux même qui ont échappé aux destructions, aient eu pour un tems une langue plus riche & plus formée, qui auroit été sans doute une de celles de l’ancien monde ; mais que la postérité de ces débris du genre humain n’ayant produit d’abord que de petites sociétés qui ont dû nécessairement être longtemps misérables & toutes occupées de leurs besoins & de leur subsistance, il a dû arriver que leur langage primitif se sera appauvri [...]. Jugeons donc quels terribles effets ont dû faire sur les premières langues des hommes, ces coups de la Providence, qui peuvent éteindre les nations en un clin-d’œil, & et qui ont autrefois frappé la terre, comme nous l’apprennent nos traditions religieuses & tous les monuments de la nature.<sup>14</sup>

Boulanger further insists that the study of the Hebrew language must be done “for the man who respects religion and good sense and who does not confuse the magic with the truth.”<sup>15</sup> Thus, it is as a historian and a literary scholar (“nous parlerons en historiens & en littérateurs”) that Boulanger carries the task of describing first the writing of the Hebrew language, its punctuation, the origins of the language and its evolution (“revolutions”<sup>16</sup>) both within the Hebrew people and other nations.

## **II. Nicolas-Antoine Boulanger’s *Hebrew to French Lexicon* and the Dawn of Modern Hebrew Lexicography**

Whether the acculturation of the Hebrew language is the result of Boulanger’s pedagogical tips in view of his audience<sup>17</sup> or of reflections springing from his personal ideology, it must be examined in light of other 18<sup>th</sup>-century Hebrew lexicons.

### *From the Works of Christian Hebraists to Boulanger*

Pre-modern lexicography was often the advocate of the sacredness of the Hebrew language. Dominating the field of Hebrew lexicography during the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Christian Hebraists “mostly

---

<sup>14</sup> Boulanger, ‘Langue Hébraïque’ (p.83b), cited in P. Sadrin, *Nicolas-Antoine Boulanger (1722-1759) ou avant nous le déluge*, p.28.

<sup>15</sup> Boulanger, ‘Langue Hébraïque’ (p.76), “(...) pour l’homme qui respecte la religion & le bon sens, & qui ne prend pas le merveilleux pour la vérité.”

<sup>16</sup> Boulanger, ‘Langue Hébraïque’ (p. 76).

<sup>17</sup> The question of audience is a difficult one that must be addressed. It is unclear whether Boulanger intended this dictionary to be of private personal use or if he aimed at publishing it. Determining the audience may, of course, impact the value of the following analysis for one cannot expect the same standards of composition.

followed the methods established by their predecessors in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. But signs of change began to appear.”<sup>18</sup> Boulanger’s method and philosophical grounding embody these signs, namely that of the introduction of methods of comparative linguistics.<sup>19</sup>

The lexicon is contemporary to the works of three outstanding Christian Hebraists: the Dutch scholar Albert Schultens (1686-1756), and the German scholars Johann Simonis (1698-1768) and Johannes David Michaelis (1717-1791). Schultens “published works on Arabic and Hebrew grammar as well as translations of Hebrew texts.” His work is characterized by “his wide knowledge of the Arabic language to define Hebrew terms,” thus earning him, as the title “Father of Modern Hebrew Grammar” as “a pioneer of a new linguistic method”<sup>20</sup> As for Simonis and Michaelis, they both “contributed further to the development of Hebrew linguistics during the second half of the eighteenth century.”<sup>21</sup> To Simonis, one owes “works on the Masorah, Hebrew grammar and lexicography” as well as “two Hebrew-Latin dictionaries”<sup>22</sup>: the *Dictionarium Veteris Testamenti hebraeo-chaldaicum*, published in Halle in 1752 and the *Lexicon manual hebraicum et chaldaicum* published in the same place in 1756.

#### *Philhellenism and the Primacy of Latin*

Though it is hard to prove how Boulanger might have had knowledge and use of these works, his lexicon demonstrates a similar application of comparative linguistics, notably of Hebrew with Arabic, Celtic, Syriac and Greek. For instance, in the case of א, Boulanger had presented its linguistic genealogy from the Greek in his “observations,” stating that the name “aleph” probably came from the Greek letter’s name “alpha.” These observations seem to demonstrate if not a kind of philhellenism, at least a capacity to create linguistic genealogies and comparisons. To Boulanger, the letter א functions as a vowel in a similar way in Egyptian and Arabic.

