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ABSTRACT

A Carthusian monk at a priory near Abbeville, France, laid down his pen on April 30, 1440, ending twenty years’ work writing a Latin-French dictionary which is remarkable for its size, organization and comprehensiveness. Compiled by a cleric and based on a long tradition of medieval grammars and lexica, the Dictionarius of Firmin Le Ver would be the last of a line of manuscript bilingual dictionaries written in France.

In 1539, a Parisian editor and printer produced a bilingual dictionary which is equally remarkable – for its organization, and for the fact that it is the first printed dictionary in which French is the language of entry. Based on a humanist tradition which sought to return the Latin language to its classical roots, the Dictionaire Francoislatin of Robert Estienne is intended to assist students in their apprenticeship in Latin. Nonetheless, the French definitions illustrate the adequacy of the vernacular to express the nuances of Latin meaning, and at the same time they provide a synchronic record of early sixteenth-century French. The Dictionaire Francoislatin is, understandably, regarded as the corner-stone of modern French lexicography.

The century which separates Le Ver’s Dictionarius from Estienne’s Dictionaire Francoislatin is a brief period in the long history of Western lexicography, but it is the bridge between two different cultures: medieval and humanist. Our study follows the transition from the manuscript to the printed tradition through examination of four families of bilingual Latin-French dictionaries printed in France during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century. We look at their sources, both bilingual Latin-French and monolingual Latin dictionaries, and at their lexicographical methodology. We also identify internal relationships among successive editions of each dictionary, as well as external relationships among the four families.
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# ABBREVIATIONS AND OTHER CONVENTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>British Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>Bibliothèque municipale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Catholicon abbreviatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFL</td>
<td>Dictionnaire François-latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLG</td>
<td>Dictionarium Latino-gallicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLV</td>
<td>Dictionarius of Firmin Le Ver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGL</td>
<td>Glossarium gallico-latinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GKW</td>
<td>Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>University of Oxford, Bodleian Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>sub voce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFC</td>
<td>Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN/EV</td>
<td>Vocabularius Nebrisssensis/Epithoma vocabulorum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[ ] markers of text added or removed
[text] = text we have added
[...] = text we have removed

" " markers of a citation

> becomes

< comes from

Contractions (e.g. ä = ‘an’ or ‘am’, q = ‘que’, etc.) found in citations from manuscript and print documents are printed in full. The letters ‘u’ and ‘v’, whether in Latin or French, are printed as they would sound phonetically (e.g. ‘Vt’ is written ‘Ut’, ‘souvenir’ is written ‘souvenir’.

When a lemma is shown as a unit of treatment in an exhibit or example, it is printed in **bold** type. The use of upper or lower case for a lemma follows the use of the source document. In Latin-French dictionaries, *italic* type is used to indicate French as the language of exit.
INTRODUCTION

Two events marked the year 1539 as decisive in the history of the French language. On August 15, 1539 at Villers-Cotterêts, Francis I issued an ordinance dealing with judicial reform, of which Articles 110 and 111 required that thereafter all judicial acts were to be pronounced, recorded, and delivered to the parties in the French language only.¹ The Edict of Villers-Cotterêts (which extended the scope of an ordinance enacted in 1510 by Louis XII, requiring the use of French in criminal law) established the supremacy of French over both Latin and local dialects as the official language of administration.

Also in 1539,² Robert Estienne, Parisian humanist and printer, published his *Dictionaire Francoislatin (DFL)*, the first printed lexicon in which entries appeared in French, followed by their Latin equivalents. Wooldridge (1989a: 177) observes that this dictionary, "produced to help young French scholars learn classical Latin, had the simultaneous effect of promoting the mastery of French."

The new status of French in the *DFL*, as well as other innovations in organization and presentation, ensured its recognition as the genesis of modern French dictionaries. In the *DFL*, declares Quemada (1967: 47), Estienne presented the first extensive inventory of the vocabulary of the French language, and thus took his place at the head of all French lexicography proceeding directly or indirectly from it. Robert Estienne was, at one and the same time, the predecessor of modern lexicographers, and the heir of countless medieval compilers and scribes.

Medieval Latin glossography and lexicography have constituted a major field of study throughout Europe since the nineteenth century. Modern French metalexicography is also an

---

¹ "Et afin qu'il n'y ait cause de douter sur l'intelligence desdits arrests, nous voulons et ordonnons qu'ils soient faits et escrits si clairement, qu'il n'y ait ne puisse avoir aucune ambiguité ou incertitude, ne lieu à demander interpretation.

"Et pour ce que de telles choses sont souvent advenues sur l'intelligence des mots latins contenus esdits arrests, nous voulons d'ores en avant que tous arrests, ensemble toutes autres procedures, soient de nos cours souveraines et autres subalternes et inférieures, soient de registres, enquestes, contrats, commissions, sentences, testaments, et autres quelconques actes et exploicts de iustice, ou qui en dependent, soient prononcez, enregistrez et delivrez aux parties en langaige maternel françois et non autrement." Cited in Brunot 1897: 666, n.1.

² The title bears the date 1539, although the colophon on the last page is dated 1540. We use the generally accepted date of 1539 for this edition.
important academic discipline, and French dictionaries from the sixteenth century to the present day are the object of ongoing research. Unfortunately, the study of early Latin-French lexica has been sporadic, although closer examination would undoubtedly reveal their privileged position as a link between medieval Latin and modern French dictionaries. The debt owed by modern monolingual dictionaries to earlier bilingual versions is stressed by Wagner (1967: 120):

"Les dictionnaires monolingues des langues occidentales qui nous sont aujourd'hui si familiers ne sont pas issus par simple mutation, traduction ou adaptation, des dictionnaires latins antérieurs. C'est au contraire par une lente évolution des versions bilingues plus anciennes que se sont dégagées les formes essentielles de nos modernes répertoires."

Gaston Paris announced in 1870 his intention to publish a corpus of French manuscript glossaries. However, he did not carry out the project and it was abandoned until the 1930s, when Mario Roques, a former student of Paris, outlined a plan (1936a; 1936b: ix f.) for publishing a Recueil général des lexiques français du moyen âge. Roques identifies four categories of documents to be included in the collection:

a) French glosses inserted into a text or added in marginal notes;

b) glossaries, primarily bilingual, which assemble the glosses in lists which are independent of the work in question;

c) topical or thematic dictionaries, often bilingual; and,

d) alphabetical dictionaries, generally bilingual;

and organizes them according to the following types:

I. LEXIQUES ALPHABÉTIQUES.

A. Lexiques généraux.

1. Latin-français
2. Français-latin
3. Autres combinaisons bilingues avec éléments français
4. Français seul.

B. Lexiques spéciaux.

Noms } avec les mêmes sections 1, 2, 3, 4 que ci-dessus.

Verbes }
II. LEXIQUES MÉTHODIQUES.

A. *Lexiques généraux.*

1, 2, 3, 4...

B. *Lexiques spéciaux.*

Animaux, 1, 2...
Plantes, 1, 2...
etc.

III. GLOSSAIRES SÉPARÉS.

IV. GLOSES TEXTUELLES.

Roques explains that he proposes to concentrate first on the large alphabetical lexica. Tome I of *Lexiques alphabétiques*, which appeared in 1936, comprises Roques' edition of five manuscripts, each containing a medieval Latin-French alphabetical glossary which he calls *Abavus*, from the first word in the glossary. Tome II, published in 1938, is an edition of one manuscript from a series of alphabetical Latin-French glossaries which Roques calls *Aalma*.

Unfortunately, Roques' plans were interrupted by the Second World War and the program was abandoned until the late 1980s, when it was renewed by Jacques Monfrin and Brian Merrilees. The first volume in the *Nouveau Recueil des Lexiques latin-français du Moyen Âge* was published in 1994. It is an edition by Brian Merrilees and William Edwards of the *Dictionarius* of Firmin Le Ver (DLV), a large manuscript Latin-French dictionary (ms. Paris, BN nouv.acq.fr. 1120) compiled in northern France between 1420 and 1440. Editions of four other dictionaries are being prepared at present for the *Nouveau Recueil*: ms. Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine H236; the *Catholicon latin-français* in mss. Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine H110 and Stockholm, KB N78; the *Glossarium gallico-latinum* (GGL) in ms. Paris, BN lat. 7684; and the *Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus* (VFC), printed by Guillaume Le Talleur of Rouen c.1490 and reprinted by his successor, Martin Morin, in 1500.

Detailed examination of the structure, organization, and metalanguage of the DLV, and of its links with the GGL and the VFC,⁴ is expanding our knowledge of the evolution of French

---

lexicography in the fifteenth century, while a critical edition of a bilingual incunable (VFC) will be an important addition to the study of printed dictionaries before Estienne. Apart from excellent studies by Lépinette (1992) and Lindemann (1985 and 1994), the area of early printed Latin-French dictionaries has been virtually neglected.

Buridant (1986: 33), in a summary of contemporary research on medieval glossography and lexicography, emphasizes the fact that the passage from the fifteenth to the sixteenth century in the field of lexicography remains relatively unexplored. The present study attempts to contribute to filling this gap by tracing the descent of early printed Latin-French dictionaries from their manuscript predecessors, examining their internal structure and methods, and defining the external relationships among them.

Collison (1982: 19f.) observes:

"It is [...] impossible to compile a completely new dictionary. Even if no other dictionaries are physically consulted, the compiler's efforts are inevitably drawn from their education and experience, [...] all of which can be traced to the influence of dictionaries published in the past. Once a dictionary has been issued, its future influence is well-nigh incalculable."

Although Collison may have intended his remarks to pertain to modern lexicography, they are especially relevant to the present effort to trace the transmission of early Latin-French lexica.

It should be noted that the scope of the present study extends only to glossaries and dictionaries containing Latin and French forms. It does not cover other French-vernacular lexica, e.g. Hebrew, German, Flemish, English, etc. Also, it is chiefly concerned with alphabetically-ordered texts. There is a short review of some local-order and thematic Latin-French lexica, but the study is by no means complete in these areas. Lindemann (1994) presents a comprehensive analysis of bilingual and multilingual lexica, manuscript and printed up to 1600, where French is either the source or the target language.

Pre-print glossaries and dictionaries are the subject of Part A of our study, which briefly reviews (in chronological order, according to evidence presented by various authorities) Greek and Latin grammars and lexica from Antiquity to the Middle Ages, and Latin-vernacular glossaries and dictionaries from the third to the fifteenth centuries.
Chapter 1.0 deals with Greek and Latin works, while Chapter 2.0 discusses Latin-vocabulary lexic in general, and the Latin-French/French-Latin glossaries and dictionaries of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in particular. Among these, in 2.5.3. we examine the Aalma series first identified by Mario Roques (see p. 3 supra) in some detail, in view of its relationship to the first printed Latin-French dictionary, Catholicon abbreviatum (see 4.0). We are fortunate to be able to add three manuscripts to the series (see p.53f. infra), in addition to the twelve originally identified by Roques (see p. 50 infra). Chapters 1.0. and 2.0. describe the general characteristics, sources and transmission of these manuscript works, and Chapter 3.0. summarizes the methods used in their compilation and presentation, as well as the status of French in bilingual lexica.

Part B deals with Latin-French and French-Latin dictionaries printed up to 1539. Chapters 4.0. through 7.0. examine (in chronological order based on the first edition) the sources, general characteristics and transmission of the principal families: Catholicon abbreviatum, Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus, Vocabularius nebrissensis, and the lexicographical works of Robert Estienne. The last three families of dictionaries are well-researched, but the Catholicon abbreviatum (CA) has received very little attention. For this reason, we have analyzed the CA in considerable depth in Chapter 4.0, establishing its descent from a manuscript source, and tracing its printing history as well as the links among the various editions.

Chapter 8.0. presents a typological summary of the structure and lexicographical methodology, and examines the importance of the French language in these early printed dictionaries.

The dissertation ends with an overview of the transmission of Latin-French dictionaries from manuscript to printed tradition. We include our suggestions of some opportunities for future research.
A. PRE-PRINT GLOSSARIES AND DICTIONARIES

1.0. GREEK AND LATIN LEXICA

1.1. Greek Lexica – Fifth Century B.C. to Eleventh Century A.D.

The Greek term glossa originally meant a ‘tongue’, and later a ‘language’ or ‘dialect’ (Holtz 1996: 1). Gradually glossa came to denote any obsolete, foreign, dialectal or technical word, and Greek lexicography began with the compilation of ‘glossaries’, that is, collections and explanations of these opaque terms (Hessels 1910: 124). The first glossaries (fifth and fourth centuries B.C.) were generally devoted to explaining difficult words in the works of a single author, notably Homer whose poems contain elements of different dialects. Zgusta/Georgacas (1990:1696) explain that Homer always had a central place in Greek education and, therefore, a need existed for explanation of such terms. Other collections from this early period are glossaries of medical terms and of difficult words in other literary works.

Since "[i]n fifth-century Athens, language consciousness arose at the same time as philosophy and democracy" (Amsler 1989: 32), it is not surprising that philosophers were the earliest ‘glossographers’ – writers of glosses. Philosophers who compiled glossaries in the fifth century B.C. include the Sophist Protageras of Abdera and the materialist Democtus, and in the fourth century the Peripatetic Praxiphanes of Rhodes (Collison 1982: 26). We know only the authors and titles of these earliest glossaries, preserved through references in later collections (Zgusta/Georgacas 1990: 1696).

Traces of speculation on the origin of language survive from the writings of a number of early philosophers; however, the first extensive record of the different theories on the nature and origin of language is found in Cratylus, a dialogue of Plato (c.427–347 B.C.), in which three speakers present their views. Hermogenes takes the position that language is conventional and that all names have their origin in convention, Cratylus holds that language is natural and that every name is either a true name or not a name at all, and Socrates presents an intermediate view, that language is founded in nature but modified by convention (Amsler 1989: 32; Sandys 1921: I, 92). The controversy over the origin of language long continued.
Aristotle, among others, rejected the notion that words existed naturally, and held the opinion that their meaning was purely conventional (Sandys 1921: I, 96).

Early philosophical theorizing about language and the origin and meaning of words gradually led to definition of strategies for discovering that meaning, of which etymology became the principal method. Etymology (from Latin etymologia < Greek etymon ‘true’ + logos ‘speech’, ‘reason’) "explain[s] language change and meaning through specific interventions which disrupt the surface features of language, reveal underlying connections, forms, or semantic relations, and reproduce the original linguistic forms" (Amsler 1989: 19). According to philosophical ideals, etymology "reveals the original word-thing relations which ground language in meaning" (id. 1989: 27).

Where etymology is the retrogressive search for the original word, derivation (from Latin derivatio < derivare < de- + rivus ‘stream’) is the progressive formation of words over time from a primary or base word. Derivation coincides with etymology to reveal the real meaning of words (Marinoni 1968: 131). Throughout Antiquity and the Middle Ages, both Greek and Latin lexicographers and encyclopaedists frequently used etymological and derivational approaches in compiling their works, either as the first principle of organization or as the second, following alphabetical order.

