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John Palsgrave’s English-French dictionary, Lesclarcissement de la langue francoys (1530) opens with a wedding. He writes: “I have ... assaye so to marie our tongye & the french togide” (A.iii). Figuring the project of bilingual lexicography as a marriage of tongues, Palsgrave’s nuptial metaphor also has a more literal referent. Palsgrave was the tutor of Henry VIII’s sister Mary, and he travelled with the princess as her secretary when she moved to France, in 1514, to marry Louis XII. Palsgrave’s trope memorializes the royal wedding which inspired his own lexicographic marriage of tongues; however, it also reflects an intimate knowledge of his sovereign’s agenda. Attempting to “reduce” the French tongue by bringing it “under rules” (A.vi), Palsgrave enacts, linguistically, the English mastery over France that Henry VIII, addressed in this text as “King of England and of France” (A.iii), hoped to enjoy. By joining his lively 18-year-old sister to the fragile and gouty 52-year-old French king, Henry planned to expedite the passing of the aged monarch, and, hence, to have a reasonable chance at placing a Tudor nephew in line to the French throne.

Generally considered to be the first bilingual vernacular dictionary (or, to use Palsgrave’s own term, vocabulist), as well as the first extensive, systematic analysis of French grammar, Palsgrave’s Lesclarcissement constitutes a characteristically Tudor response to the history of conquest, conflict, and rivalry that complicated the study of French

---

1 On Palsgrave’s life and work see Stein (1997).

in sixteenth-century England. Having neither shaken off fully the mentality of subjection, nor achieved permanently the long-awaited victory over France, English students of French were required to come to terms, literally and figuratively, with the pervasive presence of French language and culture in England that was the legacy of the Norman Conquest. At first glance, Palsgrave’s account of his instruction of the young princess in the terms of her marital obedience to the French king appears to draw upon the gender hierarchy implied by heterosexual marriage in order to reinforce the continuing supremacy of the French language. Although the predominance of French in England, which had remained the language of royalty and religion, of Parliament and of public records, throughout the Middle Ages, had diminished by the time Palsgrave composed his dictionary, knowledge of French nevertheless remained a crucial marker of education and social class, and was beginning to replace Latin as the language of international diplomacy. However, by teaching Mary Tudor to “speak any sentence trueth and paffly to endue any matter in the french tongue” and to “understand any authour that writeth in the savd tong” (A iii), Palsgrave also supplies his student with the verbal tools of English domination over France. Mastered by Palsgrave and his reader, French is placed fully under English control, utterly demystified. Mary’s French lessons are thus pressed into the service of Tudor ascendency; her fluency in French is less an expression of submission to her French husband than an extension of the political will of her English brother.

Printed shortly after Palsgrave’s Lesclairement, Giles du Wes’s Introductio fōr to leere to rede to prononcer and to speke Frenche trewe (1532–33) also emerges out of the experience of giving French lessons to an English princess named Mary Tudor to prepare her for marriage. Composed for the daughter of Catherine of Aragon and Henry VIII, du Wes’s French text is as slim as Palsgrave’s text is massive, as personal as Palsgrave’s is public, and as retrospective as Palsgrave’s is pioneering. If Palsgrave’s French lessons attempt to undo the legacy of the Norman Conquest, du Wes, by contrast, refuses to rend asunder two languages which have been brought together, for better or for worse, by a shared history. Issued during a crucial period in the reign of Henry VIII, during his courtship and marriage of Anne Bolyn and divorce from Catherine of Aragon, and just before his final break with Rome in 1533–4, both texts draw upon contemporary preoccupations with the sacrament of marriage and the stigma of adultery to conceptualize their contributions to the emergent genre of the bilingual vernacular dictionary. What happens to a language, these texts ask, when it is invaded by another language, or when it is broken down into its component parts and joined with its synonyms in another language? Is it marriage? Or is it adultery? And what does it mean, given England’s past history and present rivalry with France, to teach an English princess to speak French “true and?” Their respective answers to this question reveal the competing intellectual affiliations and political agendas that informed the development of Renaissance lexicography, and illuminate the relationship between Tudor politics, humanist scholarship, and the rhetoric of love and empire.

