

## The English Dictionary in the 15th Century

GABRIELE STEIN  
(Hamburg)

Research on the early history of English dictionaries has so far mainly concentrated on the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries<sup>1</sup>. Most of the major dictionaries of that period have been described in detail, discussed with respect to their sources, their interrelationships and their lexicographical importance. We know much less about the lexicographical activities of the 15th century. Thomas Wright's edition of *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies*<sup>2</sup> includes six 15th century vocabularies, two of which are metrical ones. The structure and tradition of these early vocabularies was investigated by D. T. Starnes in his paper on «Medieval and Renaissance Vocabularies and the English Dictionary»<sup>3</sup>. As to the English dictionaries of the fifteenth century we are not sure whether all extant manuscripts have actually been discovered and brought to scholarly attention. Our understanding of early English lexicography will therefore depend on the state of knowledge of the respective manuscripts. And the tradi-

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. for instance STARNES, D. T.-NOYES, G. E. (1946), *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson, 1604-1755*. Chapel Hill, reprint 1965; STARNES, D. T. (1954), *Renaissance Dictionaries English-Latin and Latin-English*. Austin; SLEDD, J. H.-KOLB, G. J. (1955), *Dr. Johnson's Dictionary. Essays in the Biography of a Book*. Chicago; STEINER, R. J. (1970), *Two Centuries of Spanish and English Bilingual Lexicography, 1590-1800*. The Hague; ANDERSON, J. D. (1971), *The Development of the English-French, French-English Bilingual Dictionary: A Study in Comparative Lexicography*. Ph. D. dissertation, Louisiana State University; WELLS, R. A. (1973), *Dictionaries and the Authoritarian Tradition. A Study in English Usage and Lexicography*. The Hague-Paris; HAYASHI, T. (1978), *The Theory of English Lexicography 1530-1791*. Amsterdam; STEIN, G. (1981), *Das englische Wörterbuch*. Vol. I., forthcoming.

<sup>2</sup> WRIGHT, T. (ed.) (1857-1873), *A Volume of Vocabularies*. Privately printed; reprints 1882, 1968.

<sup>3</sup> STARNES, D. T. (1946), «Medieval and Renaissance Vocabularies and the English Dictionary». In: STARNES, D. T.-NOYES, G. E. (1946), *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson, 1604-1755*. Chapel Hill, reprint 1965, Appendix I: 197-211.

tional views on the chronology of early English dictionaries will have to be modified accordingly.

For the English dictionaries of the fifteenth century, which are our sole concern here, we find the following chronology in H. B. Wheatley's survey «Chronological Notices of the Dictionaries of the English Language»<sup>4</sup>:

ab. 1440 Galfridus Grammaticus	<i>Promptorium Parvulorum</i> (Harl. MS., No. 221)
ab. 1450 Anon.	<i>Dictionarium Anglo-Latinum</i> (B. M. Add. MSS., No. 15, 562)
1483 Anon.	<i>Catholicon Anglicum</i> (Lord Monson's MS.)
1499 Galfridus Grammaticus	<i>Promptorium Parvulorum</i> (First Edition, printed by Pynson)

Wheatley's list, though very small, is more comprehensive for the fifteenth century than that published five years earlier by J. E. Worcester<sup>5</sup>. W. W. Skeat in his «Bibliographical List of the Works that have been published, or are known to exist in MS., illustrative of the various dialects of English»<sup>6</sup> follows H. B. Wheatley<sup>7</sup>. If we take into account the order in which the two languages in these bilingual dictionaries are presented we have to observe that these three 19th century scholars and lexicographers shared the view that the English-Latin dictionary preceded the Latin-English one. Wheatley did, however, also draw attention to the earliest Latin-English dictionary, the *Medulla Grammaticae* or *Grammatices* which he supposed «to have been compiled by the author of the *Promptorium*»<sup>8</sup>. In his edition of the *Promptorium Parvulorum* A. Way conjectured the date 1460 for the earliest copy of the *Medulla Grammaticae* known to him<sup>9</sup>. This date was then accepted and propagated by other scholars.

A more recent discovery and study of another *Medulla* manuscript in the Jesuit College at Stonyhurst, Lancashire, England, conjectured an earlier date for the *Medulla*. In his excellent monograph on *Renaissance*

<sup>4</sup> WHEATLEY, H. B. (ed.) (1865), «Chronological Notices of the Dictionaries of the English Language». *Transactions of the Philological Society*: 218-293; 288.