Lexicographical activity flourished in the fourth and third centuries B.C. with the work of Alexandrian philologists. Among the earliest glossographers of the Alexandrian school were the poet Philetas of Cos (c.340–284 B.C.) whose Miscellanea explains rare words in Homer, various dialects and technica, and Simias of Rhodes who compiled three books of glottai (Hunt 1991: I, 3). Zenodotus of Ephesus (c.325–c.234 B.C.), a pupil of Philetas and the first librarian of the vast library at Alexandria, also wrote a glossary of the difficult words in Homer (Sandys 1921: I, 119 f.). Onomastica (from Greek onomastikos < onomazein ‘to name’, < onoma ‘name’) first appeared in the third century. The poet Callimachus of Cyrene (c.310–c.235 B.C.), collected the names of rivers, fish, winds and months (Holtz 1996: 6; Hunt 1991: I, 4) and Xenocritus and Philinus, both of Cos, compiled glossaries of medical terms (Collison 1982: 26f.).
Aristophanes of Byzantium (c.257–c.180 B.C.), a pupil of Zenodotus and also a director of the library at Alexandria, made the first known attempt to compile a comprehensive dictionary of the Greek language. His work, called *Lexeis*⁵ (from *lexis* 'word' < *legein* 'to say'), "marked a new epoch by tracing every word to its original meaning" (Sandys 1921: I, 129). Only fragments of the *Lexeis* survive today. Glossographers of the second century B.C. who stemmed from Aristophanes include Diodorus, Artemidorus, Nicander of Colophon and the critic and grammarian Aristarchus of Samothrace (Hessels 1910: 124).

In ancient Greece, *grammata* referred to the 'letters of the alphabet', and *grammatikos* was the term applied to one who knew their nature and number, that is, 'one who could read' (Sandys 1921: I, 6). Thus Grammar, which was "at first regarded mainly as the art of reading and writing" (*id.* 1921: I, 90) occupied a subordinate position in early Greek philosophy. Gradually, however, it came to enjoy a privileged status in Stoic philosophy in the third and second centuries B.C. (Amsler 1989: 22; Holtz 1981: 8) and *grammatikos* came to define one who taught and wrote about language. Dionysius Thrax (born c.166 B.C.), a pupil of Aristarchus, wrote the earliest extant Greek grammar (apparently at Rhodes, under Stoic influence). His text was used by early and later Roman grammarians, and was cited by grammarians and lexicographers throughout the Middle Ages (Collison 1982: 27; Sandys 1921: I, 138f.). About this same period, Diogenes of Babylon wrote the first treatises on the sounds of the human voice (Holtz 1981: 9).

By the first century B.C. the study of language played a fundamental role in Alexandrian philosophy and rhetoric (Amsler 1989: 16), and "the sphere of grammar enlarged to include the full critical study of the poets [...] and the title *kritikos*, or critic, became synonymous with *grammatikos*" (Copeland 1991: 11). Glossaries surviving, at least partially, from the first century B.C. include the Homeric glosses of Apion, a Greek grammarian who worked at Rome, and the Homeric glosses of Apollonius Sophista, who cites Apion (Daly 1967: 31f.). The grammarian Didymus (c.65 B.C.–10 A.D.) was among the most prolific writers of the age. His lexicographical work includes large compilations on the language of comedy and on the lan-
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⁵ Hunt (1991: I, 4) refers to this work as *Glottai*. 
guage of tragedy, which are principal sources of a number of later collections (Sandys 1921: 1, 141).

Indeed, most compilers of lexica, both literary and non-literary, drew on earlier compilations, although sources were not always explicitly named. Aristophanes included material from previous glossaries in the Lexeis, and in the first century A.D. the Alexandrian grammarian Pamphilios frequently cited Aristophanes in his glossary of rare and difficult words known as the Lexicon (Zgusta/Georgacas 1990: 1697). (Lexicon derives from Greek lexikos 'of words' < lexis 'word'). Only fragments exist today of Pamphiillos’s work, and of the summaries made of it by Vestinus in the first century and by Diogenianos in the second century (id. 1990: 1697).

Examples of specialist glossaries developed from earlier compilations of medical terms are the Collection of Technical Terms in Hippocrates written by the Greek grammarian, Erotian, in the first century A.D., and the Interpretation of Hippocratic Glosses compiled by the physician Galen of Pergamos (c.131–201 A.D.) (Daly 1967: 34; Sandys 1921: I, 296, 329).

In the first century A.D. a reaction set in among many Greek scholars and writers against the use, for literary purposes, of a common form of Greek, known as Koiné, which had gradually replaced the older varieties following the expansion of Greek territory under Alexander the Great. They urged a return to the pure Attic variety used by the Classical authors for writing (and speaking, in formal situations). A predictable result of this trend was the creation of Atticist lexica (described by Zgusta/Georgacas 1990: 1697 as "probably the first puristic dictionaries in the world"), which preserved the Attic Greek of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Examples of Atticist lexica are those compiled in the second century A.D. by Aelius Dionysius and the geographer Pausanius, as well as the Onomasticon of the Sophist and grammarian Julius Pollux of Naucratis (fl. 180) (Collison 1982: 34f.; Sandys 1921: I, 323). The Onomasticon covers, among other subjects, "the language of law and administration, music and dancing, medicine, the stage and numismatics" (Collison 1982: 34). Other important second-century collections are the thirty-seven books of words and phrases compiled by Phrynicus Arabius, and the lexicon of Valerius Harpocracy, entitled Technical Terms of the Ten Orators, which is
largely concerned with the language of Attic orators (Hessels 1910: 124; Sandys 1921: I, 324f.).

Hesychius of Alexandria compiled an extensive glossary, probably in the fifth century A.D., which subsumes the work of Diogenianos, with additions from the Homeric glosses of Apion and Apollonius (Collison 1982: 36; Sandys 1921: I, 378). Other fifth-century lexicographers are Stephanus of Byzantium, whose *Ethnica* (from Greek *ethnikos* 'national' < *ethnos* 'nation, people') a large geographical lexicon, exists today only in epitome, and the Alexandrian teacher and grammarian, Orion. The latter’s etymological lexicon was one of the sources of later Byzantine etymological compilations (Sandys 1921: I, 378). It was one of the "many streams of Greek lexicography [which] flowed into the vast river of Byzantine lexicography, characterized by the great etymological lexica" (Marinoni 1968: 128).

Photius (c.825–891), patriarch of Constantinople from 857 to 863 and again from 878 to 886, compiled a *Lexicon* in which he used excerpts from Diogenianos and Harpocratian, as well as early Platonic and Homeric glossaries. It is preserved in a single manuscript known as *codex Galeanus* which dates from about 1200 A.D. and is now in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge (Collison 1982: 44, n.26; Sandys 1921: I, 399). Through direction of the compilation of *Etymologicum genuinum*, which was started by an unknown author and finished by Photius, and of *Etymologicum parvum* which followed it, Photius became the founder of the Greek etymological lexica compiled in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (Sandys 1921: I, 400, 414f.).

A work which goes beyond the glossary format is *Suda*, a combination of glossary and encyclopaedia, which probably dates from the late tenth or early eleventh century. In addition to translations of the headwords or lemmata, *Suda* (traditionally known as *Suidas* from the mis-reading of later manuscripts) provides examples of the way in which terms are used, and also includes a vast amount of encyclopaedic information (Collison 1982: 45; Sandys 1921: I, 407f.).
1.2. Latin Lexica – Second Century B.C. to Tenth Century A.D.

The Greek grammarian Crates of Mallus, founder of a renowned school at Pergamos, is credited with introducing Stoicism into Roman philosophy and literature during his visit to Rome in 168 B.C. (Amsler 1989: 24; Sandys 1921: I, 173). However, Roman study of grammar and etymology truly began with the work of the philologist Lucius Aelius Stilo (c.152–74 B.C.). Stilo, who spent two years at Rhodes and was probably acquainted with Dionysius Thrax (see p. 8 supra), wrote on grammar and etymology, and also produced a glossary (Collison 1982: 27).

Among Stilo’s pupils was Marcus Terentius Varro (116–27 B.C.), the first important Roman grammarian and a proponent of Roman Stoic grammar (Amsler 1989: 24). Varro was a prolific author, particularly in the area of language study, but only a small portion of his prodigious output (74 works, comprising 620 books) is still extant. Of his vast treatise De lingua latina, only six (V to X) of the original twenty-five books have come down to us. This comprehensive work on the Latin language owes much to the Stoic teaching of Aelius Stilo, and to the grammar of Dionysius Thrax (Sandys 1921: I, 179). It included "discussions on etymology, gender, case-formation, comparison of adjectives, conjugation of verbs, and the collocation of words in forming sentences" (Nettleship 1895: 147). The first three of the surviving books De lingua latina deal with etymology, and Amsler (1989: 25) notes that Varro developed "the first comprehensive etymological model for the study of the Latin or Greek language", which would greatly influence medieval grammar and lexicography.

Varro was also the author of the first encyclopaedic Latin work on the 'liberal arts', entitled Disciplinarum libri novem. It comprised grammar, logic, rhetoric, geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, music, medicine and architecture. The first seven topics were the seven liberal arts of St. Augustine (354–430 A.D.), who substituted philosophy for astronomy, and of Martianus Capella (fl.410), who wrote an encyclopaedia on the seven liberal arts. These seven subjects later became the trivium and quadrivium of the medieval educational system (Sandys 1921: I, 178).

Holtz (1981: 10) observes that in the history of Latin grammar Varro's name stands out; he typifies Latin grammar in Antiquity and inspires it until the fifth century A.D.
Other works dating from the last years of the Republic which are sources for later grammarians include the *Synonyma* and the incomplete *De inventione* of Cicero (106–43 B.C.), the *Commentarii grammatici* of Nigidius Figulus (c.98–45 B.C.), which deals especially with orthography, synonyms and etymology, and the *De analogia* of Julius Caesar (c.102–44 B.C.) (Nettleship 1895: 147f.; Sandys 1921: I, 180, 194).

In the Augustan age the first important treatise on language is *De verborum significatu*, written by M. Verrius Flaccus (fl.10 B.C.) (Collison 1982: 30f.; Sandys 1921: I, 200). Nettleship (1895: 158) concludes that two of Varro’s lost works, *De sermone latino* and *De antiquitate litterarum*, were among the sources of Verrius’s vast work, of which he remarks (1885: 205): "Its title, *De verborum significatu*, gives but an inadequate idea of its contents, which embrace not only lexicographical matter, but much information on points of history, antiquities, and grammar...". It survives only in a fragment of an abridgement created by the grammarian Sextus Pompeius Festus in the second century A.D., which was further abridged by Paulus Diaconus (see p. 18 infra) in the eighth century (Collison 1982: 34; Engels 1961: 2; Sandys 1921: I, 200).

Latin grammarians of the first century A.D. whose writings were frequently cited by medieval authors are Remmius Palaemon of Vicentia (fl.35–70 A.D.), who wrote the first scholastic treatise on Latin grammar (Nettleship 1895: 149), Valerius Probus of Beyrut (fl.56–88), and Fabius Quintilianus, or Quintilian (c.35–95), a pupil of Palaemon (Sandys 1921: I, 200f.). A lost work of Suetonius Tranquillus (c.75–160), an encyclopaedia of at least ten books entitled *Prata*, is also a source for later writers, including Saint Jerome and Isidore of Seville (Nettleship 1885: 248) (see p. 13 and p. 15 infra). Suetonius’ other writings include a grammatical treatise entitled *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, which is frequently cited by later authors.

Grammar was among the many topics which interested Pliny the Elder (23–79 A.D.), and his writings include eight books entitled *Dubius sermo*. The work is based chiefly on Varro, on the lexicon and grammatical treatises of Verrius Flaccus, and on Julius Caesar’s *De analogia* (Nettleship 1895: 161). It is almost certain that Pliny’s treatise is an important source for
Quintilian, Nonius Marcellus (*id.* 1895: 163), and later grammarians including Donatus. The many wordlists contained in the elder Pliny’s monumental *Historia naturalis* were equally important sources for medieval lexicographers.

Aulus Gellius (born c.130 A.D.), a leading scholar of the second century, wrote *Noctes Atticae* during a stay in Athens. It is a compilation of earlier scholarship on Latin language and literature, and on law and philosophy. About a quarter of the treatise (more than one hundred chapters) concerns Latin lexicography, ten chapters deal with etymology, and more than thirty chapters discuss the finer points of Latin grammar (*Nettleship* 1885: 268f.). Other second-century writers on orthography and grammar are Terentius Scaurus, Velius Longus and Flavius Caper.

The study of grammar in the fourth century begins with the encyclopaedic *De compendiosa doctrina* written by the North African Nonius Marcellus (fl. 323 A.D.). It is divided into three parts: lexicographical, grammatical and antiquarian. Sources for the large lexicographical portion include Verrius Flaccus, and for the grammatical part, Probus and Pliny (*id.* 1885: 228f.), as well as Gellius, who is not named (*Sandys* 1921: i, 220). Saint Jerome (c.346–420), best known for his translation of the Bible, also produced a variety of grammatical texts, including glosses of hard words, and text commentary and exegesis (*Amsler* 1989: 109). Jerome’s sources include the work of Suetonius Tranquillus (see p. 12 *supra*).

Jerome’s tutor during his time in Rome was the grammarian and rhetorician Aelius Donatus, whom Collison (1982: 36) describes as “the most eminent teacher of his age”. Hunt (1991: i, 83) remarks that Donatus’s "reputation rests largely on his two grammars which were almost entirely lacking in originality but proved to be of great practical utility." The grammars are the shorter (*Ars minor*), which deals only with the parts of speech, and the longer (*Ars maior* or *Ars secunda*). Holtz (1981: xi)⁶ notes that the *Ars Donati* was the indirect heir of the language studies of Varro and Pliny, and that the text survived until the Renaissance because it represented access to the science of grammar and to written language. He explains (1981:

---

⁶ Holtz 1981 is the definitive study of the *Ars Donati* and its influence on Western pedagogy which endured for a millennium.
237) that contemporary grammarians, by imprecisely attributing to Donatus everything which deals with grammar, are responsible for the first identification of Donatus with his art. "The name of the grammarian thus becomes the symbol of grammar...".

The Roman grammarian, Servius Honoratus (born c.370) is chiefly known for his commentary on Virgil, but his other works include treatises on prosody and metre and a commentary on the *Ars Donati*. Holtz (1981: 224) notes that three grammatical texts of the fifth and sixth centuries (those of Cledonius, Pompeius and Cassiodorus),⁷ while revealing wide distribution of Donatus’s manual, owe an equal debt to Servius; the fortune of the manual seems linked to that of its commentator.

About 510 A.D. Priscianus, or Priscian, a native of Caesarea who taught at Constantinople during the time of the Emperor Anastasius (491–518) (Hunt 1991: I, 84), wrote, among other treatises, a comprehensive grammar entitled *Institutiones grammaticae*. Its popularity is evidenced by the fact that more than one thousand manuscripts of it still exist (Sandys 1921: I, 274). The grammar is divided into eighteen books, the first sixteen on accident, and the remaining two on syntax. From the latter, Priscian may be considered the creator of Latin syntax (Holtz 1981: 239). His Latin grammatical sources include Caper, Charisius, Diomedes, Probus and Donatus (with Servius on Donatus) (Sandys 1921: I, 273). Priscian did not in any way repudiate the work of his predecessors and exhibited only deference towards Donatus, whose material he used frequently in his text (Holtz 1981: 244). However, given their conceptual differences, competition between Priscian and Donatus was inevitable, although it did not really appear until the ninth century and it was only at the end of the eleventh century that Donatus’s reputation was overshadowed by that of Priscian (id. 1981: 240).