Although the need for a French tutor reinforces the exalted position of the French language, in the complexities of which even clever English princesses require intensive schooling, Palsgrave’s greatest appeal was the symbolic power of his control, as an Englishman, over French. As Alan White observes, “the dictionary embodies an implicit hierarchy of language and produces a linguistic environment which, taken together, powerfully establishes the ‘high’ language over against all other registers, dialects and socioclects” (1983, 6). Whereas with Renaissance Latin-vernacular dictionaries, such as Sir Thomas Elyot’s Latin-English Dictionary (1538), the hierarchy is implicit, in the case of bilingual vernacular dictionaries, the identity of the “high” language is a site of contestation and rivalry. In the case of English and French, this struggle is infl ected by a history of military conquest as well as cultural supremacy. In the same way that, as Stephen Merriam Foley has argued, Elyot’s Latin-English text transforms the pedagogic occasion into a “new cultural field for establishing royal absolutism,” Palsgrave’s Lesclairement seizes the opportunity, presented by the royal wedding,

---

5As Stein observes (1996, 1) the term dictionary was first used by Sir Thomas Elyot to name his Latin-English Dictionary (1538), although Palsgrave’s work is of a similar scale and comprehensive nature.


7On the linguistic situation in England in the Middle Ages, see Clanchy (1979).

8The dating of this text is the subject of some debate. Based on internal evidence, F. Genin proposes a composition date of 1527–30 (1862, 16–17). Following Lambley, Kibbee argues for the earlier date of 1524–7 (1991, 194).

9On the history of the Renaissance dictionary, see Starnes (1954) and Stein (1985).
in sixteenth-century England. Having neither shaken off fully the mentality of subjection, nor achieved permanently the long-awaited victory over France, English students of French were required to come to terms, literally and figuratively, with the pervasive presence of French language and culture in England that was the legacy of the Norman Conquest. At first glance, Palsgrave’s account of his instruction of the young princess in the terms of her wisely obedience to the French king appears to draw upon the gender hierarchy implied by heterosexual marriage in order to reinforce the continuing supremacy of the French language. Although the predominance of French in England, which had remained the language of royalty and religion, of Parliament and of public records, throughout the Middle Ages, had diminished by the time Palsgrave composed his dictionary, knowledge of French nevertheless remained a crucial marker of education and social class, and was beginning to replace Latin as the language of international diplomacy. However, by teaching Mary Tudor to “speak any sentence truely and perty to endy any matter in the french tong” (A.iii), Palsgrave also supplies his student with the verbal tools of English domination over France. Mastered by Palsgrave and his reader, French is placed fully under English control, utterly demystified. Mary’s French lessons are thus pressed into the service of Tudor ascendency: her fluency in French is less an expression of submission to her French husband than an extension of the political will of her English brother.

Printed shortly after Palsgrave’s Lesclarissiment, Gilles du Wes’s Introductorie for to lerne to rede to pronounce and to speke Frenche trewely (1532–33) also emerges out of the experience of giving French lessons to an English princess named Mary Tudor to prepare her for marriage. Composed for the daughter of Catherine of Aragon and Henry VIII, cu Wes’s French text is as slim as Palsgrave’s text is massive, as personal as Palsgrave’s is public, and as retrospective as Palsgrave’s is pioneering. If Palsgrave’s French lessons attempt to undo the legacy of the Norman Conquest, du Wes, by contrast, refuses to rend asunder two languages which have been brought together, for better or for worse, by a shared history. Issued during a crucial period in the reign of Henry VIII, during his courtship and marriage of Anne Boleyn and divorce from Catherine of Aragon, and just before his final break with Rome in 1533–4, both texts draw upon contemporary preoccupations with the sacrament of marriage and the stigma of adultery to conceptualize their contributions to the emergent genre of the bilingual vernacular dictionary. What happens to a language, these texts ask, when it is invaded by another language, or when it is broken down into its component parts and joined with its synonyms in another language? Is it marriage? Or is it adultery? And what does it mean, given England’s past history and present rivalry with France, to teach an English princess to speak French “trewely”? Their respective answers to this question reveal the competing intellectual affiliations and political agendas that informed the development of Renaissance lexicography, and illuminate the relationship between Tudor politics, humanist scholarship, and the rhetoric of love and empire.