This move constitutes only one aspect of the ideological context of his dictionary. The second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century witnessed major changes in the study of the Hebrew language in

---

<sup>18</sup> S. Brisman, *History and Guide to Judaic Dictionaries and Concordances*. Volume Three, Part One of Jewish Research Literature, Hoboken: Ktav, 2000.

<sup>19</sup> For a possible earlier use of comparative linguistic, see Sophie Kessler-Mesguich. “Hébreu, arabe et araméen chez quelques auteurs juifs (Xe-XIe siècles) et chrétiens (XVIe-XVIIe siècles).” In: *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*, tome 23, fascicule 2, 2001. Dix Siècles de Linguistique Sémitique. pp. 13-37.

<sup>20</sup> S. Brisman, *History and Guide to Judaic Dictionaries and Concordances*, p. 63-64.

<sup>21</sup> S. Brisman, *History and Guide to Judaic Dictionaries and Concordances*, p. 64.

<sup>22</sup> S. Brisman, *History and Guide to Judaic Dictionaries and Concordances*, 64.

France. The establishment of the Hebrew chair at the Sorbonne in 1751 led to the first Hebrew grammar composed in French by Ladvoat for his students in 1755.<sup>23</sup>

The importance of the French language organizes the arrangement of Boulanger's lexicon. Since the Latin alphabet organizes the entries, the "observations" concerning the letter "a" comprise two Hebrew letters: א and ו. To Boulanger, these letters are not treated as consonants, rather as vowels, which leads him to introduce in his "observations" the function of the letter ה that changes the pronunciation of both א and ו. A little further, the letter "c" stands for three Hebrew consonants: "cheth ה, caph כ and quoph ק." Once again, Boulanger combines the presentation of the Hebrew alphabet with his knowledge of Greek: the Hebrew letter כ is the ancestry of the Greek kappa κ. Its numeral value is 20 and 500 for the final caph ך. Boulanger asserts that it is from this letter כ that the Greeks entrusted the κ with the numeral value 20, while the Latin form of the letter "c" results from the reversed Hebrew ך.<sup>24</sup>

The lexicon makes use of the principles of Latin grammar to explain any changes of spelling and the variations of letters. For instance, Boulanger uses the Latin cases (nominative, accusative, ablative and genitive) to explain analogies between the Arabic and the Hebrew alphabets, namely the changing place of the *dagesh*. The Latin alphabet remaining the organizing principle of the lexicon, the entries are not arranged by roots, rather by their transliterations. This leads to the repetition of the same verb in several of its conjugated forms.<sup>25</sup>

Philhellenism further emerges in Boulanger's associations of Hebrew words with Greek mythology. The myth of Orpheus pervades the translations of entries page "org-orz." Boulanger finds in the term "orpat" and its derivative "toraph" an allusion to Orpheus. The translation of "toraph" as "il est pris, déchiré" and "parah" as "déchirer" recalls « Orphée pris et déchiré par les

---

<sup>23</sup> See M. Hadas-Label, "Les études hébraïques en France au XVIIIe siècle et la création de la première chaire d'Écriture Sainte en Sorbonne," *Revue des études juives* 144(1-3), 1985, pp. 93-126, and "Hebrew linguistics by christians in 18th century France" (in Hebrew) *Brit Ivrit Olamit* 6, 1988, pp. 45-50. See also her *Histoire de la langue hébraïque: Des origines à l'époque de la Mishna*. Paris / Louvain: Peeters, 1995. For further reference, I refer the reader to Sophie Kessler-Mesguich. "Aspects et tendances de l'enseignement de l'hébreu en France, du Moyen Age à la fin du dix-septième siècle". *Pardès* 12 (1990):108-121 ; see also the bibliography in her "Hébreu, arabe et araméen chez quelques auteurs juifs (Xe-XIe siècles) et chrétiens (XVIe-XVIIe siècles)". *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 23.2 (2001):13-37.