In addition to Donatus and Priscian, the chief authors of grammatical texts in the late Empire were Victorinus, Diomedes, and Charisius in the fourth century; Martianus Capella, Consentius and Phocas in the fifth; and Cassiodorus in the sixth (Brehaut 1912: 91). These writers contributed little that was original; in the main, their works were copies of earlier

---

⁷ Cledonius held a chair of grammar at Constantinople, Pompeius taught in Africa (Holtz 1981, 233), and Cassiodorus was a statesman from 507 until c.540, when he retired and founded a monastery named Vivarium, to perpetuate Roman culture.
grammars (id. 1912: 91). The De orthographia of Cassiodorus, for example, borrowed from the works of twelve grammarians, beginning with Donatus and ending with Priscian (Sandys 1921: I, 260).

Probably about the fifth century, notations of the contents which were written in the margins of Nonius Marcellus’s work (see p. 13 supra) were collected and put into alphabetical order. As the glossae Nonianae they were used in many later compilations. The glossae Eucherrii, extracted from the Formulae spiritualis intelligentiae of Saint Eucherius, bishop of Lyons in the fifth century, arose in much the same way (Hessels 1910: 126).

The only glossographers of the sixth century whose names are known today are the North Africans, Fabiüç Planciades Fulgentius (c.468–533 A.D.), who wrote Expositio sermonum antiquorum, and Placidus, who compiled one of the best-known and most influential medieval Latin glossaries (id. 1910: 126). Speaking of the glossae Placidi, Nettleship (1885: 245) notes that "the book is not merely a glossary, but a badly compiled handbook of general instruction, containing, besides the glosses, notes on antiquities, mythology, rhetoric, grammar, and matters of general information." It is not possible to identify all the sources, but Placidus includes glosses from Festus (Della Casa 1981: 38), and from Plautus and Lucilius (Hessels 1910: 126; Sandys 1921: I, 248).

Evidence confirms that the Ars Donati were known and used in Roman Gaul in the fifth century (Holtz 1981: 232) and that commentaries on Donatus, notably that of Pompeius, made their way to Visigothic Spain and to Ireland in the sixth century (id. 1981: 233). In the seventh century, the Auricept (the poet’s primer) was compiled in Ireland. Collison (1982: 40) notes that this is the oldest treatise of any language of Western Europe and that it relies heavily on Donatus in discussing the origins of the Irish language.

The many writings of Isidore of Seville (c.570–636), bishop and scholar, "are among the most important sources for the history of intellectual culture in the middle ages" (Brehaut 1912: 16). Isidore’s most influential works for the future of language study are the Differentiae and the encyclopaedic Etymologiae sive Origines. The Differentiae are divided into two books, of which the first, De differentia verborum, contains 610 articles in first-letter alphabetical
order, with words arranged in pairs and distinguished from each other. Many words are synonyms, and directions are given for their use. The second book, De differentiis rerum, explains, in forty articles, various terms of a theological and spiritual nature (id. 1912: 26; Lindemann 1994: 96).

Braulio, bishop of Saragossa, the friend for whom Isidore compiled the Etymologiae, divided them into twenty books, "describing the whole as a vast volume of 'etymologies' including everything that ought to be known" (Sandys 1921: 1, 456). Brehaut (1912: 33f.) details Isidore's philosophy in using an etymological approach to compiling his encyclopaedia:

"Throughout the Etymologies there is a leading principle which guides Isidore in his handling of the different subjects, namely, his attitude toward words. His idea was that the road to knowledge was by way of words, and further, that they were to be elucidated by reference to their origin rather than to the things they stood for. [...] All he had to do, he believed, was to clear away the misconceptions about their meaning, and set it forth in its true original sense. [...] The task of first importance, therefore, in treating any subject, was to seize upon the leading terms and trace them back to the meanings which they had in the beginning ..."

Book I, De grammatica, is a lengthy treatise on grammar (that is, the study of literature at large). The following extract\(^8\) illustrates the place of glossography and etymology in Isidore's conception of grammar:\(^9\)

"Chapter 5. On grammar.
 [...] 4. The divisions of the grammatic art are enumerated by certain authorities as thirty; namely, eight parts of speech, the articulate voice, the letter, the syllable, metrical feet, accent, marks of punctuation, signs and abbreviations, orthography, analogy, etymology, glosses,\(^10\) synonyms, barbarisms, solecisms, [other] faults, metaplasms, schemata, tropes, prose, metres, fables, histories."

Book X of the Etymologiae, De vocabulis, is a short glossary arranged alphabetically to the first letter, which deals with the origin of certain words,\(^11\) predominantly substantives which describe mankind, and adjectives which describe human qualities (Lindemann 1994: 96).

The content and method of the Etymologiae show considerable similarity with the succession of Roman encyclopaedists: Varro, Verrius Flaccus, Pliny the Elder, Suetonius

---

\(^8\) De grammatica I.5.4: "Divisiones autem grammaticae artis a quibusdam triginta innumerantur, id est, partes orationis octo: vox articulata, littera, syllaba, pedes, accentus, positurae, notae, orthographia, analogia. etymologia, glossae, differentiae, barbarismi, solecismi, vitia, metaplasmi, schemata, tropi, prosa, metra, fabulae, historiae."

\(^9\) Translated in Brehaut 1912: 97.

\(^10\) Emphasis is ours.

\(^11\) "Origo quorundam nominum, id est unde veniant, non paene omnibus patet. Proinde quaedam noscendi gratia huic operi interieimus." Lindsay 1911: 1.
Tranquillus and Nonius Marcellus. Through a comparison of outlines of their contents, Brehaut (1912: 41 n.1) illustrates Isidore’s indebtedness to these works. Other identified sources of the *Etymologiae* include Cicero, Quintilian and Boethius (Fontaine 1981: 98f.), and the commentaries of Servius on Virgil, Gregory and Donatus. Nettleship (1885: 245) maintains that although some notes in Isidore coincide with Placidus, there are sufficient differences in others to show that Isidore did not borrow directly from Placidus; rather, they probably used the same handbooks.

Isidore was cited in grammars and lexica until the end of the Middle Ages, and the *Etymologiae* became “the standard book of reference on all matters connected with the arts and sciences” (Laistner 1931: 176). Hrabanus Maurus (c.776–856), who became archbishop of Mainz, copied the *Etymologiae* and reissued them in a somewhat altered version under the title *De rerum naturis*, also later called *De universo* (id. 1931: 176). Maurus’s encyclopaedia contained twenty-two books rather than twenty, the contents were reordered, some sections were omitted, and other material was added. Maurus wrote several educational texts as well, and was the first to introduce Priscian into German schools (Sandys 1921: I, 483). Also in the ninth century, a pupil of Maurus, Walafrid Strabo (c.809–849), abbot of Reichenau, was the author of the original form of the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Vulgate, which was subsequently revised by Gilbert de la Porree and Anselm of Laon (id. 1921: I, 485).

At the beginning of the eighth century, the Anglo-Saxon monk and historian, Bede or Baeda (673–735), gathered together all existing knowledge of physics, music, philosophy, grammar, rhetoric, arithmetic and medicine in forty-five works, which may be classified as grammatical, scientific, historical and biographical, and theological. Commenting on the close relationship between grammar and glossography, Della Casa (1981: 38) points out that a tenth-century manuscript (Vat. 1469) of Bede’s *De Orthographia* is “contaminated” by glosses from Placidus and other glossaries.

Another Anglo-Saxon churchman and scholar, Alcuin of York (c.735–804) , met Charlemagne while on a mission to Rome in 781 and was persuaded by him to settle in France,
where he initiated monastic and educational reforms. His extensive writings include treatises on grammar, orthography, rhetoric and dialectic (Sandys 1921: 1, 474 f.).

Paulus Diaconus, or Paul the Deacon (c.720–c.799), entered the Benedictine order at Monte Cassino in 774, and in 782 went to the court of Charlemagne, where he remained until 786. During his stay in France he wrote a *Commentarius de arte Donati*, and after his return to Monte Cassino, he sent to Charlemagne an epitome of the abridgement made by Sextus Pompeius Festus of Verrius Flaccus’s *De verborum significatu* (Engels 1961: 2) (see p. 12 supra).

As we have seen, lexicographical activity in the Latin West in the classical and early Christian eras was largely the province of grammarians and encyclopaedists, although by no means exclusively; orators, historians and other writers enthusiastically addressed the topics of glossography, synonymy, orthography and grammar. At the same time, the ‘glossing’ of texts continued; sacred Scripture and works by Christian writers were added to those of classical authors, and new glossaries were compiled from the glossed manuscripts. Glossography began to change during the period from the sixth to the eighth centuries: large compilations were made from several small ones, old glossaries were amalgamated with more recent ones (Hessels 1910: 126), and the resulting compilations were sorted alphabetically.

Glossaries whose authors are unknown are often designated by the first word they contain, for example, *Abba, Abolita, Abstrusa, AA, Abavus, Affatim*, and so on. The *Abolita Glossary*, which dates to the beginning of the eighth century, is described as a Spanish compilation (*CGL IV* 4). Its principal source is Festus, with additional material from Virgil, Terence, Apuleius, etc. (Laistner 1931: 178; Lindsay 1917: 120). In existing manuscripts the *Abolita* is frequently associated (though not mixed) with the *Abstrusa Glossary*, which dates from the beginning of the seventh century and which Lindsay (1917: 121) believes to be a French compilation. Festus is the *Abstrusa*’s main source; others include Isidore, and Servius’s commentaries on Donatus and Virgil (*id. 1917* 122). The *Abavus Glossary* (which includes *Abavus maior* and *Abavus minor*) was compiled in the eighth or ninth century. Its sources
include *Abstrusa, Abolita, Affatim, AA, Abba*, scholia on Virgil, Philoxenus, Isidore, and the Vulgate (*GL II: 25f.*).

The compilation which dominated the field of glossography in the early Middle Ages is the *Liber glossarum*, also known as *Glossarium Ansileubi*, written in France\(^\text{12}\) in the latter part of the eighth century (McGeachy 1938: 309). Lindsay (1917: 126) states, "The *Etymologiae* of Isidore, snipped into paragraphs, is the groundwork of the whole". However, it also draws on *Abstrusa, Abolita, Placidus*, on Paulus's epitome of Festus, and on the medical glossaries of Galen, Hippocrates and Pandectus. And it includes material from Virgil, Terentius and Cicero, as well as from the Church Fathers, Eucherius, Fulgentius, and others (*GL I: 2f.; McGeachy 1938: 309*).

The *Liber glossarum* was a major source for the *Reichenau Glossary* (see p. 34 *infra*) and for the *Elementarium doctrinae erudimentum* of Papias (see 1.3.1.), and was copied and abstracted for many other glossaries and epitomes. It also survives in rearranged form as the principal source for the vast *Glossarium Salomonis*, attributed to Saiomo III, abbot of St. Gall and bishop of Constance (d.919) (McGeachy 1938: 310f.). And in the seventeenth century it was the chief source for Du Cange's *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis* (id. 1938: 312f.).

Hessels (1910: 127) observes that the number of glossed manuscripts diminished toward the eleventh century, and that new grammatical treatises began to appear. The principal grammatical authorities followed in the Latin West up to the eleventh century were the manuals of Priscian and Donatus with Servius on Donatus, and the grammatical treatises of Cassiodorus, Isidore and Bede, as well as the commentary on Donatus by Remigius of Auxerre (d.908) (Sandys 1921: I, 665). In the twelfth century new works began to supplement the standard texts. Peter Helias, one of the best-known medieval grammarians, wrote a commentary on Priscian, *Summa super Priscianum*, c.1150. Alexander of Villedieu completed the *Doctrinale*, a hexameter poem in 2645 lines, c.1199, and Eberhard of Bethune wrote the

---

\(^{12}\) Some authors, e.g. Hessels (1910: 127), hold that the author lived in Spain.

In surveys of medieval Latin lexicography the large compilations tend to overshadow the smaller ones. However, small lexica continued to appear in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, such as the treatises of Adam of Petit Pont, Alexander Nequam and John of Garland (see 2.4.). Many thematic glossaries, particularly in the areas of law, medicine and theology, were written in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. One example is the Expositiones vocabulorum biblie, compiled between c.1248 and c.1267 by William Brito (see 1.3.4.), which deals with difficult words in the Bible. Another is Reductorium, repertorium et dictionarium morale utriusque testamenti, an encyclopaedia written by Pierre Bersuire (1290–1362), of which Part 3 is an alphabetically-arranged glossary of words from the Bible, with moral expositions (Collisw 1982: 48).

The Mammotrectus super biblia of Johannes Marchesinus (fl. c.1300), a manual for the clergy, also falls under the heading of thematic lexica. It contains etymological explanations of the difficult words in the Bible and in the liturgical Hours (Sandys 1921: I, 667).

Early printers quickly exploited the rich resource offered by Greek and Roman lexicographers and grammarians. Editions of Aulus Gellius, Varro, Verrius Flaccus, Nonius Marcellus, Donatus, and many others, number among the first printed books. There are also a large number of nineteenth- and twentieth-century editions, from original manuscripts, of Greek and Latin grammars and glossaries.

1.3. Latin Lexica – Eleventh to Fourteenth Centuries

1.3.1. Elementarium doctrinae erudimentum of Papias

Papias, a cleric and possibly a native of Pavia in Lombardy (Hunt 1991: I, 371), spent ten years\(^\text{13}\) compiling his Elementarium doctrinae erudimentum, and finished it about 1053. His

\(^{13}\) "... opus quidem a multis alii iam pridem elaboratum, a me quoque nuper spatium circiter decem annorum prout potui adauctum et accumulatum ..." Cited in Daly/Daly 1964: 230 and Hunt 1991: I, 371 n.4.
dictionary represents an important step forward in Latin lexicography. Marinoni (1968: 132f.) explains that times have changed; an increasing number of people, in new social categories – commerce, public life, politics – are learning to write Latin. These people do not need the old glossaries with their collections of outdated words, and grammar texts are too ponderous for rapid reference. What is needed is a new type of lexicographical collection; one which is, above all, easy to consult. It is this need which Papias attempts to fill.

Papias’s consciousness that he has created an original work is clear from his lengthy preface. In the following extract, Papias proudly states that his work is more than a simple glossary:¹⁴

"But now it appears I ought not to pass on without mention of the name of this Art which, although it was once called Glossary because it adhered literally and simply to the interpretation of each individual word, now that definitions and notations according to the rules as well as quotations and many other features of this sort have been added, may be more profoundly and appropriately be called a Basic Introduction to Education."¹⁵

Despite this assertion, Papias’ work is still close to the glossary structure. The text is a mixture of short articles consisting chiefly of synonyms or short definitions, and longer articles arranged according to the derivational method, or comprising lengthy explanations of an encyclopaedic nature (Weijers 1989: 141). Hunt (1991: I, 371) observes that the Elementarium "marks the first stage in the elaboration of wordbooks".