Although the need for a French tutor reinforces the exalted position of the French language, in the complexities of which even clever English princesses require intensive schooling, Palsgrave’s greatest appeal was the symbolic power of his control, as an Englishman, over French. As Allon White observes, “the dictionary embodies an implicit hierarchy of language and produces a linguistic environment which, taken together, powerously establishes the “high” language over against all other registers, dialects and socicelles” (1983, 6). Whereas with Renaissance Latin-vernacular dictionaries, such as Sir Thomas Eloyt’s Latin-English Dictionary (1538), the hierarchy is implicit, in the case of bilingual vernacular dictionaries, the identity of the “high” language is a site of contestation and rivalry. In the case of English and French, this struggle is inflected by a history of military conquest as well as cultural supremacy. In the same way that, as Stephen Merriam Foley has argued, Eloyt’s Latin-English text transforms the pedagogic occasion into a “new cultural field for establishing royal absolutism,” Palsgrave’s Lesclarissiment seizes the opportunity, presented by the royal wedding,
to scripting a new relationship between England and France (see Foley 1994, 212).

Palsgrave's use of marriage as trope for his project is consistent with the realities of high-level, early modern courtship: as Mary Tudor and King Louis meet for the first time on their wedding day, so does the tutor, as Palsgrave would have us believe, initiate the English princess into the hallowed complexities of the French tongue. However, Palsgrave's implication is more symbolic than historically accurate. Mary spoke French from the cradle (Richardson 1970, 23). Long before Palsgrave arrived at court, Henry VII had been employing the distinguished products of Burgundian humanism. The king's secretary was the scholar Jean Meautys, and Quentin Poulet, followed by William Faques, presided over Henry VII's newly-founded library, filling it with French manuscripts and books printed in Paris by Antoine Véard. Bernard André, the blind poet of Toulouse, was employed as poet laureate and resident court "historiographer," while Giles du Wes served as French tutor to the princes Arthur and Henry.7 At four, Mary spoke French well enough to charm Erasmus when he visited the court. She played with the children of French nobility, family friends made during her father's exile in France. Her brother Henry would later woo Anne Boleyn in letters penned in capable, albeit eccentric, French.8 Henry and Mary's grandmother, Lady Margaret Beaufort, who oversaw their education, translated a number of French romances and religious writings; their great-grandmother was the French Catherine who could have been wooed, pace Shakespeare, quite adequately in French by Henry V (Jones and Underwood 1992, 181–2).

By drawing attention to his role as the French tutor of Mary Tudor, a "right excellent princes" and his sovereign's "most entirely beloved sister quene" (A.xii), Palsgrave places his work within an English tradition of addressing French manuals to women. Walter of Bibbesworth's popular Le Tretiz, a thirteenth-century collection of Anglo-Norman phrases, glossed in Middle English, was composed for the Anglo-Norman noblewoman, Dionysse de Mountechens. A guide intended to help her teach her children the French vocabulary required to manage their estate, Le Tretiz also serves as a codification of aristocratic manners (1990). In Caxton's Doctrine (1900), a French-English wordlist assembled for the purposes of merchant travelers, the traveling salesman engages in a series of dialogues with shrewd wives and mischievous maidservants. A fifteenth-century adaptation of Bibbesworth, which circulated in manuscript form under the title Femina, supplied middle-class schoolboys with the knowledge of French they required for clerical or administrative careers, thus filling the role occupied by upper-class women, who taught their children French from childhood.9

From Cicero on, women's duties to home and hearth have made them the guardians of the "mother tongue," while stereotypical conceptions of woman's unruly speech are connected with the unregulatable nature of vernacular languages (Parker [1990] and Fleming [1994]). In sixteenth-century England, however, some languages were considered more female than others. If Latin was the international language of educated men, French was the vernacular of communication between the sexes, required for courtship and at court: as John Florio points out, "French hath long time beene termed the language of Ladies" (1603, 1.94; see also Fleming [1994]). Palsgrave's description of the French language draws upon a prevailing stereotype of female prolixity: "they have three words to express the name of a thing which we express by one word alone" (C.iiii), while his reference to "the naturall inclina- tion that the frenche men haue unto eloquence and facundite" (A.i.i) endows its native speakers with the life-giving qualities of the goddess Natura herself. By teaching Mary Tudor French, Palsgrave transforms her into an ideal image of the French language: aristocratic, feminine, and subject to the "rule" of English men.