<sup>5</sup> WORCESTER, J. E. (1860), «History of English Lexicography». In: WORCESTER, J. E. (1860), *A Dictionary of the English Language*. Boston: liii-lviii.

<sup>6</sup> SKEAT, W. W. (1873-1877), «A Bibliographical List of the Works that have been published, or are known to exist in MS., illustrative of the various dialects of English». *English Dialect Society Publications*, Section I. — General. (A.) Dictionaries: 3-17; 3.

<sup>7</sup> Skeat mentions, however, also the *Catholicon of Jacobus Januensis*; MS. O.5.4, Trinity College, Cambridge.

<sup>8</sup> WHEATLEY, H. B. (1865), *op. cit.*: 220.

<sup>9</sup> WAY, A. (ed.) (1865), *Promptorium Parvulorum Sive Clericorum*. *Dictionarius Anglo-Latinus Princeps, auctore fratre Galfrido Grammatico dicto, ex ordine fratrum predicatorum Northfolciensi, circa A. D. M.CCCC.XL*. London: xxii; cf. also STARNES, D. T. (1954), *op. cit.*: 26.

*Dictionaries English-Latin and Latin-English* D. T. Starnes draws attention to this unpublished dissertation of the University of Michigan<sup>10</sup>. Its author, R. T. Meyer<sup>11</sup>, regards the Stonyhurst Manuscript of the *Medulla* as the most complete of all known manuscripts of the text and maintains, according to Starnes' account, that «the Stonyhurst *Medulla* antedates 1400»<sup>12</sup>. Starnes is, as far as I know, the only scholar who has mentioned this earlier dating of the *Medulla*. He has, to my mind however, not drawn the necessary conclusion from it. He could have made the explicit and very valid point for the history of English lexicography that Meyer's hypothesis challenges the traditional chronology of the early English dictionaries. The first English dictionary was a Latin-English and not an English-Latin one. Starnes did not highlight this point in his background survey for the sixteenth century. Consequently, the first part of his study on *Renaissance Dictionaries* begins with the fifteenth century and the dictionaries of this period are discussed in the following order:

1. *Promptorium parvulorum* (ca 1440)
2. *Catholicon Anglicum* (ca 1483)
3. *Medulla grammaticae*
4. [H]ortus vocabulorum
5. John Stanbridge's *Vocabula* (1496) and *Vulgaria* (1508)<sup>13</sup>.

R. T. Meyer's dissertation is, however, not the only contribution to English lexicography which challenges the traditional view. In the British Library I hit upon P. Haworth's paper «The First Latin-English Dictionary. A Bristol University Manuscript» which up to now seems to have been ignored by scholars and lexicographers<sup>14</sup>. When Haworth published his paper Meyer's dissertation was still unwritten and the predominating view was that the manuscript of the *Medulla Grammaticae* described by Way dated from about 1460. One of Haworth's main concerns was therefore the relation of the *Medulla* to the manuscript fragment which he had found in the Library of the University of Bristol. After careful investigations and comparisons Haworth came to the following conclusion: «It appears from his careful descriptions of these, as well as from such comparisons as I have been able to make with the other MSS., that the Bristol fragment is at least a generation earlier than them all»<sup>15</sup>. This would give us a date of about 1430 for the Bristol fragment which according to Haworth is

<sup>10</sup> STARNES, D. T. (1954), *op. cit.*: 25.

<sup>11</sup> MEYER, R. T. (1943), *The Sources of the Stonyhurst Medulla*. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Michigan; cf. also his paper «The Relation of the *Medulla* to the Earlier Glossaries», forthcoming.

<sup>12</sup> STARNES, D. T. (1954), *op. cit.*: 26.

<sup>13</sup> STARNES, D. T. (1954), *op. cit.*: ix.

<sup>14</sup> HAWORTH, P. (1923), «The First Latin-English Dictionary. A Bristol University Manuscript». *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archeological Society* XLV: 253-275.