Papias concludes his preface with a list of his sources (Daly/Daly 1964: 231); however, de Angelis (1977) clearly demonstrates that his principal source is the Liber glossarum or Glossarium Ansileubi (see p. 19 supra). Since the Liber glossarum is itself compiled from many sources, de Angelis also gives the original source from which each lemma is drawn, as in the following examples:

**Exhibit 1: Sources of Elementarium doctrinae erudimentum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isidore of Seville</th>
<th>Liber glossarum</th>
<th>Elementarium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ls. 10. 14)</td>
<td>(AB 11)</td>
<td>(AB 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abactor** est fur iumentorum et pecorum, quem vulgo abigieium vocant, ab abigendo scilicet.

Lindsay 1911, I (no pagination)  
GL I: 15  
de Angelis 1977, 1: 2

¹⁴ "Iam vero de huius artis nomine non pretermittendum videtur, quae quidem, etsi olim, quia ad verbum et simpliciter unius aliius dictionis retinebat interpretationem, glossarium vocaretur, iam vero, diffinitionibus et secundum regulas notationibus, sententii quoque et multis id genus superadditis, altius atque aptius elementarium doctrina erudimentum nominari poterit." Cited in Daly/Daly 1964: 230, and translated in id. 1964: 234.

Grammatical material included by Papias comes, directly or indirectly, from Priscian, Fulgentius, Pompeius, Charisius, and others; medical terms generally from Hippocrates; names of trees, plants, gems, etc. from Pliny. Classical authors include Juvenal, Cicero, Virgil, and others.

Papias was an important source for virtually all Latin lexicography until the fifteenth century. According to Bursill-Hall (1981) there are 110 existing manuscripts of the *Elementarium*. It was first printed in Milan in 1476, and printed again in Venice in 1485, 1491 and 1496. The latter edition was reprinted at Torino in 1966. In 1977, V. de Angelis published the first three volumes of a critical edition, covering the letter 'A'. Papias’ work was also the basis of *Universal Vocabulario*, the first Latin-Spanish dictionary, printed in 1490 by Alfonso Fernández of Valencia (Lépinette 1992: 248; Lindemann 1994: 141).

1.3.2. *Liber derivationum* (Panormia) of Osbern of Gloucester

Hunt (1991: I, 371) writes:

"The emergence of dictionaries as distinct from 'libri glossarum', or collections of glosses, is the result of the increasing use of the derivational principle as a method of extending the lexical knowledge of students whose Latin was relatively elementary. [...] Etymology became the key not only to generating vocabulary but to semantic precision. [...] In periods of superior Latinity the need was for explanations of rare or archaic words and the lemmata might be collected in alphabetical arrangement to constitute glossaries, a method which ran the risk of generalising many purely ad hoc meanings. For more elementary instruction, on the other hand, methods of word composition and generation were no longer simply treated orally in the classroom, but incorporated in reference works for private study and consultation and there arranged in 'articles' in which sequences of lexical items are connected by phrases such as *inde*, *componitur*, *derivatur*, *dicitur*, etc. The 'disciplina derivationis' became particularly widespread in the twelfth century."

The teaching of Priscian (see p. 14 *supra*) is at the root of the twelfth-century expansion of the *disciplina derivationis*. By contrast with Donatus, Servius and later Isidore, for whom derived nouns are only one of the twenty-seven or twenty-eight types into which the category of appellative nouns is divided, there are for Priscian only two types of appellative nouns: primitive and derived, and there are also two types of verbs: primitive and derived. He thus derives a
large part of the Latin vocabulary from a restricted number of primitive words, through precise rules which fix the meaning of the inflections applied to a root to obtain the different categories of nouns and of verbs (Marinoni 1968: 134).

There were two schools of thought in the twelfth century concerning the relationship of derivatio and etymologia. Weijers (1989: 147f.) explains that one group "took etymologia narrowly, as the simple explanation of a word by one or more other words according to its character or verbal likeness [...] whereas the [other] group took etymologia in a larger sense, including not only derivatio (which is in fact a form of etymology that derives one word from another thought to have existed earlier [...]}, but also interpretatio (the explanation in a different language) and compositio (the composition of a word from several others)." 16

The interest in the technique of derivation is clear from the many extant manuscripts containing collections of derivations, usually called simply derivationes (id. 1989: 148). At first, the collections of derivationes were kept separate from glossaries, but at some point, as the need developed for dictionaries containing virtually all Latin words together with all their possible inflections, lexicographers attempted to merge derivationes and glossaries. An important example is a compilation found in three twelfth-century manuscripts (mss. Munich 17151, 17153 and 17194). It consists of two parts: Expositiones, which is a simple glossary, and Derivationes, a collection of derivations (Marinoni 1968: 135f.).

It is likely that Claudianus Osbernus, or Osbern (c.1123–1200), a Benedictine monk at Gloucester, used the work described above when compiling his Liber derivationum, also called Panormia (CGL I: 204f.; Manitius 1931, III: 188, Marinoni 1968: 136). Osbern adopted the same method of separating derivations and glosses; he divided his work into letter-sections, called Tractati, and further divided each Tractus into two parts (each in first-letter alphabetical order): Derivationes and Repetitiones. (The latter correspond to the Expositiones of the Munich manuscripts.) In the Derivationes the entries are grouped in word families, while the Repetitiones 'repeat' certain words from the derivation section, such as neologisms created by Osbern

16 Also see R.W. Hunt 1958: 271.
following the principles of derivation, as well as rare and difficult terms drawn from glossaries; however, they also include other terms which did not fit into the derivational method (Marinoni 1968: 137; Weijers 1989: 142).

Two lexicographical techniques – glossary and derivation – are juxtaposed in Osbern’s work, without merging entirely. Marinoni (1968: 137) concludes that Osbern felt the need, on the one hand, to unite the two methods, and on the other hand, to keep them distinct from one another.

Osbern cites a number of classical and medieval authors, including Plautus, Persius, Augustine, Cicero, Ovid, Horace, Virgil, Juvenal, Donatus and Priscian, as well as Isidore, Hrabanus Maurus, Remigius on Donatus and Johannes Scotus on Martianus Capella.

According to Hunt (1991: 1, 373, n.14), there are twenty-one surviving complete copies of the Panormia and six fragments. It has been printed once, by Cardinal Mai (1836: VIII), who did not know the author when he edited ms. Vatican Reg. lat. 1392 under the title Thesaurus novus latinitatis. He concludes from the number of romanisms and the few anglicisms in the text, that the author was an Anglo-Norman grammarian. Littré (1852: 8) also does not recognize the author, but speculates that it might be Alexander of Villedieu. It is Wilhelm Meyer (1874) who identifies the author of Panormia as Osbern of Gloucester.

1.3.3. Magnae derivationes of Hugutio of Pisa

"If Osbern represents the meeting point of two different disciplines, which yet remain distinct and separate", observes Marinoni (1968: 139), "it is Hugutio of Pisa who tries to merge them into a single instrument." Hugutio, a specialist in canon law, born in Pisa and bishop of Ferrara from c.1191 until his death c.1210, copied Osbern extensively, but without preserving the bipartite structure. Other sources for Hugutio’s dictionary, which was called simply Derivationes (others would later add Magnae to the title), are Isidore, Papias, Priscian, Petrus Helias, Remigius of Auxerre, and a number of glossary collections (Riessner 1965: 24).

Riessner (1965) identifies each source used by Hugutio in two articles from the Magnae derivationes: Augeo (194f.) and Aveo (196f.). Exhibit 2 presents a short extract from the latter:
Exhibit 2: Sources of Magnae derivationes

AVEO -es, -ui, id est cupere, et caret supino et est neutrum, quia vox ipsa deficit in passivo, sine qua voce, scilicet passiva, verbum activum esse non potest: unde Lucanus: Omnia Cesar avet (Osb.).

Inde avidus -a -um; unde avidulus -a -um, id est aliquantulum avidus: et comparatur avidior -simus; unde avide -dius -simae adverbium et hec aviditas -tis et hec avena -e, quia avide surgat: et inde hec avenula -le diminutivum et <a>ve[ru]nco -cas verbum activum, id est avenas eradicare, et per compositionem averuncio -cas, similiter avenas eellere, nam auncare dictur eellere, ex a[d]vena et run, quod compositum est averuncare (= Osb.)

Item ab aveo avarus -a -um (= Osb.); quod enim dicitur avarus quasi habens varas, id est curvas, manus,
vel avarus quasi avens aurum (Isid. Etymol. X, 9: Papias), ethimologia est, non compositio. ... 

Riessner 1965: 196

Hugutio tried to arrange his entire work according to the derivational method, creating large families of words through derivation from one root (Weijers 1989: 143), and further embellishing the whole with a variety of quotations. Austin (1946: 104) found some 2500 quotations in Magnae derivationes, of which about eleven percent come from the Vulgate Bible. Principal authors include Plautus, Juvenal, Virgil, Martianus Capella, Persius, Ovid, Terence, and others. Looking at Osbern as an intermediate source, Austin notes (1946: 105) that Hugutio shows the least correspondence with Osbern in quotations from the Vulgate, but a high correspondence in quotations from many of the authors.

Lengthy articles, stuffed with derivations and details on orthography, phonetics and grammar, and grouped in first-letter alphabetical order, resulted in a work which was very difficult to consult. Yet in spite of its cumbersome format, Magnae derivationes was quickly and widely copied. Bursill-Hall (1981) identifies 210 extant manuscripts, most dating from the thirteenth century, in European libraries. Further evidence of its extensive use is the fact that it is cited as a source in virtually every major Latin or Latin-vernacular dictionary from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries. However, Hugutio’s work has never been printed. The Modern Language Association of America has produced Magnae Derivationes of Uguccione da Pisa: a reproduction of the MS Laud 626 in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, Collection of photographic facsimiles, no. 30, 1925.

Most present-day scholars, confronted with its dense articles and (to modern eyes) preposterous etymologies, share the opinion expressed by Daly/Daly (1964: 235) that Hugu-
Nico’s *Derivationes* "was to enjoy a reputation and use out of all proportion to its real worth". However, Hugutio’s work should be measured first in terms of its value at the time it was compiled. R.W. Hunt (1950: 149) explains:

"To the teachers of the early thirteenth century Hugutio’s work appeared in a very different light. The masters of the French Cathedral schools in the twelfth century had done their work by lecturing very fully on texts. In the course of these lectures, many of which still survive, they had given etymologies and derivations of an elaborate kind, but they had never stopped to gather them together or to compile works of reference. [...] It was Hugutio’s great service that he brought together many of these scattered derivations and combined them with the older glossarial matter in a single book arranged alphabetically."

Second, it should be regarded in terms of its contribution to later lexicographical compilations, and to its status as an authority for writers such as Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio (Hunt 1991: I, 383).

1.3.4. *Expositiones vocabulorum biblic* (Summa) of William Brito

Specialist or thematic lexica, that is, covering a particular branch of learning, have existed since Antiquity (for example, Galen’s glosses on Hippocrates, and Pliny’s lists of flora and fauna). To take another example: Roman law, as codified by Justinian, emperor of Constantinople and Rome from 531 to 565, was glossed continuously between the sixth and the thirteenth centuries. Glosses written in the period from about 600 to 1070 cover the *Codex* (Books I–IX of the *Corpus iuris civilis*) and are lexical-grammatical in character: synonyms, etymologies, etc. (H. Kantorowicz in Smalley 1941: 36). An astonishing number of medico-botanical glossaries appeared in the late Middle Ages, many of which still exist (Hessels 1910: 127), while canon law and biblical study were equally important fields for the production of glossaries.

Scriptural exegesis, that is, the critical exposition or interpretation of sacred Scripture and patristic writings, began early in the Christian era and continued throughout the Middle Ages. The simplest type of exegetical writing is the gloss, so that glossing texts (between the lines or in the margins of manuscripts), and later compiling single glosses into collections for teaching purposes, was an essential part of monastic life. A large number of biblical glossaries, many of which follow the order in which the lemmata occur in the original text, are still extant. An exception to this usual ordering practice is Part 3 of *Reductorium, repertorium et*
dictionarium morale utriusque testamenti, written in the fourteenth century by Pierre Bersuire (see p. 20 supra). Another exception, and one of the most important biblical glossaries, is the Summa or Expositiones vocabulorum biblie composed by the Franciscan William Brito between c.1250 and c.1270 (Daly/Daly 1975: xxiii).

The Summa Britonis is not merely a glossary; it is a dictionary of difficult biblical terms.\textsuperscript{17} Most articles contain derivations, etymologies, and quotations, and the entries follow virtually absolute alphabetical order. By reason of its restricted nomenclature, it should probably be regarded as a member of the ‘specialist’ rather than the ‘general language’ category of dictionaries. However, its wide distribution – at least 130 copies still exist, spread across Western Europe (Daly/Daly 1975: xxi), and its organization – full alphabetical order, morphological information, use of cross-references, etc., make it an important link in the succession of medieval lexica.

The Vulgate is the principal source for the Summa; of some 2500 articles Daly/Daly (1975: xxiii) identify only fifty whose headwords do not occur in the Vulgate. Citations are plentiful and authors cited include the Roman and early Christian traditions: Horatio, Juvenal, Lucan, Ovid, Priscian, Virgil, Augustine and Jerome, among others, as well as the chief lexicographers of the seventh to the eleventh centuries: Isidore, Papias and Hugutio. Brito takes an important step, however, by adding to his sources new grammarians whose teachings are replacing those of Donatus and Priscian: Alexander of Villedieu, Alexander Nequam, Bene of Florence, Eberhard of Bethune and Peter of Riga.

The Summa is believed to be the primary source of the Mammotrectus, a biblical glossary compiled about 1300 A.D. by Johannes Marchesinus of Reggio (Hessels 1910: 127; Sandys 1921: I, 667). The Mammotrectus contains difficult words of the Bible and the liturgical Hours, with etymological and grammatical explanations. Its arrangement follows the order of books of the Bible as well as the church year, but there is also a supplementary alphabetical index.

\textsuperscript{17} "Difficiles studeo partes quas biblia gestat". Cited in Daly/Daly 1975: 3.
A fourteenth-century Latin-French glossary conserved in ms. Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine H236 (see 2.5.2.), also derives a large part of its nomenclature from the *Summa Britonis* (Grondeux 1994: 41; Merrilees 1994a: v).

Brito’s *Summa* was printed once, in the fifteenth century, under the name of Henricus de Hassia. Lloyd Daly and Bernardine Daly prepared a critical edition of the *Summa* in 1975.

**1.3.5. Catholicon of John Balbi of Genoa**

We have seen the conception of the Latin dictionary in the works of Papias, Osbern, Hugutio and Brito; now we witness its birth in the *Catholicon* of the Dominican John Balbi, a native of Genoa (Johannes Januensis de Balbis).

The *Summa grammaticalis quae vocatur Catholicon*, usually called simply *Catholicon*, was finished on March 7, 1286, and influenced European lexicography for more than two centuries until “the time when printing and the humanism of Laurentius Valla and of Erasmus of Rotterdam signalled the beginning of a new era” (Powitz 1996: 300). The huge work exemplifies the close relationship between grammar and lexicography which has been evident since Antiquity. It comprises five sections, four of which deal with grammatical topics: orthography, accent, etymology and syntax, and figures of speech. The fifth part is an alphabetically-arranged, encyclopaedic dictionary comprising more than 14,000 entries (Wallis 1981: ii).\(^1\)\(^8\) (Powitz 1993: 314 tells us that the printed version contains nearly 670,000 words).