Palsgrave makes use of the binary of gender difference celebrated in traditional structures of marriage in order to assert a fundamental difference between English and French. Palsgrave's grammatical treatise, which includes a section entitled "of the differences of Phrasys betwene our tong and the frenche tong" (C.iiii) disavows the similarities that exist between French and English, and insists, instead, upon the "diffyculte of the frenche tong/whiche mayketh so harde to be lerned by them of our nation" (A.vi). The opposition implied by the columns of English and French terms, like rows of soldiers lined up for battle, underscores the prevailing sense, throughout the text, of

7 See Kipling (1977); see also the discussions of Bernard André and other royal tutors in Carlson (1991, 60–81).

8 See St. Care Byrne (1968). For an account of Henry's letters to Anne Boleyn which place them within the context of early Tudor court politics and culture, see Lecer (1997, 87–121).

9 See Wright (1909). For a discussion of a seventeenth-century French text addressed to women, see Fleming (1589).
French as the Other. By listing English words first, Palsgrave gives French a secondary status, placing the onus upon the French language to come up with an English equivalent.  

His concern with appropriating the French language for English purposes, which he calls "french words to express our myndes withall" (A.iii), thus enlists French in the service of Tudor ascendency.

Providing detailed definitions of words, and illustrating them with quotations, proverbs, and sententiae, drawn from such celebrated literary authorities as Froissart and Jean Lemaire de Belges, Palsgrave’s Lesclacisement transcends the sheer functionalism of its predecessors, wordlists compiled for the instrumental needs of their readers, and illustrates the role the study of French was coming to play in the pursuit of higher learning. Palsgrave adopts the conventions of classical humanist lexicography to make French, a previously unsystematized "mother tongue," the object of rigorous male control. By carving out a space for French, and for women, in the pursuit of higher learning, Palsgrave manifests his intellectual affinity with his friends Erasmus and Sir Thomas More, who advocated the study of the vernacular, as well as the education of women, even as they insisted upon preserving the cultural and social hierarchies which kept women separate from classical languages, and exempt from the prerogatives of masculinity.

However, in an epistle to Henry VIII, written to accompany his translation of William Fullonius’s Acsolatus (1540) from Latin into English, Palsgrave also contends that the schoomaster is responsible not only for facilitating his student’s competence in classical or foreign languages, but also his (or her) "perfection in our own tongue" (Palsgrave 1937, 6). By citing English authors such as Chaucer and Lydgate alongside their French counterparts, Palsgrave announces England’s possession of its own distinguished literary tradition, making the process of

French lessons and occasion for expanding his student’s knowledge of the English language. The occasional inclusion of archaic terms which have no French equivalent, such as "ennose: to abuse," attributed to the monk of Berye Lydgate" (GGG.iii) or "queme: to please or satisfy," from "Chaucer in his Cauterbury Tales" (B.ii), teemed with the explanation "this term is not in use," manifests a genuinely humanist reverence for history, and bespeaks an insular attentiveness to the uniquely English. Palsgrave’s Lesclacisement looks forward to England’s illustrious future by memorializing its past.