<sup>15</sup> HAWORTH, P. (1923), *op. cit.*: 254.

part of the *Ortus Vocabulorum*: «There is no doubt that the Bristol MS. is a fragment of the original *Hortus Vocabulorum* attributed to Galfridus Grammaticus by Bale... who mentions this dictionary before the *Promptorium* (1440), which was doubtless compiled several years later than the *Hortus*»<sup>16</sup>. If Haworth's conjecture is right we would have the following chronological order for the first bilingual dictionaries in which English figures as one of the two languages:

before 1400:	<i>Medulla Grammaticae</i> (Stonyhurst Manuscript)	Latin-English
ca 1430:	<i>Hortus Vocabulorum</i> (Bristol Fragment)	Latin-English
1440:	<i>Promptorium Parvulorum</i>	English-Latin
ca 1460:	<i>Medulla Grammaticae</i> (Manuscript studied by Way)	Latin-English
1483:	<i>Catholicon Anglicum</i>	English-Latin
1499:	<i>Promptorium Parvulorum</i> (printed edition)	English-Latin
1500:	<i>Ortus Vocabulorum</i> (printed edition)	Latin-English <sup>17</sup>

This would mean that the first bilingual dictionaries for English were Latin-English ones; the English-Latin ones were compiled slightly later. In view of the fact that the earlier glosses and vocabularies are all Latin-English, this hypothesis has much more plausibility.

The antedating of the *Ortus Vocabulorum* by Haworth has implications for the question of the authorship of these 15th century dictionaries. Their common characteristic, in contrast to the bilingual English dictionaries of the sixteenth century, is that their authors or compilers are not known by name. The most explicit reference with respect to a compiler is the one in the Latin preambulum of the *Promptorium Parvulorum*: «...collecta sunt vocabula huius libelli, per fratrem predicatorem reclusum lenne...» Scholars and lexicographers have repeatedly tried to identify this friar of Lynn Episcopi, Norfolk, and the prevailing view which ensued was that the Lynn friar was Galfridus Grammaticus<sup>18</sup>. Since the support for this view was too weak D. T. Starnes rejected it in 1954: «It must be said, however, that these editors and the commentators whom they follow present no conclusive evidence that the recluse of Lynn, the compiler of the *Promptorium*, bore the name Galfridus Grammaticus. In the

<sup>16</sup> HAWORTH, P. (1923), *op. cit.*: 254.

<sup>17</sup> The Add. MS. 15,562 in the British Library, London, is supposed to be a copy of the *Catholicon Anglicum*. Sir Frederick Madden conjectured a date about 1450 for it which was repeated by Wheatley and Skeat. The catalogue in the British Library, however, says of it «written late in the XVth century». Whether it was written before 1483 or at about the same time is a difficult question to solve.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. in this respect WAY, A. (ed.) (1865), *op. cit.*: xiv-xix for a detailed discussion.

present state of our knowledge we can only say that the real name of the compiler of the first English-Latin dictionary is not known»<sup>19</sup>.

In his treatment of the *Ortus Vocabulorum* Starnes has also discussed the question of who might have been the author of the *Ortus*. Bale had assumed that Galfridus Grammaticus was the author of the *Promptorium Parvulorum* as well as of the *Medulla* and the *Ortus* without, however, producing real evidence. A. Way admitted that he had sought in vain to ascertain who might have been the compiler of this Latin-English dictionary. R. T. Meyer on the other hand had to reject Bale's ascription of the *Medulla* to Galfridus Grammaticus because he maintains that the *Medulla* was compiled before 1400. The authorship of Galfridus Grammaticus would have run into serious chronological difficulties. According to Starnes, Meyer seems, however, to accept the view that the compiler of the *Promptorium* and the compiler of the *Ortus* are one and the same.

If we follow Starnes in concluding that the name of the compiler of the *Promptorium* is not known, we still have to discuss the suggestion of some scholars that one and the same author compiled the English-Latin *Promptorium Parvulorum* and the Latin-English *Ortus Vocabulorum*.

Starnes has pointed out that this theory is difficult chronologically. The *Promptorium* was compiled in 1440 whereas the *Ortus* was published as much as sixty years later, in 1500. With Haworth's antedating of the *Ortus* the chronological difficulty is eliminated. There would only be a difference of about ten years between the compilation of the *Ortus Vocabulorum* and the *Promptorium Parvulorum*. Only a very close study and comparison of the vocabulary items actually included in these two dictionaries with their respective Latin or English equivalents could provide us with more insights and evidence. This might be achieved with the help of modern technology. Both word lists could be fed into a computer, which could then sort out those entries which are common to the word lists of both dictionaries.