Balbi’s intention to illustrate the close links between the grammar and the lexicon is evident throughout the work. Explanations of words appear in the grammar section; information on pronunciation and orthography is consistently provided in the dictionary, where references to the preceding sections also occur frequently, e.g. "sicut dixi supra in tercia parte...," etc. (Della Casa 1981: 42f.; Wallis 1981: 48).

Scholars agree that John Balbi was not an innovative thinker, but a careful, assiduous compiler of material drawn from works he judged to be important.\(^2\) Rather, it is through his

---

\(^1\)\(^8\) This figure refers to the number of alphabetically-ordered lemmata; it does not include the large quantity of sub-lemmata (derivatives) contained in the articles.

\(^2\) "Immensas omnipotenti deo. patri et filio et spiritui sancto graciae referimus acciones. qui nostrum catholicon ex multis et diversis doctorum texturis elaboratum atque contextum licet per multorum annorum curricula. In MCCLXXXVI anno domini noni marcii ad finem usque produxit." Mainz 1460. Emphasis is ours.
method of constructing his dictionary that he left a lasting mark on medieval lexicography. Wallis (1981: 59) observes that Balbi "fuses into one alphabetically-ordered, cross-referenced sequence a glossary, a grammar, a concordance, a florilegium, a repertory of distinctiones, a theological encyclopaedia, and a scientific encyclopaedia."

Priscian is Balbi’s primary source for grammatical notes, followed by Donatus, but contemporary grammarians are also represented: Eberhard of Bethune, Bene of Florence, Alexander of Villedieu and Peter of Riga (Marinoni 1968: 140; Wallis 1981: 40). Papias and Hugutio are the main sources for the lexicon; others are classical authors, the Church Fathers, Isidore, and more contemporary religious authorities such as Thomas Aquinas and Bernard of Clairvaux. The dictionary also contains many biblical quotations, exempla, and numerous versus memoriales. Some of the latter are taken from Hugutio but many come from Eberhard of Bethune and Alexander of Villedieu (Weijers 1989: 144).

Exhibit 3 illustrates that Papias is one of Balbi’s principal sources for the macrostructure of the Catholicon, although Balbi decreased the number of lemmata. Of the first twenty-four lemmata in the Catholicon, fifteen occur in the Elementarium:

Exhibit 3: Elementarium doctrinae erudimentum as a source of the Catholicon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementarium</th>
<th>Catholicon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB1</td>
<td>abba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>abacus vel abax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Abacuc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>abactus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>abactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Abai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Abi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>a ab abs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>abaddir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Abaddon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>abanech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Abarim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>abartenum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>abaso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>abbas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Abas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>abatis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>abavus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Abdias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>abdicare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>abdicere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>abdira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Abderites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Abdenago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aalma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aaron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abactus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abacuc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abacus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abalieno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abamita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abarim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abatis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abbas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abbacia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abbatissisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abdengo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abdias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abdicativus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abdico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abdicatorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abditus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abdol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abdomen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abduco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainz 1460; reprint Gregg: Westmead 1971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In relation to his other principal source, Hugutio's *Magnae derivationes*, Balbi omitted many of the archaic words which had been drawn from glossaries, and added new information, especially of a theological or scientific nature. His most important decision was the separation of the word families in Hugutio’s lengthy articles into individual entries (Wallis 1981: 34f.).

The *Catholicon* was easy to consult and was immediately successful. Copies quickly found their way into churches and convents, and occasionally into private collections, across Europe. The large number of manuscripts still extant (approximately 190, according to Powitz 1996: 300) and the diversity of their locations testifies to its widespread distribution in the Middle Ages.

The *Catholicon*’s sheer size and cost of production inevitably led to its frequent abridgement and adaptation. An example of an all-Latin abridgement is found in ms. Paris, BN lat. 7633, catalogued as *Joann. Januensis Catholicon* but comprising only 141 folios. (It is incomplete, extending just to the letter ‘X’.) The articles are very short, as the following extract shows:

**Exhibit 4: Articles Aalma and Aaron in Catholicon and Catholicon abrégé**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catholicon</th>
<th>Catholicon abrégé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aalma</strong> interpretatur virgo abscondita vel absconsio virginatis: sic dicitur in interpretationibus, vero dicit quod aalma significat absconditaque virginem et secretam. de hoc eciam dicam in virgo.</td>
<td><strong>[A]alma</strong> interpretatur virgo abscondita ut absconsio virgininitatis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aaron</strong> interpretatur mons fortis. vel mons fortitudinis, sive montanus. ut dicitur in interpretationibus Hugucio vero dicit. aaron interpretatur mons fortitudinis quia thuribulum aureum accipiens inter vivos et mortuos stetit: et ruinam mortis quasi quidam mons fortis exclusit.</td>
<td><strong>Aaron</strong> interpretatur fortis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mainz 1460; reprint Gregg: Westmead, 1971

Ms. Paris, BN lat. 7633

The *Catholicon* became a major source for large adaptations such as the *Comprehensorium* of John the Grammarian (see 1.3.6.); however, it is probably best known for its contribution to bilingual lexica. It is the primary source for a number of Latin-French glossaries and dictionaries such as the manuscript *Aalma* series (see 2.5.3.), which was later
printed as *Catholicon abbreviatum* (see 4.0.), the *Catholicon latin-français* contained in mss. Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine, H110 and Stockholm, KB N78 (see 2.5.4.), the French-Latin glossary in ms. Paris, BN lat. 7684 (see 2.5.5.), the *Dictionarius* of Firmin le Ver (see 2.5.6.), and the printed *Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus* (see 5.0.).

The *Catholicon* is also the chief source of the first English-Latin dictionary, the manuscript *Promptorium parvulorum*, and of the first printed Latin-English dictionary, the *Ortus vocabulorum*. Latin-German lexica based on the *Catholicon* include the *Gemma gemmarum* and the *Vocabularius brevilogus* and its printed derivative, the *Vocabularius Ex quo*.

The first printed edition of the *Catholicon* was produced by the Gutenberg press at Mainz in 1460, and it was reprinted twenty-four times by 1500 (Powitz 1988: 125). Its final printing was at Lyons in 1520. A ‘revised’ edition was first published by Matthias Huss of Lyons in 1491, followed by Bonetus Locatellus of Venice in 1495, Hermann Liechtenstein in 1497 or 1498, Petrus Aegidius of Paris in 1499, and Jacques Maillet of Lyons in 1500. The 1506 edition of Parisian printer Josse Bade, which was later reprinted at Lyons and Rouen, represents the most extensive revision.

### 1.3.6. *Comprehensorium of John the Grammarian*

The *Comprehensorium* is a large, alphabetical Latin dictionary created by a grammarian named John (Johannes).20 The Biblioteca Nacional of Spain in Madrid has a fifteenth-century copy of John’s manuscript (ms. 1801 – 190 folios, catalogued as *Joannis Comprehensor*), and the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris also has a fifteenth-century copy (ms. lat. 7678 – 183 folios, catalogued as *Comprehensorium de Johanes*). In describing the latter, Littré (1852: 24) observes that since the *Catholicon* is the latest authority cited, the original work probably dates from the late thirteenth century or the beginning of the fourteenth.

Littré concludes (1852: 24) that the compiler of the *Comprehensorium* was Provençal. He bases his assertion on his discovery of a vernacular term in ms. Paris, BN lat. 7678, which

---

20 "Cum in codice ethicologiarum Isidori libris Papie Hugucionis et Catholicon de vocabulorum expositione solum tractantibus quos vidi sepius et perlegi, In primo plurima, In secundo non tanta, In tercio paucia, et in quarto paucissima vocabula repererim et reperiantur deficere queque in uno ex ipsis sunt posita in alio sunt obmissa, Cogitavi ego iohannes in unum corpus redigere..." Incipit ms. Paris, BN lat. 7678
he identifies as a Provençal form:

"...Nous avons dans ce gros volume aperçu un mot qui nous a indiqué la patrie de l'auteur: 'Romipeta, qui Romam petit; unde hoc romipetagium; quod vulgo dicitur rompatge.' Rompatge (peut-être romptage ou romeatge) est une forme provençale." 21

Littré's identification of this word as Provençal is undoubtedly accurate, but we do not agree with his conclusion that the author of the dictionary was also Provençal. Rather, we believe John to have been a Spanish grammarian. If such is the case, the appearance of gallicisms in his dictionary is not surprising. The influence of French and Provençal on the Spanish and Catalan languages during the period from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries is well-documented (for example, Candau de Cevallos 1985: 99; Entwistle 1962: 82f.).

Internal evidence to support our contention that John was a Spanish grammarian is found in: 1) the fact that his first choice as a source is Isidore, the Spanish cleric and scholar who was one of the foremost authorities of the Middle Ages, from whom he declared that he had taken much of the material for his dictionary (see note 20 supra); and 2) entries which include Spanish terms or references, such as the following (the corresponding entry from the Catholicon is given for the purpose of comparison; italic emphasis is ours).

**Exhibit 5: Article Rumor in the Comprehensorium and the Catholicon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensorium</th>
<th>Catholicon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rumor.</strong> oris, m, murmur quod vulgo dicitur novallas a ruo qua celeriter ruat unde rumorculus. ii.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rumor</strong> a ruo .is dicitur hic rumor .oris .i. murmur vel quod vulgo dicitur novum quia celeriter ruat unde hic rumorculus et hic rumurculus .li ambo diminutiva a rumor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Paris, BN lat. 7678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainz 1460; reprint Westmead: Gregg, 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External evidence to support our theory lies in the fact that the Comprehensorium was the first book printed in Spain (Haebler 1903: 158, 339), finished at Valencia on February 23, 1475. We submit that the nation's first book produced in the new technology was printed from a text which had been compiled by a Spanish author. 22

We speculate further that the unknown compiler may have been the thirteenth-century Spanish grammarian, Joannes Aegidius, a Franciscan who was appointed tutor to the son of

---

21 This word is rendered as 'romiatge' in the printed version of the Comprehensorium (Paris, BN Rés. X.898).
22 The edition of the Comprehensorium conserved at the Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, under the shelf number Rés. X.155, is catalogued 'Comprehensorium. Johannes Grammaticus Hispanus'.
the king of Castille in 1270 (Hauréau 1885: 586f.). According to Hauréau (1885: 586), before John’s appointment he had written a treatise entitled *De accentu*, in which he cited William Brito as an authority. The author of the *Comprehensorium* does not include Brito in his list of sources, but the following entry demonstrates that he may have used Brito nonetheless:

**Exhibit 6: Article Abel in Elementarium doctrinae erudimentum, Summa Britonis, Catholicon and Comprehensorium**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementarium</th>
<th>Catholicon</th>
<th>Summa Britonis</th>
<th>Comprehensorium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abel</strong> interpretatur luctus vel mirabilis, idem et vanitas quia cito subtractus est.</td>
<td><strong>Abel</strong> interpretatur luctus vel pavor seu vanitas aut miserabilis.</td>
<td><strong>ABEL</strong> proprium nomen est viri. Item Abel nomen est lapidis super quem posita fuit archa Domini, sicut habetur in Regum vi g (18)...</td>
<td><strong>Abel</strong> filius Ade quae occidit Kaim interpretatur luctus et nomen lapidis super quem fuit reposita Archae dei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Angelis 1977, I: 7</td>
<td>Mainz 1460; reprint Gregg: Westmead 1971</td>
<td>Daly/Daly 1975: 4</td>
<td>Valencia 1475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.0. LATIN-VERNACULAR LEXICA

2.1. Early Bilingual Lexica

Bilingualism in Greek and Latin long continued in the Roman Empire, but by the third century "a growing linguistic rupture between East and West [...] is evidenced by the emergence of bilingual schools manuals, the *Hermeneumata pseudodositheana*" (Copeland 1991: 38). Although bilingualism declined, cultural and commercial relations continued between the two empires, leading to creation of bilingual lexica. Dating from the early Middle Ages are the Greek-Latin glossary wrongly attributed to Cyril (patriarch of Alexandria from 380–444 A.D.), and the Latin-Greek glossary wrongly attributed to Philoxenus (a Roman consul in 535 A.D.).

An example of a bilingual glossary created for administrative purposes is found in the so-called ‘Malberg glosses’, which date from the late fifth or early sixth century. They are Latin-Salian Frankish (a Low German dialect spoken by the Salian Franks who conquered Gaul at the end of the fifth century). Hessels (1910: 126) explains that they are not true glosses, but appear to be an attempt to translate some terms from Frankish law into Latin for the benefit of Roman inhabitants.

Latin-vernacular glossaries were primarily compiled for didactical purposes – to assist in teaching and learning Latin, the language of literate people. Initially, difficult words in Latin texts were glossed with simpler Latin or, occasionally, vernacular interpretamenta, written between the lines or in the margins. Later, the lemmata and their interpretamenta were collected to form glossaries. Vulgar Latin and/or vernacular terms appear in glossaries at an early date. Well-known examples of early compilations containing Anglo-Saxon elements are the *Corpus College Glossary* (beginning of the eighth century), the *Erfurt Glossaries* (eighth century), the *Leiden Glossary* (end of the eighth century), and the *Epinal Glossary* (beginning of the ninth century). At this stage, the number of Latin glosses far exceeds the number of vernacular ones.

The renowned *Reichenau Glossary* (beginning of the tenth century) comprises nearly 5000 lemmata with vulgar Latin, Romanic and Germanic glosses. Bischoff (1981: 49) notes
that earlier estimates had placed the number of Romance glosses at nearly one-quarter of the total, but Klein (1936: 36) estimates that Romanisms do not exceed ten percent of the total.

The Reichenau Glossary is made up of two parts: a Biblical glossary which follows the order of the text, and an alphabetical wordlist. Its principal sources are the Abavus Glossary and Liber glossarum; others are Isidore and St. Eucherius. In the following example, Labhardt (1936: 43f.) convincingly demonstrates the debt owed to the Abavus maior:

**Exhibit 7: Source of the Reichenau Glossary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abavus maior</th>
<th>Gloses de Reichenau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exsequias: prosecutio funeris</td>
<td>Exsequiae: prosecutio funeris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullas: ornamenta regalium camelorum</td>
<td>Bullas: ornamenta regalium camelorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capulum: spate manubrium</td>
<td>Capulum: spate manubrium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labhardt 1936: 43f.

Identification of the Abavus and the Liber glossarum as sources, dates the Reichenau Glossary to the beginning of the tenth century at the earliest, and not to the eighth century as some scholars had believed (noted in Bischoff 1981: 48).

Aelfric (c.955–1030) abbot of Eynsham in Oxfordshire was responsible for the texts which “did so much for the early study of Latin in England” (Sandys 1921: i, 512). These schoolbooks include a Latin grammar with material taken from Priscian, which is followed by a glossary of some 3,000 words in Latin and English. It is the oldest existing Latin-English glossary (id. 1921: i, 513).

The Vocabularius brevilogus was probably first compiled in northern Germany in the last quarter of the fourteenth century. Some German elements appear in the earliest manuscripts and, as time passes, German glosses gradually increase in relation to Latin ones (Grubmüller 1967: 31; Lindemann 1994: 116). The Catholicon and the Magnae derivationes are its primary sources. However, as shown in the following comparison made by Grubmüller (1967: 33) of a corresponding article in the Catholicon and the Brevilogus, much of Balbi’s material is omitted:
Exhibit 8: Article Abies in Catholicon and Vocabularius brevilogus

**Catholicon**

*Abies* abietis. *fe.ge.* arbor quaedam est, dicta ab abeo, abis, quia cito et longe sursum abeat et in excelsum promineat. Et corrigit e ante ut abietis. Est autem abies expers terreni humoris, ac proinde habilis et levis est, candorem habet et sine nodo est plana et odorifera et venenosis animalibus inimica secundum ysidorum.