<sup>24</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all quotations from the dictionary come from the three-volume manuscript of Boulanger, Nicolas Antoine. *Dictionnaire Hébreu-français*, 1740, available at the Pitts Theology Library Manuscripts Special Collections. Other languages may also be of use: Boulanger explains the use of the change of the letter "d" into "g." in ancient Gaul and Spain. "Les anciens Gaulois et espagnols changeoient ausfi le D en g." He further gives the examples of "Carthada" evolving into "Chartaga."

<sup>25</sup> See the user's guide for a detailed analysis.

bacchantes » (Orpheus taken and torn apart by the Bacchantes). Similarly, he sees in the term « haraph » translated as « décapiter » a possible allusion to “Orphée décapité par les bacchante et la tete jette dans un fleuve” (Orpheus decapitated by the Bacchantes and thrown away in a river). But, Boulanger also connects these terms with another possible allusion, that of Orpheus as a doctor, builder of Thebes: “Orphée grand medecin, il a bati thebes, et les pierres se remmoient elle emes, et s’unisfoient ensemble,” he inscribes in the left column.

### **III. Linguistic Imagination at Play in Boulanger’s *Lexicon***

When the reader opens Boulanger’s dictionary, he encounters a schematic organization: a set of “observations” introducing each letter.<sup>26</sup> The letter “g” opens with a couple of comments, probably written for pedagogical uses. Boulanger stresses the need not to confuse the letters ג and ל. After referring to the numerical value of the letter, Boulanger goes on to explain a few references to the rabbinic use of ל and the corresponding Greek letter γ, thus demonstrating a combination of his knowledge of the Greek language and the different stages of the Hebrew language, from biblical to its rabbinic variations.

#### *Mnemonic Devices and Creative Semantic Domains*

Boulanger seems to favor mnemonic devices to help the reader memorize the meaning of Hebrew words. His translation of “gam” (גַּם) as “aussi, même” is set aside the translation of “am” as “people,” though one doubts any lexical connection between both entries. In another instance, “gamal” (גַּמַּל), translated as “rendre le bien ou le mal” is associated with “גַּמְלָה” translated as “chameau,” itself associated with “amal” (“travailler”). The correlation between work and camel seems to make more sense than the one between camel and returning good or evil.

However surprising these associations may be, they may result from a different source than the organization of mere pedagogical devices designed to help the reader. In associating words from similar roots and their derivatives, it is possible that Boulanger has in mind the creation of semantic domains. By semantic domains, I understand a “group of words with related meanings. These groupings play an important role in lexicography. Even though ‘the meaning of a word does not depend on the meaning of other words, to establish what the meaning of a word is one has to

---

<sup>26</sup> For a detailed analysis of these observations, see the user’s guide.

compare it with the meanings of other, intuitively related words.”<sup>27</sup> R. De Blois gives the following example:

A simple example will illustrate what is meant here. A lexicographer who wants to describe the meaning of the English word ‘apple’ can only do so successfully once s/he has looked at the entire semantic domain to which ‘apple’ belongs: FRUITS. A careful study of this domain helps to determine the aspects of meaning that are relevant to a fruit, such as whether it is edible or not, whether it grows on a tree or on a bush, whether it grows in clusters or not, whether it contains multiple seeds or a single stone, its color, size, texture, taste, etc. Only in this way can an adequate definition of ‘apple’ be given, one that can help the user distinguish between an apple and other kinds of fruit.<sup>28</sup>

In Boulanger’s lexicon, the entry “ganau” translated as “faire larcin” is associated with “enau” (“raisin”) and “anavemo” (“leurs raisins”). But it happens that his hypotheses may be crossed out, such as his failed association between “guerroyer, guerre” and “garar” (גָּרַר) translated as “trainer, mettre en morceau.” In other instances, the organization of the lexicon by the Latin transliteration of Hebrew entries enables original associations. The grouping of both ה and כ under the consonant “c” enables Boulanger to associate words with their antonyms. Under קְדֻמוֹתָר translated as “antiquité,” Boulanger refers to its antonym יָדְשִׁי translated as “nouveau, récent.”