One factor which seems to me to make common authorship rather unlikely are the sources which were consulted for the compilation of these two dictionaries. The sources of the *Ortus* which are named in the dictionary itself and which have been discussed by individual scholars are<sup>20</sup>: John Balbus' *Catholicon*, the *Vocabularius Breviloquus* attributed to Guarinus, Nicolas Perotti's *Cornucopia sive linguae Latinae commentarii*, the *Gemma Vocabulorum* and the *Medulla Grammaticae*. For the *Promptorium Parvulorum* these are<sup>21</sup>: John Balbus' *Catholicon*, *Huguitionis Pisani derivationes magnae sive dictionarium etymologicum*, William Brito's *Summa*, the *Mirivalensis in Campo Florum* attributed to Thomas Walley, John

<sup>19</sup> STARNES, D. T. (1954), *op. cit.*: 8-9.

<sup>20</sup> STARNES, D. T. (1954), *op. cit.*: 28, 31-36; WAY, A. (ed.) (1865), *op. cit.*: lvii-lviii, lxii.

<sup>21</sup> WAY, A. (ed.) (1865), *op. cit.*: xxiii-xxxii; MAYHEW, A. L. (ed.) (1908), *The Promptorium Parvulorum. The First English-Latin Dictionary*. Edited from the Manuscript in the Chapter Library at Winchester, with Introduction, Notes, and Glossaries. London: xvii-xxiv; STARNES, D. T. (1954), *op. cit.*: 11-17.

Garlandia's *Dictionarius*, the *Commentarius Curialium*, the *Libellus misteriorum qui dicitur Anglia que fulget*, the *Merarius*, the *Distigius* all attributed to John Garlandia, and works written by Robertus Kylwarbi and Alexander Neccham. Since the only source used for both dictionaries is John Balbus' *Catholicon* the implication is that the compiler of the *Ortus* consulted quite different sources for the *Promptorium Parvulorum* which he wrote about ten years after the *Ortus* and in which he had transposed the order of the languages. If the theory of common authorship was correct, one would expect many more correspondences with respect to the sources consulted.

So much for the chronology and the authorship of the earliest bilingual English dictionaries. As to a detailed characterization of 15th-century English dictionaries, research has mostly concentrated upon a more technical description of the various manuscripts and editions and their history involving also questions of the author and the sources respectively. This holds above all for the editors of these early texts, but also for D. T. Starnes. Starnes, however, was at the same time the first to tackle issues which are more at the centre of lexicography proper. I would therefore like to pursue this more intrinsically lexicographical characterization of the dictionaries under discussion and leave other related issues aside.

The various manuscripts of the *Medulla Grammaticae* which are in the possession of the British Library, London, are lexicographically far less advanced than the texts of the *Promptorium*, the *Catholicon* and the *Ortus*. This may be taken as an indication that the original was compiled much earlier. There is in general no grammatical information for the Latin headwords, there are no synonyms, no verses, etc. This paper will therefore concentrate on the other three dictionaries and try to outline some of those features which are relevant to the development of English lexicography<sup>22</sup>.

All three of them are arranged alphabetically. For the early English dictionaries 'alphabetical order' does not however mean that they are consistently alphabetical throughout. Starnes has already drawn attention to this difference: «These earlier compilers frequently claim, as in the *Ortus*, an alphabetical order of words. An AB or ABC order is more nearly descriptive, and few follow rigorously even this arrangement»<sup>23</sup>. Keeping these reservations in mind one could say that the arrangement in the *Catholicon* and in the *Ortus* is more consistent than the one in the *Promptorium Parvulorum*. Yet a closer study of the order in which the vocabulary items are displayed in these three dictionaries reveals many more interesting features. From this point of view the *Ortus Vocabulorum* is the least interesting one. I would therefore like to advance the view that we find more original lexicographical initiative in English-Latin dictionaries

<sup>22</sup> For an extract of these dictionaries with full bibliographical references see STEIN, G. (1981), *Das englische Wörterbuch*. Vol. I, forthcoming.

<sup>23</sup> STARNES, D. T. (1954), *op. cit.*: 42.

of the 15th century than in Latin-English ones. This can be demonstrated in several respects.

In the *Promptorium Parvulorum* the compiler distinguishes between a nominal part, the *Nominale*, in which he lists all parts of speech with the exception of the verbs, and a verbal part, the *Verbale*, in which the verbs are recorded. For each letter we are first given the *Nominale* and then the *Verbale*. The separation as such was quite common for 15th-century vocabularies; the compiler of the *Promptorium* was, however, the first author to use this part of speech arrangement in an English dictionary.