Although the wedding of Mary and Louis XII took place in 1514, Palsgrave composed his text long after he had been dismissed, along with most of Mary’s other servants, by Louis XII, and sent home to England, where he was given appointments in the church and, briefly, the position of tutor to Henry Fitzroy. Nostalgic for happier days as the French tutor of a glamorous princess, Palsgrave also recalls a better time for England, a time in which England possessed vast stretches of French soil, a time of high hopes for the birth of Tudor heirs, and a time before the optimism of nuptial ceremonies was overshadowed by the spectre of divorce. By 1530, Mary had long since returned to England. Louis had lasted only eleven weeks as her husband. After enduring a torturous enclosure to ensure that she had not conceived an heir to the French throne (as well as to prevent her from becoming pregnant in her widowhood), which was accompanied by the charge that she was having an affair with the heir-presumptive, Francis I, who inscribed on a portrait of Mary the words plus sale que royne (= ‘more dirty than queenly’), Mary finally re-crossed the channel to marry her old lover, the decidedly English (and decidedly impoverished) Charles Brandon, duke of Suffolk.

Yet long after her marriage to Brandon, whose estate was enriched by her French income, Mary continued to symbolize English hopes for France. By returning to live out her life in England, yet maintaining her title as (in Palsgrave’s words) “beloved sistere quene Mary douager of France” (A.i), Mary embodies an ideal form of double translation: like the English words in Palsgrave’s dictionary, she could

---

10The dictionary is predominantly English-French, although the pronoun section includes French-English listings.

11Erasmus describes Palsgrave as "devoted to good literature, full of promise, known to be a hard worker, and ... both my friend and yours" in a letter Palsgrave was dispatched to deliver to More; see Mynors and Thompson, The Correspondence of Erasmus: (1927, 162–3). In an epistolary dialogue with More concerning the education of his pupil, Henry Fitzroy, the son of Henry VIII and his mistress, Elizabeth Blount, Palsgrave identifies French lessons with the young man’s Latin education, and opposes them to the traditional aristocratic pastimes of hunting, hawking, and horsemanship, which were distracting him from his studies; see Rogers (1947, 404–5).

12On Palsgrave’s use of Chaucer and Lydgate, see Stein (1996, 87–9 and 185–8).

13Historians believe that Mary Tudor had married Charles Brandon, with whom she had long been on intimate terms, secretly in Paris; see Richardson (1970, 168–72).
be translated into French and back again into English, without any loss of her distinct, English identity. Although the white gowns that she habitually wore alluded to the name given to her by admiring French subjects, la reine blanche, in the possession of an English princess, the crown of France remained a malleable instrument of Henry's power, and a testament to Tudor ambition.

Unlike her aunt and namesake, the Mary Tudor who would eventually become Mary I of England had no confidence that she would ever be a queen at all (see Erickson [1978] and Loades [1979]). The elder Mary Tudor enjoyed the title Queen of France because it pleased Henry VIII, but the younger Mary Tudor's coronation as Queen of England could not have been more contrary to her late father's wishes. The elder Mary Tudor's French lessons take place in an atmosphere charged with great expectations for a fruitful (if not especially long) union, while the younger Mary Tudor studies French resigned to the realities of adultery. And while the encyclopedic enormity of Palsgrave's folio announces itself as an extension of Henrician magnificence, Giles du Wes's little quarto merely gives the appearance of compliance with the current regime. For his Mary, this strategy represented the only hope of remaining alive long enough to lead England out of what she considered to be its Protestant heresy.

Unlike her aunt's glittering upbringing, Mary's lonely childhood had given her little exposure to the French spoken at court. When she refused to recognize the divorce of her parents, Mary had been placed under house arrest, stripped of the title of "princess," and forced to play servant to her infant sister, Elizabeth. After she signed the Act of Succession along with formal letters of submission to her father's will (which she revoked in secret missives of protest addressed to Charles V, the pope, and sometimes only to God), Mary enjoyed a period of lenience and re-acceptance by her father, who employed du Wes, who had been a fixture at court since the time of Henry VII, to instruct her in French. Du Wes, like Mary, pays lip service to these changes of nomenclature and status: he addresses Mary as "right high excellent and most virtuous lady" (A.iii') but not as princess, while referring to her hated stepmother Anne as "by the grace of God Quene of Englande and of France" (A.i'). Palsgrave made it clear that, although he was Mary's tutor, he was really working for the king: "commaunded by your most redouted hyghness" (A.i'). But du Wes's Introductorie is just the opposite: the putative obedience of his dedications obscures the status of his text as a performance of solidarity between student and teacher.