Grubmüller 1967: 33

Lindemann (1994: 117) observes that the *Brevilogus* contains few additional lemmata not found in the *Catholicon* or *Magnae derivationes*. Any additions are usually common words which Balbi and Hugutio ignored. She speculates that the didactic objective of the work is responsible for inclusion of common words, and also for its unusual structure; the *Brevilogus* is made up of three parts: *Nomina, Verba* and *Indeclinabilia*, and each part is alphabetically ordered.

A further indication of the *Brevilogus*’s purpose may be observed in the appearance of a system of abbreviations to indicate conjugation and gender (although it is not evident in Exhibit 8 above). This system extends to a printed descendant of the *Brevilogus*, the Latin-German *Vocabularius ex quo* (Grubmüller 1967: 33; Lindemann 1994: 117). It is interesting to note that a system of grammatical signs is also used in the *Aalma* manuscripts (see 2.5.3.), in the *Glossarium gallico-latium* (see 2.5.5.) and in the *Dictionarius* of Firmin Le Ver (see 2.5.6.).

The *Brevilogus* was re-drafted by the German humanist and reformer, Johannes Reuchlin, as an all-Latin dictionary, with additional lemmata. It was first printed at Basle in 1478 under the title *Vocabularius breviloquus*, and subsequently reprinted many times (see 5.1.2.).

**2.2. Latin Texts with French Glosses**

Tony Hunt’s excellent three-volume23 account of *Teaching and Learning Latin in 13th-Century England* is the only comprehensive survey to date of the wide range of glossing activity in Anglo-Norman. His study concentrates on vernacular glosses in an array of manuscripts, including

---

literature, hymnals, commentaries, exotica, non-grammatical works and grammars, but also includes wordlists and glossaries. On the original purpose of most of the documents, Hunt observes (1991: 1, 19):

"[T]he bulk of Latin texts glossed in the vernacular are the product of the thirteenth century and are a sign of the increasing need for literacy as a means of coping with the proliferation of written records. Even allowing for the much greater residue of manuscript material from this period, it is clear that greater effort was being expended on the production of grammatical aids to the teaching of Latin and that the use of these aids presupposed the employment of the vernacular as one medium of instruction and explication."

We have restricted our examination to Latin grammars and lexica containing French forms, and have organized them into the four categories proposed by Roques (1936a: 250f.; 1936b: xf.):

a) French glosses inserted into a text or added in marginal notes;
b) glossaries, primarily bilingual, which assemble the glosses in lists which are independent of the work to which they relate;
c) topical or thematic dictionaries, often bilingual; and,
d) alphabetical dictionaries, generally bilingual.

Our research concentrates on category d); therefore, references and examples under the first three headings are representative but by no means exhaustive.

The first category defined by Roques consists of lexicographical and grammatical works designed for the teaching of Latin, where French glosses are integrated with the text or added as explanatory notes. "In medieval education, observe Febvre/Martin (1971: 22), the gloss or commentary on well-established authorities was all-important in every field of learning."

Into this group fall wordbooks such as Adam of Petit Pont’s De utensilibus ad domum regendam pertinentibus, Alexander Nequam’s De utensilium nominibus, and John of Garland’s Commentarius and Dictionarius, as well as grammars such as Eberhard of Bethune’s Graecismus and Alexander of Villedieu’s Doctrinale. Scheler (1865a: 43f.) comments on the didactic nature of these texts in the introduction to his edition of the Dictionarius.

The twelfth-century English scholar and teacher, Adam of Petit Pont, spent much time in France. His De utensilibus relates a visit (real or imagined) to his estate in England, and describes the people and the everyday objects he encounters. The treatise exists in fifteen manuscripts (Hunt 1991: I, 167). The De nominibus utensilium numbers among the more
modest works of another twelfth-century English scholar, Alexander Nequam. The treatise, which is similar to that of Adam of Petit Pont, survives in over thirty manuscripts (id. 1991: I, 177). Exhibit 9 gives a few vernacular glosses from Scheler’s editions (1866, 1867) of these two wordbooks:

**Exhibit 9: Some vernacular glosses from the *De nominibus utensilium* of Alexander Nequam and the *De utensilibus* of Adam of Petit Pont**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>De nominibus utensilium</em> of Alexander Nequam</th>
<th><em>De utensilibus</em> of Adam of Petit Pont</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Bruges, SB n° 536. ff.80r-89v</td>
<td>Ms. Bruges, SB n° 536, ff.89v–94v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pulli, pucins</td>
<td>telarum, de teiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>galli, chocs</td>
<td>stamina, estinz, warp (angl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>galline, gelines</td>
<td>tramas, trames, vof (angl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gallinarii, Kochereus</td>
<td>licta, fils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allites sive allilia, chapuns</td>
<td>radios, rales, sles (angl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anseres, gars</td>
<td>panulos, petite perches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anates, annes</td>
<td>globellos, lusseus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ciconee, cigoynie, storc (angl.)</td>
<td>mataxas, serences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ardee, heyruns</td>
<td>alabre, traules, reles (angl.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scheler 1866: 71f. Scheler 1867: 89

"The *Dictionarius* [of John of Garland], following the tradition established by Adam of Petit Pont and Alexander Nequam, is [...] a storehouse – *promptuarium* John calls it – of the names of everyday things." (Hunt 1991: I, 194). The contents of the wordbook, which was written in Paris c.1220, are arranged in a familiar assortment of topics, ranging from parts of the body to commercial trades and their equipment, through arms and weapons, domestic objects, clothing, weaving and other feminine occupations, to flora and fauna.24 The *Dictionarius* is often collocated in manuscripts with the treatises of Adam of Petit Pont and Alexander Nequam. John of Garland’s *Commentarius*, composed in Paris in 1246, is also a wordbook and concentrates on features of the life of the nobility, especially courtiers (id. 1991: I, 204).25 Despite John of Garland’s considerable other literary production, these two treatises

---


25 A few examples of French glosses from the *Commentarius* were printed by Barthélemy Hauréau in *Notices et Extraits* 27/2, 1879, 59–60.
(in particular, the *Dictionarius*) remained very popular and were glossed extensively. Exhibit 10 presents a few vernacular glosses from these two works:

**Exhibit 10: Some vernacular glosses from the *Dictionarius* and the *Commentarius* of John of Garland**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dictionarius</th>
<th>Commentarius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Oxford, Bodleian, Rawlinson C. 496, ff.1r–9v</td>
<td>Ms. Bruges, SB nº 546, ff.77va–83va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glingva: gallice gencive</td>
<td>hec scoria, -rie: gallice machefer, anglice sinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uva: gallice grape</td>
<td>hec lentiscus: bul gallice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ren -nis: membrum in singulari gallice ren- non, renes in plurali gallice reins</td>
<td>hic sacrista: gallice segresteyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plusculas: gallice bocles</td>
<td>hoc suffragum: frese gallice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tibialla: gallice estivaus</td>
<td>hec clientela: serchuere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruralia: hoc crurale gallice houses</td>
<td>astutus: vezé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crepitas: gallice botes</td>
<td>hic fragus: pael de genul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pulvillii: ille partes selle, gallice dicuntur bat</td>
<td>convales: praeries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hunt 1979b: 11

The *Doctrinale* of Alexander of Villedieu, which he completed c.1199, consists of three parts, of which the first relies heavily on Priscian and the third on Donatus. The second section is chiefly Alexander’s own work. The *Doctrinale* quickly became popular in schools and universities, and survives in over 400 manuscripts (Hunt 1991: I, 85). Eberhard of Bethune wrote the *Graecismus* toward the end of the twelfth century. Its contents are also divided into three parts, but it leans more heavily toward derivation and the meaning of words than does the *Doctrinale* (id. 1991: I, 94f.).

### 2.3. Local-order Latin-French Glossaries

Glossaries compiled in local order independently of the text to which they relate, comprise the second category of texts identified by Roques. He cites as an example (1936b: xi), the *Reichenau Glossary* (see p. 34 supra), of which one part follows the text of the Bible, although it does not fall within the chronological scope of his enquiry. He then identifies two other more relevant examples. The first is a short Latin-French glossary in ms. Paris, BN lat. 13191, f.78, which applies to a treatise entitled *Doctrina puerorum*, found in ms. Tours, BM nº 852, ff.33v–40 (thirteenth century). The other is a monolingual French glossary, ms. Brussels, KB nº 9543 (end of the thirteenth or beginning of the fourteenth century), intended to assist in understanding a
work entitled *Li Ars d’amour*. The latter glossary, part of which is written in alphabetical order, consists of 205 French lemmata and French glosses, including substantives, adjectives, participles and verbs (Lindemann 1994: 151).

Hasenohr (1984) published another French glossary, found on ff.87–88 of ms. Poitiers, BM no. 94 (end of the fifteenth century), in which all of the words are qualifying adjectives relating to the virtues and qualities, or vices and faults, of human nature. These epithets are grouped according to the traditional branches of vices or virtues (*id.* 1984: 122f.; Monfrin 1988: 31), and they relate directly to a French treatise on rhetoric which immediately precedes the glossary, on ff.37–86v of the same manuscript (Hasenohr 1984: 123.).

Lindemann (1994: 125f.) cites a collection of French glosses relating to a letter of Sidonius Apollinaris, found by Gustav Gröber in ms. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 172 (12th century). Delisle (1869) describes a collection of short Latin works, mostly relating to natural history and medicine, found in ms. Tours, BM no. 789 (formerly Cathédrale no. 433) (twelfth century), of which ff.1–5 comprise a Greek-Latin glossary, which also contains French glosses for many Latin words. The lemmata are not in alphabetical or thematic order; they may relate to some unknown text. A few of the Latin terms and their French glosses are shown in Exhibit 11:

**Exhibit 11: Some vernacular glosses from ms. Tours, BM no. 789, ff.1–5r**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Term</th>
<th>French Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ejulatus</td>
<td>escri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripes</td>
<td>tripet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallatinus</td>
<td>ii, rapun (l. capun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scropha</td>
<td>truei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suculus</td>
<td>parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panticulus</td>
<td>turtel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agaso vel agasus</td>
<td>merescald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situla</td>
<td>seel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raphanum</td>
<td>rait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debacher</td>
<td>caris, afoler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alietus</td>
<td>i, falcon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accipiter</td>
<td>ostur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisus</td>
<td>espever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hec ortocrea</td>
<td>e, rusole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignitatubulum</td>
<td>astre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrosillum</td>
<td>perresil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delisle 1869: 327

Meyer (1895) describes two other collections, neither of them following alphabetical or thematic order, which may be presented in the order in which the lemmata occurred in an as-yet-undiscovered text. He observes (1895: 162) that the text was probably one of the didactic

---

26 This glossary was published by Baron de Reiffenberg as "Court glossaire roman du XIII" ou du commencement du XIVe siècle, tiré du Ms. de la Bibl. royale [de Bruxelles] no. 9543", in Gautier de Tournay, *Gilles de Chin*, le Baron de Reiffenberg, éd., Bruxelles, 1847.

works which students were obliged to read or learn by heart, in order to fix Latin vocabulary in their minds. One of these collections, containing about fifty French glosses, is found in ms. Paris, BN lat. 8246, f.106r (c.1286). The other glossary, which occupies f.77v of ms. London, BL Harley 2742 (thirteenth century), contains 117 Latin lemmata, of which about 100 are glossed in French.

We include in this section a small Latin-French glossary published by Ulysse Robert in 1873. Robert found this glossary, which contains 239 lemmata arranged in first-letter alphabetical order, on ff. 23v–24 of ms. Paris, BN lat. 8653A, which is the notebook of a schoolboy from Arbois, and probably dates from the early fourteenth century. It is unlikely that this small glossary relates to a specific text, but it was clearly compiled as an aid to learning Latin and the lemmata may have been drawn from several school texts. Allen (1914: 42) describes the process of which this small compilation could have been a part: “The normal method of acquiring a dictionary was, no doubt, to construct it for oneself; the schoolboy laying foundations and building upon them as he rose from form to form, and the mature student constantly enlarging his plan throughout his life and adding to it the treasures gained by wider reading.”

2.4. Thematic Latin-French Glossaries

The most common wordlists are the thematic glossaries, or nomina
ia, which constitute Roques’ third category; that is, lemmata arranged by classes of objects – household items, clothing, arms, wild and domestic animals, etc., or by subjects – medicine, botany, etc.

Ewert (1957), Hunt (1991: I, 400) and Lindemann (1994: 129f.) describe a thematic Latin-Anglo-Norman glossary containing about 700 glosses, found on ff.18–21 of ms. Glasgow, Hunter 292 (formerly U.6.10, R.7.14). This Nominale, which is written in a mid-thirteenth-century hand, is set out in anything from two to five columns per page. It begins with a random list of eighteen Latin verbs and French equivalents, followed by a list of plant names, then by short lists of Latin synonyms grouped under French headings. The remainder of the glossary is
divided into twenty sections, ranging from plant names through parts of the body, clothing, horses, domestic animals and wild animals, to birds and trees.\(^{28}\)

Hunt (1991: 1, 401) and Lindemann (1994: 131f.) also describe ms. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 88, ff.147va–152vb (mid-thirteenth-century),\(^{29}\) which contains a Latin-French glossary made up of eighteen similar chapters. The similarities between Hunter 292 and Douce 88 are obvious from the extract shown below in Exhibit 12.

**Exhibit 12: Comparison of De avibus domestici in mss. Glasgow, Hunter 292 and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 88**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>De avibus domestici</strong></td>
<td><strong>De avibus domestici</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hic et hec <em>altillus</em> et hoc <em>altile</em>: oiseaux <em>nuri en cort</em></td>
<td>hic et hec <em>altillus</em> et <em>altile</em> et plr. hec altiiia: oiseaus engressis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hic <em>gallus</em>: coc</td>
<td>hic <em>gallus</em>: coc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hic <em>gallina</em>: geline</td>
<td>hic <em>gallina</em>: geline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hic <em>pullus</em>: pucin</td>
<td>hic <em>pullus</em>: pucin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hic <em>anser</em>: gars</td>
<td>hic <em>anser</em>: gars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hic <em>auca</em>: ewe</td>
<td>hic <em>auca</em>: ewe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hic et hec <em>anas</em> -tis: anete</td>
<td>hic et hec <em>anas</em> -tis: ane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hic <em>columba</em>: columb</td>
<td>hic <em>columba</em>: columb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et plr. hii et hee <em>palumbes</em>: <em>columb de bois</em></td>
<td>plr. hii <em>palumbes</em>: <em>columbs de bois</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hic <em>pavo</em>: poun</td>
<td>hic <em>pavo</em>: poun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hic et hec <em>grus</em>: <em>grue</em></td>
<td>hic et hec <em>grus</em>: <em>grue</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ewert (1934) describes a nominale found on ff.414v–415r and two columns of f.415v of ms. St. John's College, Oxford, 178. It has 360 lemmata, arranged in groups which are very similar to those in ms. Glasgow, Hunter 292 and ms. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 88.