In some cases in which the alphabetical arrangement is irregular from our modern point of view we wonder whether the compiler of the *Promptorium* was sometimes guided by pronunciation rather than by spelling. Such instances are for example.

*Base*, or fundament...

*Bace*, fishe...

*Bace*, chaumber... etc.

or

*Bage*, or *bagge*, of armis...

*Bag*, or poke

*Bage*, or sachel...

or

*Baryn*, or make bare...

*Barryn* Doris, or oþer lyke schettynggis...

*Barryn* harneys...

*Barkyn* leder...

15th-century English dictionaries do not yet reflect actual language usage as to the spelling of the headword. The most common practice is that the beginning of a line starts with a capital letter. Words which are usually spelled with a lower case initial thus always appear with a capital initial. This practice is applied in the *Ortus* as well as in the *Promptorium* with the further difference that in the *Ortus* the English equivalent is then given in lower case whereas the compiler of the *Promptorium* frequently uses upper case initials for the part of the Latin equivalents. A very original deviation from this practice can be observed in the *Catholicon Anglicum*. For the English headwords the compiler very frequently also lists the article or the particle *to* for verbs, and such items then come to stand at the beginning of the line. He does not, however, follow the general practice of using a capital initial for the beginning of the line. The capital initial is usually preserved for that word which he regards as the proper headword. This method is also extended to the representation of derivatives and verbal collocations as can be seen from the following examples:

**Acceptabylle...**

**Accept...**

**vñAcceptabylle...**

or

**Acordynge...**  
**An Acordynge...**  
**vnAcordynge...**  
**to gedder Accorns...**  
**an Acorne...**

The two derivatives *vnacceptabylle* and *vnacordynge* would not be in alphabetical order. By using a capital letter for the initial of the basis from which the words are derived the compiler has justified his arrangement. The same remarks hold for the syntagma *to gedder Accorns*. In a modern dictionary such items as *unacceptable*, *unaccording*, or *to gather acorns* would most likely be listed as run-on entries. Looked at from this point of view one could also maintain that the subtle use of the capital initial was a device used by the compiler of the *Catholicon Anglicum* to achieve an economical type of 'run-on entry'.

Another striking feature which we can observe in these 15th-century English dictionaries and which is different from our modern practice is the structure of the headword entry. In the *Ortus Vocabulorum* the Latin headword is frequently followed by a Latin explanation of the meaning of the headword. That is, the Latin headword is often defined before we are actually given the English equivalent. Examples are:

Bacalum dicitur feretrum in quo mortui deferuntur. a beer.  
 Baculo as i. baculo percutere. to smyt wyth a staff.  
 Banniola lectus qui in itinere baiulatur. a trossyng bede.

Taking into account the dictionary as a whole and the percentage of Latin headwords for which there is no English equivalent but either a Latin definition or a Latin synonym, the *Ortus Vocabulorum* strikes me less as a Latin-English dictionary than as a Latin-Latin one which has been supplied with a considerable number of English equivalents.

In the *Promptorium* and the *Catholicon* we encounter similar headword entries for English. They seem to be tied to particular contexts and I would therefore like to maintain that they have a specific function. They usually occur when the same English form corresponds to more than one Latin word. That is, the function of these English synonyms or definitions following the English headwords is that of disambiguating homographs. The examples quoted on p. 319 can be taken as an illustration. Others could easily be supplied, cf.

*Bak*: dorsum, -i, -o.  
*Bak of a best*: Tergus, -ris, neut., 3...  
*Bak of a man or a woman*: Tergum, -i, -o.  
*Bak of an egge toole*: Ebiculum, -li.



This means that the compilers of these early dictionaries were aware that a single English form corresponded to different words in Latin. They did not yet use our modern practice of differentiating homographs by raised figures or figures in brackets. Instead they simply briefly specified the item in order to show which meaning they were dealing with.