Exposing and celebrating the fluidity of identity between French and English which Palsgrave sought to deny, du Wes's Introductorie looks back with affection to England's medieval and Catholic, as well as French, heritage. Avoiding such humanist conventions as the detailed exposition and illustration of terms and a systematic grammatical treatise, du Wes makes no reference to English or French literary authorities; he limits his introductory material to brief notes on pronunciation, and presents a selection of wordlists, dialogues and model letters. With English, in large black-letter text, dominating the small italic font reserved for French, Palsgrave's text typographically enacts his sovereign's political intentions. The Introductorie, by contrast, looks back to the foundational role played by French in the history of the English language: following the ordinatio of medieval manuscripts, French is printed in large, black-letter text, while English terms provide a much smaller interlinear gloss. Where Palsgrave aims to be comprehensive, du Wes occasionally finds it unnecessary to provide an English version of what he considers to be a self-evident French term.

Such omissions and decisions are not the result of his ignorance of or lack of respect for humanist methodology: du Wes had known and worked with Erasmus, Bernard André, and Thomas More long before Palsgrave was born. But he simply refused to elevate vernacular languages to the status of classical tongues. Calling attention to Palsgrave's copiousness, to its "great space and long proces" (A.iii'), du Wes takes his rival to task for his adoption of humanist methodology for the purposes of vernacular language instruction. While Latin and Greek, he argues, are conceived "without any fault," possess "infallible rules," and may well be taught and illustrated "by the principles and the rules made by diverse well expert auctors" (A.iii'), vernacular tongues are mere mortals: fallible, rife with exceptions and imperfections. "Compiling rules and principles," he retorts, "is against me and my reason" (A.iii'); French is best taught by ear.

By rejecting the marriage of humanism and nationalism enacted by Palsgrave's Lesclarissement, du Wes communicates his own political and religious affiliations. If Palsgrave's lexicographic method anticipates a Protestant fascination with allowing direct, unmediated access to the scriptures, du Wes may be considered Catholic in his refusal to demystify language learning and to remove the priestly role of tutor from the process. By preserving the linguistic boundaries between classical and vernacular, du Wes also expresses his resistance to the shifting religious and political order: his argument against the vernacular may extend to an opposition to Protestant arguments for the trans-
lation of the Bible and liturgy into the vernacular, as well as to Henry’s rejection of papal authority, and assumption (as a kind of vernacular king) of the role of head of the English church. After Mary and her mother had been stripped of the rights conferred on them through birth and marriage so that another queen and princess could be installed in their places, du Wes makes a claim to his superiority as a tutor on the basis that French is his mother tongue. Unlike Palsgrave, whose French is a mere “thyng borrowed,” du Wes boasts that his French is “maternal and natural” (A.iii'), “born of the land and country” (A.ii').

In a text composed for a devoutly Catholic princess who felt little sympathy for her father’s divorce, this invocation of the powerful rights guaranteed through motherhood suggests a sympathy with religious orthodoxy that is confirmed by the prayer to the Virgin Mary, his student’s namesake, which opens the text. At a time when Marian worship was beginning to be repressed, and when the mothering of male heirs was an extremely fraught issue for the king, this celebration of the Madonna and child implies a form of resistance to religious reform, as well as providing a tacit explanation for the king’s continuing bad luck.

Prefatory notes on the virtue of silence, through which one may, he says, “declare” the “thynges that directely expressed maye nat be” (B.i'), reveal how du Wes employs equivocations and omissions to imply, without directly expressing, his opinions concerning his charge’s plight. He teaches her French words that, when taken together, ventriloquize the opinion of Anne Boleyn held by Mary and her supporters. Although these adjectives are not tied to a proper name, together they make their intent clear to those who are looking for it by painting the following portrait: “a woman dishonest/read to fall/shameless/wanton/subtile/painted/descyeavable” (D.iii'). A little verse in praise of Henry VIII mixes up the terms of God and Father, Virgin, Mother and Queen in such a way that the poem can be read both as a compliment to Henry as head of the church and to Anne as his blameless consort, and as an assertion that God (as opposed to Henry) is the only “christian king” (S.iii') and that only the Virgin (and not the King’s wife) “hath no pere” and “lyved without blame” (T.i'). Reprinted four times during the fifteen-thirties, the text’s popularity may have less to do with its practical utility as a manual for language instruction than with its capacity to express, obliquely, a sense of opposition to the current regime (see Alston 1985, 6).