#### *Linguistic Bridges or the Exoticization of the Familiar*

Boulanger’s creation of semantic domains attempts to outline links between Hebrew and the 18<sup>th</sup>-century French language. The page “gar-gas” is especially informative in this regard. “Garnaa” and its variants “naara, nagara” translated as “fillette” is associated with “grace, gars, garnement” in the right column. Boulanger outlines a similar association for “garna, naar” which he translates as “enfant.” He further explains “garou/arou” as “mélange d’animaux-monstre” and associates it with the “loup-garou.” Sometimes, the Celtic language serves a linguistic bridge between Hebrew and French. Using the Celtic “ger” translated as “la guerre,” Boulanger translates “ger” (גָּר) as “voyageur, étranger, habitant,” perhaps linking the state of wandering as a consequence of war.

---

<sup>27</sup> Reinier de Blois. Semantic Domains. In *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, edited by Geoffrey Khan, Shmuel Bolozky, Steven Fassberg, Gary A. Rendsburg, Aaron D. Rubin, Ora R. Schwarzwald, and Tamar Zewi. Accessed April 3, 2017. doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2212-4241\\_ehl1\\_EHLL\\_COM\\_00000218](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2212-4241_ehl1_EHLL_COM_00000218). See also Wierzbicka, Anna. 1992. “Semantic primitives and semantic fields”, in Lehrer and Kittay (eds.), *Frames, fields, and contrasts: New essays in semantic and lexical organization*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, p. 210.

<sup>28</sup> Reinier de Blois. Semantic Domains.



Thus, the dictionary operates as a bridge between both worlds, between Hebrew idioms and French idioms. In translating “geuth” (גְּאוּת) and “gaavah” as “vanité, fierté,” Boulanger associates it with the French expression “fier comme un gueux” in the right column. Similarly, the translation of “gib/hiv” as “obscurcir, couvrir de nuages” is given its French corresponding expression, “giboulée.” To the entry תְּלֵמִיָּה he gives the French explanation “blanc d’oeuf, petit poulet qui se porte bien” (egg white, little chicken that is doing well). Boulanger’s imagination travels time and results in a few anachronisms. He translates “gir” (גִּר) as “chaux, cendre, ciment” which, to my knowledge, did not exist in the ancient world.<sup>29</sup> His translation of תְּלֵלִיָּה mentions the “flute, cornemuse, instrument, orgue” (flute, bagpipes, instrument, organ). And, here comes my favourite: after he translates גִּלְגֹּל as a “corps imparfait, sans forme, ni figure, masse ronde, masse non polie, un mole un embrion,” he associates “golos” to a “vaisseau barque ronde” (with a possible reference to one of his preceding works abbreviated B.554) and to a “gondole,” a Venitian reference he inscribes in the right column of the page. From the werewolf (“loup-garou”) to Venitian gondolas, Boulanger’s imagination leaps through bridges of time and languages and offers his reader a familiarization of the exotic- unless it is the familiar itself that he adorns with exoticism.

### ***Conclusion: Boulanger and the Legacy of Language***

“Words are a living and portable inheritance from the past, and they embody a culture with a particular fullness.”<sup>30</sup> This comment on early modern dictionaries suits perfectly the description of Boulanger’s massive undertaking. He embodies a lexicographer “rich enough to express a heritage [that] will be affected by a double inheritance, cultural and personal.” From Boulanger’s writings, it is the sense of personal freedom that P. Sadrin wanted to emphasize above all.<sup>31</sup> Indeed, in the context of an ambiguous and complex relationship that the Enlightenment nurtures to Judaism, Boulanger’s work stands a quiet milestone, in the image of the discretion of the philosopher whose humble aim was to treat religion as reasonably as possible.

---

<sup>29</sup> The Littré dictionary itself traces the first occurrences of the word in the 13th century. Though he defines “ciment Romain” as a “sorte de mortier, ainsi nommé,” he asserts that the Romans never knew it (« bien que les Romains ne l’aient jamais connu »). See Emile Littré, and L. Marcel. Devic. *Dictionnaire De La Langue Française : Par E. Littré*. Paris, Londres: Hachette & Cie, 1877.

<sup>30</sup> J. Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe. Lexicography and the Making of Heritage*, p.15.

<sup>31</sup> P. Sadrin, *Nicolas-Antoine Boulanger (1722-1759) ou avant nous le déluge*, and Boulanger, Nicolas-Antoine, in A. C. Kors (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Enlightenment*.