In his introduction to Tome I of *Lexiques alphabétiques*, Roques (1936b: xviiif.) describes the various works contained in ms. Évreux, BM nº 23 (beginning of the fourteenth century). One of the texts, on ff.149–153, is a Latin-French glossary which he calls *Abavus* (see 2.5.1.). Another text, on f.153 and f.156r, is a thematic Latin-French glossary containing

---

\(^{28}\) Extracts from this glossary were published by Paul Meyer in: "De vestibus mulierum", *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Literatur*, VII, 1866, 37–38; "Notifications et extraits de manuscrits conservés au Musée Huntérien à Glasgow", *Archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires* IV (2° série), 1867, 156–167; and *Documents manuscrits de l'ancienne littérature de la France conservés dans les Bibliothèques de la Grande-Bretagne*, Paris, 1871, 120–121 and 123–126. Ewert (1957) edited the remainder of the Hunterian glossary which had not been previously edited by Meyer. The entire text of ms. Hunter 292 was published in Hunt (1991: l, 401f.).


Hauréau (1885: 595f.) describes a fourteenth-century thematic glossary which follows the double alphabetical glossary in ms. Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine H236 (see 2.5.2.). In the thematic glossary, Latin lemmata and French equivalents are grouped under familiar headings: parts of the body, clothing, wild and domestic birds, and so on. Exhibit 13 is the section on domestic birds from this manuscript. The similarities with the same section in ms. Glasgow, Hunter 292 and ms. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 88 are striking.

**Exhibit 13: De avibus domestica from ms. Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine H236**

De avibus domesticis dicendum est

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hic pavo, vonis, pavons</td>
<td>hec galina, ne, gueline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hic anser, séris, gars</td>
<td>hic pulus, li, pouchins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hec auca, ce, aue</td>
<td>hec columba, be, coulon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoc atlie, lis, capon</td>
<td>hic vel hec grus, gruis, grue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hic gallus, li, cos</td>
<td>hic cignus, ni, cigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauréau 1885: 596</td>
<td>hic anas, anete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scheler (1865a) edited a large thematic glossary (twenty-eight chapters, containing some 700 lemmata), found in ms. Lille, BM n° 147 (formerly n° 388, n° 369), ff.1–12 and 310v–312v (fifteenth century). As may be expected, this glossary deals with, among other topics, the human body, domestic and wild animals, snakes, birds and fish, rivers, winds and countries, metals and gems, trees and plants, titles of officials and clerics, and items belonging to the house, including utensils.

Littré (1852: 32f.) briefly describes a thematic Latin-French glossary, found in ms. Paris, BN lat. 8426 (fifteenth century). He does not indicate the number of folios but gives twenty-nine categories of terms which are found in the manuscript, including the human body, various trades, animals, birds and fish, trees and plants, and so on. The manuscript ends, "Explicit per

---


31 Roques (1936b: xiii) mentions this thematic glossary as well.

32 This glossary was previously published by Émil Gachet, "Manuscrit d’un glosaire latin-français du XVe siècle" in Compte rendu des séances de la Commission Royale d’histoire de l’Académie Royale des sciences, des lettres... XI, Bruxelles 1846, 300–322.
me Petrum Rogerium", but it is not clear whether Peter Roger is the author of the glossary or a scribe.

Medico-botanical glossaries are an especially numerous sub-group of thematic glossaries. One of the earliest of these, dating from the twelfth century, is a collection found on ff.34–35 of ms. Tours, BM n° 789 (formerly Cathédrale n° 433). This glossary, which is described in Delisle (1869: 323 and 330f.), relates almost exclusively to botany.

Many botanical nominalia are located in English libraries, often collocated with medical receipts. Hunt (1989a) published more than 1800 vernacular names, covering over 600 plant species (1989a: xi), drawn from over sixty texts, dating from 1280 to 1500. He explains (1989a: xviii): "These lists were compiled as practical aids to the understanding and making up of medical prescriptions. [...] The regularity with which varied lists were compiled and copied suggests that they were found useful."

Some of the collections, e.g. those found in mss. London, BL, Add. 15236 ff.2r–9r, London, BL, Sloane 5 ff.4v–12v (700 glosses), and London, BL, Royal 12.G.IV.6 (400 glosses), are written in alphabetical order, although this arrangement is not common. Most of these thematic glossaries are multilingual. Some are Latin-French or Latin-English, others are Latin-French-English. Still others contain Irish or Welsh; in ms. London, BL Add. 15236 ff.2r–9r, for example, the vernacular entries are marked anglice, gallice or hibernice (id. 1989a: xix).

2.5. Alphabetical Latin-French Lexica

The macrostructure of monolingual Latin dictionaries developed, as we have seen, from large alphabetical glossary collections which resulted from combining two or more smaller glossaries. Since monolingual French glossaries were virtually non-existent, such a process could not be part of the development of French dictionaries. Monolingual Latin lexica were the foundation of the Latin-French glossaries and dictionaries which gradually appeared toward the end of the thirteenth century. These bilingual glossaries were used for purposes of translation and to foster the teaching and learning of Latin, but it is in these bilingual texts that French lexicography had its beginnings. Wagner (1967: I, 120) remarks:
"Les dictionnaires monolingues des langues occidentales qui nous sont aujourd'hui si familiers ne sont pas issus par simple mutation, traduction ou adaptation, des dictionnaires latins antérieurs. C'est au contraire par une lente évolution des versions bilingues plus anciennes que se sont dégagées les formes essentielles de nos modernes répertoires."

Alphabetical bilingual lexica comprise the final group of works identified by Roques, and it was on them that he announced his intention to concentrate first, because of the importance of some members of the group as well as the possibility for extensive comparison with other collections (1936b: xii).

2.5.1. Abavus series

As the first step toward carrying out his plan for a Recueil général des lexiques français du moyen âge, Roques (1936b) edited five manuscripts, each containing a version of a Latin-French glossary. They are the earliest manuscripts (dating from the late thirteenth to the late fourteenth century) in which French forms are consistently entered as equivalents for Latin lemmata. Roques called the series Abavus, after the first lemma.33 Following are brief descriptions of the manuscripts (id. 1936b: xvii–xxiii):

- **Ab1** Douai, BM n° 62, ff.250v–259v; last quarter of the thirteenth century (c.1285); 2662 articles.34
- **Ab2** Évreux, BM n° 23, ff.149–152; beginning of the fourteenth century; incomplete, begins with cloaca; 853 articles.35
- **Ab3** Rome, Vatican lat. 2748; first half of the fourteenth century; 5856 articles.
- **Ab4** Paris, BN lat. 7692, ff.1–101; middle of the fourteenth century; 9413 articles.
- **Ab5** Conches, BM n° 1, ff.1–91; 1388; incomplete, begins with affluentia; approximately 9200 articles.

A sixth member of the group, which was unknown to Roques, is a fragment of a Latin-French glossary found in a Latin-German glossary, ms. Trèves, BM n° 1125 (fourteenth century), described by Holmér (1964). The Latin-French portion of the manuscript, ff.1r–2r, consists of 279 articles beginning with the letter 'A'. Similarities which this fragment shares with the Abavus manuscripts edited by Roques (1936b) led Holmér to conclude that it is also part of

---

33 Roques (1936b: xxiii, n.2) acknowledges that the word abavus is also the beginning as well as the name of a Latin glossary published in CGL t. IV and in GL t. II, and states that his choice of title does not imply a filiation from the Latin glossary to the Latin-French one.

34 The Douai glossary was previously published in Escallier (1851) and Escallier (1856).

35 The Évreux glossary was previously published in Chassant (1857, 1877).
the series. Holmér (1964: 86) believes that the Trèves fragment (Ab6) is closely related to Ab1. However, through a comparison of the first thirty lemmata from Ab6 with the same quantity from Ab1 and from Ab3, Lindemann (1994: 148) illustrates convincingly that Ab6 is, in fact, related to Ab3.

Roques (1936b: xxiii f.) also describes another manuscript, Paris, BN lat. 4120, dated 1352, which contains on ff.122–125 a short glossary beginning with the word absconsa. He is uncertain whether this glossary is part of the Abavus group and resolves to publish it separately. Merrilees (1994c: 14) concludes, from a sampling of letters 'A', 'B' and 'C' from this text, that it is probably not a version of Abavus. It contains many lemmata not found in the Abavus family and it appears to have sources in addition to Papias and Balbi. He also notes that alphabetical order is followed only to the first letter and that the whole glossary seems to be composed of blocks of words which may have an internal alphabetical order, yet do not show evident thematic or textual relationships.

Roques (1936b: xxv) observes that Ab1 and Ab2 are obviously linked by their similarity of inventory, but their differences are such that it is unlikely one derived from the other. He also considers Ab4 and Ab5 to be intimately related and probably derived from the same model (1936b: xxiii). He published Ab4 in its entirety, but published only the variants of Ab5, deeming that it would be of little interest to print both of them (1936b: 239).

Roques (1936b: xxxiif.) thinks that the source of the two oldest Abavus manuscripts (Ab1 and Ab2), as well as the Absconsa fragment, is a Latin-French glossary based on a Latin lexicon deriving from Papias; that Ab3 is a revision of this first stage; and that Ab4 and Ab5 represent a later revision of the second stage.

Interpretamenta are mainly one-word equivalents in the two oldest manuscripts, Ab1 and Ab2. Paraphrases or additional synonyms are rare, as are indicators of metalanguage. Lindemann (1994: 137) confirms that an "overwhelming majority" of the lemmata in Ab1 derive from Papias, as the following extract shows:
The two youngest Abavus manuscripts, Ab4 and Ab5, both of which date from the second half of the fourteenth century, are very different from the Douai-Évreux tradition. Their nomenclature is much more extensive and their structure is also more complex: multiple equivalents are common, glosses sometimes include both Latin and French definitions, there is a rudimentary Latin metalanguage, and each contains approximately 175 versus memoriales. Those versus which Roques was able to identify (1936b: xxxii) were drawn from Eberhard of Bethune.

Ab3 is smaller (5856 articles) than Ab4 and Ab5, both of which number more than 9000 articles, but its structure resembles theirs. The most important characteristic shared by the three later manuscripts is their obvious link with the Catholicon of John Balbi (Lindemann 1994: 145). Balbi’s influence is evident in this sample:
| 25  | abdere       | Abd0            | abdere       |
| 28  | abducere     | Abduco          | adducere     |
| 53  | abit         | Abeo (aberro s.v. Erro) | abire        |
|     | -            | -               | aberrare     |
|     | -            | Absum           | abesse       |
| 36  | abicere      | Abiicio (abiecio s.v. Abiectus) | abicere      |
|     | -            | Abigere         | abiectio     |
|     | -            | Abigatus        | hic abigeatus |
| 38  | abies        | Abies           | abies        |
| 45  | abigerus     | Abigeus         | abigeus      |
| 42  | abigere      | Abigo           | abigere      |
|     | -            | Abiges          | abiges vel abigeus |
| 51  | abyssus      | Abissus         | abyssus      |

de Angelis 1977: I, 5-16 | Mainz 1460; reprint Gregg: Roques 1936b: 93-94
Westmead, 1971

Some derivations, i.e. abavus, aberrare, abiectio, have been given the status of lemmata and placed in alphabetical order. They do not appear as lemmata in the Catholicicon, but occur respectively as sublemmata of Avus, Erro, and Abiectus (id. 1994: 146).

2.5.2. Brito 2: ms. Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine H236

The need felt by clerics and teachers for Latin-vernacular lexica, so obvious from the evidence left to us, was satisfied through the application of diverse lexicographical techniques to earlier Latin glossaries and dictionaries. The original versions of the Abavus manuscripts, for example, were based on the work of Papias and Balbi. In small centres where these great compilations were probably not available, an author who was determined to create a bilingual lexicon would be obliged to use the resources at hand.

Such appears to have been the case with ms. Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine H236, of which 103 out of 127 folios contain a double glossary, Latin-Picard and Picard-Latin, consisting of 4825 entries (Grondeux 1994: 41).

The anonymous compiler of the alphabetical Latin-Picard glossary was probably a schoolmaster living in northern France, specifically in Artois, in the first half of the fourteenth century. His principal source (id. 1994: 41; Hauréau 1885: 594) was the Expositiones vocabulorum biblie, compiled by William Brito between c.1248 and c.1267 (see 1.3.4.), and his secondary source (Grondeux 1994: 41) was the Graecismus of Eberhard of Bethune, written near the end of the twelfth century.

Grondeux (1994: 42f.) explains that the author used Brito’s entries as his basic framework, at the same time shortening them considerably, and then inserted lemmata.
selected from the *Graecismus* together with their explanations, commentary, etymology, etc. With this foundation established, the compiler made several modifications to it: he took the verbs out of the general language collection to make a separate section, reworked Brito’s alphabetical order, and provided grammatical indicators for some entries. Entries do not follow a fixed structure; material from the *Expositiones* may be juxtaposed with material from the *Graecismus*, a *versus* and grammatical information may be included, and there may or may not be a Picard equivalent. Only about one article in four includes a Picard translation.

From a lexicological standpoint, the interest in this unique manuscript arises from the Picard forms in the second glossary. A second anonymous writer used the alphabetical glossary to compile a ‘reverse’ glossary, starting with Picard terms and finding their Latin equivalents. This second author provided a translation for some 2900 of the 4825 lemmata in the first glossary. He wrote the Picard forms in the margins of the alphabetical glossary in the order in which they occurred; that is, first those which begin with ‘a’ in Picard and ‘a’ in Latin, next those which begin with ‘a’ in Picard and ‘b’ in Latin, and so on. Thus the primary ordering is alphabetical according to the vernacular forms, and the secondary ordering is alphabetical according to their Latin equivalents (*id.* 1994: 45f.).

(An anonymous fifteenth-century scribe adopted a similar method, inverting Latin lemmata and French equivalents, when writing ms. Paris, BN lat. 7684, which is discussed in 2.5.5.)

The interest in the Picard-Latin glossary in ms. Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine H236 from a lexicographical point of view, lies first in the attempt to create a glossary in which Latin is the exit language and a vernacular (in this case, Picard) language is the entry. Its second lexicographical interest stems from a reference system which the compiler devised as an aid for users. He assigned an alphanumeric notation to each Picard word in the ‘reverse’ glossary. The notation corresponds to the location in the text of its Latin equivalent (Hauréau 1885: 594; Merrilees/Shaw 1994: 8). The scribe’s system for referencing the text is described more fully on p. 95 *infra.*
The script and the page layout of ms. H236 make it a very difficult work to consult, but despite its drawbacks Grondeux (1994: 44) states that it shows signs of considerable use. Anne Grondeux edited this manuscript for her thesis at l’École Nationale des Chartes, and it is currently being prepared for publication in the Nouveau Recueil des Lexiques latin-français du Moyen Age.

2.5.3. Aalma series

The Catholicon of John Balbi was, as we have remarked earlier (see p. 30 supra), the foundation for much of medieval Latin and vernacular lexicography. The earliest alphabetical Latin-French lexicon based entirely on the Catholicon is found in ms. Paris, BN lat. 13032 (A1), and dates from the end of the fourteenth century (Roques 1938: xi). It comprises 166 folios, two columns per page, thirty-six lines per column. Roques published this manuscript in Tome II of Lexiques alphabétiques, calling it Catholicon français or Aalma (id. 1938: xiv).