Divorce looms large over this text, determining the extent to which French studies function, for Mary, as part of a greater strategy of

Realpolitik. In one of the practice dialogues, Mary learns from the ominously-named “lady of Maltravers” that “without knowing the french speche/ye should be forced to take by elections/A faire lady and mynyon/For to assist your persone/And also for to interpret/That which it should please you to declare/To your husband and lord … which might be occasyon/To give you suspicion/Putting you in ialousye” (T.iii'). The advice of Mme. Maltravers recalls Anne Boleyn’s former position as one of Catherine of Aragon’s ladies in waiting. A “faire lady and mynyon,” Anne had aroused both the suspicions of her mistress and the desire of her mistress’s husband, and was the recipient of passionate letters from the king, penned in French. This dialogue alludes not only to the French which Catherine did not speak at all, but also to the excellent French in which Anne was known to revel: one “Nan de Boleine” crossed the channel when the first Mary Tudor went to France to marry King Louis, and she stayed in France for four years after the rest of Mary’s entourage (including Palsgrave) returned to England. The idea of learning French, the tongue of her mother’s betrayal, and of her own loss of legitimacy, as a means of ensuring against the adultery of her future husband situates Mary’s French lessons within the greater game of Realpolitik. Like so many of Mary’s actions at this time, French studies are part of a policy of short-term capitulation (and humiliation) intended to preserve, in the long run, her own shot at the throne. French, then, is not only the language of her father’s adultery, but also the language of her Catholic allies, and the vehicle of her own plans to ensure England’s future “fidelity” to Rome.

Although they occupied the same position, as the tutor of an English princess named Mary Tudor, Palsgrave and du Wes respond very differently to the linguistic, cultural, and political history that binds France and England together. Their respective attitudes to the impending nuptials of their students reveal the competing models of language and nationhood — as well as marriage — in circulation at a moment of profound crisis and change in English history. Yet in both texts, to marry (or to “Mary”) requires a certain degree of cynicism and subterfuge. The process of learning French is adumbrated by a duplicity that testifies to the realities of life in the early modern fast lane, while at the same time, it confirms a feminest stereotype. As the princesses

---

14On Anne Boleyn’s French education, see Ives (1986, 22–46)
learn to translate from English into French they are, themselves, making the transition from maidenly innocence into carnal knowledge. To speak French "trewely," in both cases, is not only to display one's worldliness or sophistication, it is also to sidestep the ideals implied by the Anglo-Saxon notion of pledging one's "troth." As the title of Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*, or *All is True*, suggests, it is the English themselves who speak the truest French.
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The modern history of languages may suggest a movement toward simplification, despite salient exceptions like the development of case in Baltic. The simplification may involve inflections (exemplified by the once considerably inflected Chinese languages) and/or some leveling of grammatical gender, if it ever existed. During the twentieth century there has been movement toward affinity within some Western subfamilies of Indo-European, so that the languages seem to be moving toward greater similarities rather than the differentiation once characterizing the development of the Indo-European subfamilies. This change contrasts with the slow alteration of Vulgar Latin into the generally mutually unintelligible Italian, French, Spanish, etc.

English is one of the starkest examples of gender-leveling within the Indo-European descendants, particularly since the quantity of Old English gender-marking articles was comparable to that of Old High German (OHG). English lost most concord marking except chiefly in anaphoric pronouns. It underwent several centuries of terminal segmental loss that essentially eliminated grammatical gender except in the third-person singular personal pronouns, generally resulting in a situation where most nouns denote gender semantically — i.e., according to biological sex.

Another major development among languages in contact especially since World War II has been the worldwide influence of English. That impact has promoted similarity to English, as in borrowing both the noun and its plural -s, even if the grammatical system of the affected language differs typologically. In a reverse example, once the Japanese neologisms employing solely English elements are phoni-