As to the grammatical information which we are given in 15th-century English dictionaries we note again certain similarities and differences. A characteristic of 15th-century—and of 16th-century—English dictionaries is that grammatical information is only provided for the Latin part of the dictionary, whether in Latin-English or in English-Latin dictionaries. For the English language no grammatical specifications are given. Our three dictionaries differ, however, with respect to the amount of grammatical information actually given and the way in which it is coded. By explicit grammatical information I understand metalinguistic terms such as 'masculinum', 'femininum', 'neutrum', 'second declension', etc. By implicit grammatical information I understand the listing of grammatical forms themselves without specific reference to the respective grammatical term. In all three dictionaries we find a mixture of both types. Inflectional forms are recorded in an implicit way, the indication of the paradigm and usage restrictions such as 'indefinitum', 'caret supinum', etc. in an explicit way. The recording of gender is, however, different. The *Promptorium* and the *Ortus* give explicit indications whereas the nouns in the *Catholicon* are preceded by such implicit signs as *hic, hec, hoc*.

The *Ortus Vocabulorum* is the only Latin-English dictionary of these three. Compared to contemporary 15th-century vocabularies or 16th-century Latin-English dictionaries the *Ortus* manifests one striking characteristic. Explicit grammatical indications do not follow the Latin headword to which they belong. Instead, they usually occur at the end of the line, that is, after the English equivalent. The only 16th-century English dictionary in which we observe the same curious arrangement is Claudius Hollyband's *Dictionarie French and English*<sup>24</sup>.

We conclude by having a look at the 'equivalent part', that is, the part which follows the headword entry and usually gives an equivalent in the other language. The equivalent part is richer in the English-Latin dictionaries than in the Latin-English one. Since the reason for this cannot lie in the sources we have to consider the function of these dictionaries. Both types of dictionary were written for the English student learning Latin. For the understanding of Latin texts he needed a Latin-English dictionary, if he wanted to compose Latin texts himself he had to have an English-Latin one. The Latin-English arrangement would therefore correspond to the receptive, passive aspect of language learning, the English-Latin order to the productive, active one. This is the reason why the Latin part of

<sup>24</sup> HOLLYBAND, C. (1593), *A Dictionarie French and English*. London; but see also STEIN, G. (1981), *op. cit.*

Latin-English dictionaries is not as rich as the corresponding part in English-Latin ones. It may also account for the striking feature of the *Ortus* mentioned earlier. An English reader of a Latin text would more immediately be interested in the meaning of a Latin word than in its grammar. Therefore the English equivalent was given before the information on grammatical features of the Latin word. In English-Latin dictionaries, however, the user was given as much information on the Latin items as possible: grammatical specifications; information such as the name of the Latin author or the work consulted; verses from such authors; and explicit synonym differentiations.

The latter is a specific characteristic of the *Catholicon Anglicum* which has been rightly emphasized by Starnes. Examples for such explicit synonym differentiations are for instance:

**A Felay** (Felowe A.); consors in premio, comes in via, sodalis in mensa, collega in officio, socius in labore vel potius in periculo, complex, socius in malo; ...

**A Fischer**; piscator, piscarius; versus: ¶ Piscator prendit quod piscaris bene vendit.

In other cases the equivalent parts list a number of synonyms or synonymic expressions, verbal collocations (which are not yet translated into English—this is an achievement of 16th-century English lexicography) and derivatives—a richness which is unparalleled in the English part of Latin-English dictionaries of the same period. An example in point is the entry for *battle* in the *Catholicon Anglicum*:

**A Batalle**; acies, ala, bellum indicatur populorum, bellulum diminutivum; bellaticus bellicus, bellicosus participia; bellax, belliger, Auellum est inter ciues dictum, quod auelluntur populi in duas partes; certamen loco virtutis po[nit]ur: ciuile bellum ex ciuibus constat & auellum ut supra; conflictus, congressus, domesticum ex domesticis, duellum ex duobus est, intestinum ex parentibus; guerra, rebellio, mars, obsidio, pugna fit inter duos & inter plures; vnus contra vnum procinctus ti, procinctus ti; pallas dea belli, prelium geritur, preliolum diminutivum, a pre & lite vel a pre & luendo, proprie est primus congressus vel conflictus, bellum ipsa guerra: vnde dictum, romani victi sunt in prelio sed numquam in bello, quia sepe in congressibus vincebantur vel in ipsis conflictibus sed nunquam in guerra; vel prelium de prope, bellum de longe.

From the description I have given for the *Promptorium Parvulorum* and the *Ortus Vocabulorum* it should have become clear that the methods of presentation used by the compiler differ considerably. They do not, in my opinion, speak in favour of one and the same authorship for both dictionaries.