Roques (1938: xvii) identifies eleven other manuscripts containing the Aalma lexicon:

- **A2**: Paris, BN lat. 17881; end of the fourteenth or beginning of the fifteenth century
- **A3**: Paris, BN lat. 14748; 1433
- **A4**: Paris, BN lat. 7679; fifteenth century
- **A5**: Exeter n° 3517; 1431
- **A6**: Salins n° 44; before 1436
- **A7**: Lille n° 388 (now n° 147); fifteenth century
- **A8**: Metz n° 510; fifteenth century
- **A9**: Saint-Omer n° 644; fifteenth century
- **A10**: Troyes n° 1459; fifteenth century
- **A11**: Angers n° 417; fragments of letters D, E, F
- **A12**: Épinal n° 224; sixteenth century.

It should be kept in mind that the dates given only represent the approximate dating of the copies. Roques believes (1938: xiii) that A1 is not an original version but a copy based on an earlier Latin-French adaptation of the Catholicon. Littré (1852: 29), in describing A4, remarks that despite the recent date of this copy (fifteenth century), the glossary contains words which belong to an older state of the language.

The prologue to A3\(^{36}\) recognizes the contribution of the Catholicon to the Aalma glossary, and also clearly indicates the glossary's didactic purpose:

\(^{36}\) Cited in Merrilees 1994a: xiv, n.38.
"Afin que plus tost et plus prestement les escoliers et autres puissent mettre le latin en francois et le francois en latin des moz de gramaire et par especial du livre nommé Catholicon. En ce livret nommé le Miroier des nouveaux escoliers est mis le latin et après le francois des moz plus necessaires et acoustumez contenus ou dit Catholicon et d'aucuns autres moz. Et par la lettre de l'a.b.c. mise en la fin du mot est sceu de quel genre est le dit mot, car m. signifie le masculin genre et f. le feminin genre et semblablement des autres lettres pour les autres genres tant du nom comme du verbe."

The following comparison illustrates the close relationship between the Catholicon and Aalma:

Aalma:

**Exhibit 16: Source of the Aalma glossary in ms. Paris, BN lat. 13032 (A1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catholicon</th>
<th>Ms. Paris, BN lat. 13032</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aalma</td>
<td>Aalma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Aaron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>Ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abactus. ta. tum</td>
<td>Abactus. ta. tum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abacuc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abacus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abalieno. Nas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abamita. Te</td>
<td>Abamita. abamite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abarim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abatis. Batus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abax. Acis</td>
<td>Abavus. abavi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbas</td>
<td>Abbas. abbatis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbacia</td>
<td>Abbacia. cie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbatissa. tisse</td>
<td>Abbatissa. tisse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdenago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdias</td>
<td>Abdias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdicativus</td>
<td>Abdicativus. tiva. tivum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdico. Cas. cavi. care</td>
<td>Abdico. cas. cavi. care. catum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdicatorium. ri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abditus. Ta. tum</td>
<td>Abditus. ta. tum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abd. Dis abdidi. ditum</td>
<td>Abd. dis. abdidi. abdere. abditum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdomen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abduco. Ducis. xi. ctum</td>
<td>Abduco. abducis. abduxi. abducere. abductum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>Abel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abo. Abis abivi. ire</td>
<td>Abo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abestis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abesus. A. um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abgrego. gas. gare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abiectus</td>
<td>Abiectus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abiecicula</td>
<td>Abiectio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abiegnus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abiens</td>
<td>Abiens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mainz 1460; reprint Gregg: Westmead, 1971

It also points up the fact that the author of Aalma omits some proper nouns, rare words and derivations. On the other hand, he gives to Abavus, which is a sub-lemma of Avus, and to
**Abiectio**

which is a sub-lemma of **Abiectus** in the *Catholicon*, the status of lemmata in alphabetical order in *Aalma*. Roques (1938: xvi) gives some other examples of this intervention.

Roques (1938: xviif.) demonstrates that, compared with articles in the *Catholicon*, the definitions in the *Aalma* glossary are significantly abridged. At the same time, he points out the wide variances among the texts:

**Exhibit 17: Article Coragium in Catholicon and the Aalma manuscripts**

*Catholicon*

Coragium: a coragios dicitur hoc coragium. gii. id est suffragium, et coragium pars ludi scilicet quando proverbia dicuntur, vel coragium est virginale signum. vel virginalis pompa quam solent vergines facere in quibusdam locis circa mortuum, vel chorea et quelibet chorea sic potest dici: et componitur a chorea et ago. gis. Sed hoc corragium per duo. r. aliud est scilicet id quod ex toto et intimo corde petitur, et componitur a cor et ago. gis.

*A1, A8*

coragium. gii. courages, suffrages ou partie du jeu (de dieu Metz) quand on dit les proverbes ou signe de verge (vierge Metz) ou dance de virges environ le mort et toute dance.

*A5*

courage aut suffragium vel virginale signum.

*A9*

soffrage, danse, carole.

*A2, A3, A4, A6, A7, A10 and A12*

coraige

Roques 1938: xviif.

Although **A1** is the oldest and the most complete of the *Aalma* group, Roques (1938: xix) concludes that the other manuscripts are not copies of it, but rather represent different editions of a more complete version. He also points out (1938: xx) that "a reduced version" of *Aalma* is the source of the first printed Latin-French dictionary, known as *Catholicon abbreviatum* (see 4.0.).

We believe that three other manuscripts, which were apparently unknown to Roques, should be added to the twelve which he identifies as constituting the *Aalma* series. The first is described in Littré (1852: 33) as *Catholicum or Dictionnaire latin-français*, conserved by the Archives nationales de France, section historique, as ms. M.897 (**A13**).\(^\text{37}\) Littré remarks that although the writing in the manuscript dates from the fifteenth century, the original appears to

---

\(^{37}\) Lindemann (1994: 218) is also of the opinion that ms. AN M.897 is part of the *Aalma* series.
have been much older. He does not give the number of folios, and at the present time the
manuscript is not available to us.\textsuperscript{38}

According to Littré (1852: 36), the first word of the dictionary in A13 is alma – ‘vierge’,
and the last word is zucara – ‘sucre, une espice’, which corresponds with the first and last
entries in A1. There is also close correspondence among the other entries which Littré cites as
being of interest:\textsuperscript{39}

**Exhibit 18: Comparison of the Aalma glossary in mss. Paris, Archives
Nationales M.897 (A13) and Paris, BN lat. 13032 (A1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alma vierge</td>
<td>Aalma vierge secrete ou sainte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron propre nom</td>
<td>Aaron propre nom d’ome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abactus chasses</td>
<td>Abactus chassés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abbas abbes</td>
<td>Abbas abbes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adamas ayement</td>
<td>Adamas aymant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aedus bichet ou chevriet</td>
<td>&lt;Edus bouch ou chevrl - s.v. Edus&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affari aresnier ou parler</td>
<td>Affor arraignier ou parler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>albugo albuns d’oeuf</td>
<td>Albugo la clarté ou blancheur des yeux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albumen albin de oef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambo deux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amigdalum amande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agmidalus amendier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ardello hardieux ou lecheur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avarus aver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bibliopola le vendeur ou aoumeur de livres</td>
<td>Bibliopola le vendeur ou aoumeur de livres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burgensis bourgeois</td>
<td>Burgensis bourgeois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calamitosus chetiz, malestruit</td>
<td>Calamitosus chetz et malestruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cespes wason</td>
<td>Cespes wason. gason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chere, grec Dieu te sault</td>
<td>Chere en grec. Dieu te sault ou esjole toy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clamo clamer, ou braire, ou apeler</td>
<td>Clamo clamer ou appeller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debilitas flebesse</td>
<td>Debilitas feblesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desipio assotir ou amenrir del sen</td>
<td>Desipio assotir ou amenrir de sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dyamas dyamant, une pierre precieuse</td>
<td>Dyamas dyamans. une perre precieuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heros baron</td>
<td>Heros baron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heroys baronnesse</td>
<td>Heroys baronnesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immaturus non mehur</td>
<td>Immaturus non mehur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irundo arondelle</td>
<td>Irundo arondelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jacobipeta perelin de Saint-Jacques</td>
<td>Jacobipeta pelerin Saint Jaques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jugum jou a acoupler beufs</td>
<td>Jugum jou a couplier beufs ou terti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juveneus veel, c’est jesne buef ou tourel</td>
<td>Juveneus veel. pigron. c’est juenne buef ou touriau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacerta laisarde</td>
<td>Lacerta laisarde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacertula petite laisarde</td>
<td>Lacertula laisardecte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legumen leun</td>
<td>Legumen leun. comme pois feves et les semblans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zucara sucre, une espice</td>
<td>Zucara succes. une espice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Littré 1852: 33f.

\textsuperscript{38} In June 1995, in response to our request for a microfilm of the manuscript, Mme Christine Nougaret,
Conservateur en chef chargé du Centre d’accueil et de recherche des Archives nationales, advised that they
have not yet been able to identify it under n° M.167. After sending all the information we had at our disposal,
we await further word from les Archives nationales.

\textsuperscript{39} Lindemann (1994: 218) notes the absence of the lemma aedus from A1. It is found as Edus.
Litré (1852: 36) remarks that versus appear occasionally in A13 and cites three of them. They are identical to three versus occurring in A1.

The second manuscript which we believe to be a part of the Aalma series is found in ms. Metz, BM n° 1182 (A14). It is slightly smaller (141 folios, two columns per page, thirty-two lines per column) than A1. A comparison of the first twenty-two lemmata from A14 with parallel lemmata in A1 shows a high degree of correspondence between them:

Exhibit 19: Comparison of the Aalma glossary in mss. Metz, BM n° 1182 (A14) and Paris, BN lat. 13032 (A1)

Ms. Metz, BM n° 1182

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lemma</th>
<th>ms. Metz</th>
<th>lemma</th>
<th>ms. Metz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&lt;alma. a&lt;alm. vierge secrete ou sainte et est fem. generis</td>
<td>Abbeo</td>
<td>Abs. abiss abbes</td>
<td>Abbeo. abiss abbes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab&lt;i&gt;lma.</td>
<td>Ab &lt;alm. abiss abbes</td>
<td>Ab &lt;alm. abiss abbes</td>
<td>Ab &lt;alm. abiss abbes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abientio</td>
<td>Abieger</td>
<td>'Abientio</td>
<td>Abieger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abiemus .num. vel abiegnus. a. um de sapin</td>
<td>Abientio</td>
<td>Abieger</td>
<td>Abieger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abier</td>
<td>Abieger</td>
<td>Abieger</td>
<td>Abieger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abis .dis .adi .re .ditum oster ou muser et est verbum</td>
<td>Abis .dis .adi .re .ditum oster ou muser et est verbum</td>
<td>Abis .dis .adi .re .ditum oster ou muser et est verbum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abidias .dis vel .ados et est nomen proprium</td>
<td>Abidias .dis vel .ados et est nomen proprium</td>
<td>Abidias .dis vel .ados et est nomen proprium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdicativus .va .vum refusans</td>
<td>Abdicativus .va .vum refusans</td>
<td>Abdicativus .va .vum refusans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdictus .ta .tum musier ou oster</td>
<td>Abdictus .ta .tum musier ou oster</td>
<td>Abdictus .ta .tum musier ou oster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 ms. Ab muta .te

---

40 There is an error in the description of this manuscript in the Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France, Tome XLVIII. 1933, pp. 402–403, under the Ville de Metz: “1182 – Catholicon seu dictionarium Latinum. Début: ‘alma, alme, vierge secrete ou sainte, et est femini generis...’” – Fol. 141 -zocara, zocare, vel zocara, zucare, sucre, une espicre, tamen aliiq dicunt zocara et aliiq dicunt zucara... Explicit Catholicon, et dicitur Catholicon... a catha quod est universale et yhcos quod est scientia, quasi universalis scientia... XV° siècle. Papier. 1414 feuilles, à 2 col. 290 sur 220 millim. Rel. peau blanche. (Vente Saibante, no. 333 – Salis, no. 36.) The emphasis is ours; the manuscript contains 141 folios.
The principal differences are the lack of one lemma in each manuscript (Abienus in **A14** and Abatis in **A1**), the lack of a French equivalent or definition in some articles in **A14**, and the inclusion of two versus memoriales in the latter. We believe, however, that **A14** without doubt forms part of the Aalma series.

In the course of our research at l’Institut d’Histoire et Recherche des Textes, Paris, we learned of another likely addition to the Aalma inventory: ff.14–25 of ms. Paris, BN nouv.acq.fr. 24398 (**A15**), which contain a fragment of the dictionary. These twelve folios, which apparently date from the end of the fourteenth or the beginning of the fifteenth century, were found in the cover of l’Article 104 de la Série E des Archives du Cogner. They are all badly mutilated in the upper corners.

Exhibit 20 compares twenty-one lemmata beginning Mur- to Musca- from **A15** with the corresponding lemmata from **A1**.

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Paris, BN nouv.acq.fr. 24398</th>
<th>Ms. Paris, BN lat. 13032</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Munimen</strong> nis. }</td>
<td>Munimen .minis deffension, gamissement, aide n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Munimentum</strong> ti. } gamisement, aide</td>
<td>Munimentum .ti idem n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Munio</strong> is ivi. gamir, defendre, aider</td>
<td>Munio, munis, munivi .nire .nitum gamir, faire def-fense ou aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Munitio</strong> rii. gamison</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Munium</strong> nii. don, office</td>
<td>Munium .nii office deu ou don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Munus</strong> eris. don, office</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Munisculum</strong> li. petit don</td>
<td>Munisculum .cul petit don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muralis</strong> et hoc le. de mur</td>
<td>Muralis et hoc murale de mur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Murale</strong> lis. mur</td>
<td>Murale, muralis mur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Murena</strong> ne. lamproye vel</td>
<td>Murena, murenem lemprio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murena eciam dicitur une perre precieuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murena .mule petite lemprio ou petite telle perre precieuse. chainette a oumer le col</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muri</strong> de. occiseur de souris</td>
<td>Muria, murie la crouiste qui vient par dessus l’oile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Murilegus</strong> gi. chat</td>
<td>Murica .de occiseur de soris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Murmur</strong> ris. murmusement, noaise</td>
<td>Murilegus .gi chat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Murmuro</strong> as. noaiser</td>
<td>Murmur, murmuris mwmurremens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murmuro .ras .ravi .rare murmurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murtetum .ti yaue qui souart chaude de terre comme de bains naturel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muratorius</strong> ta tum. muré</td>
<td>Muratus .ta .tum mures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muro</strong> as. murer</td>
<td>Muro, muras .ravi .rare murer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Murus</strong> .ri mur</td>
<td>Murus, muri murs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mus</strong> muris. souriz</td>
<td>Mus, muris soris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Musae</strong> se. science</td>
<td>Musa, muse muse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Musc</strong> sce. mouche</td>
<td>Musca, musce mouche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muscarium</strong> rii. .i. flabellum esmouchowoer</td>
<td>Muscarium .carii .i. flabellum esmouchower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although **A15** lacks four lemmata which occur in **A1** and the latter lacks two which occur in **A15**, and there are some differences in French equivalents, it is apparent there is a close relationship between the two manuscripts.

Naïs (1986) announced a project to create a concordance of Roques’ edition of **A1**, but, as far as we know, the proposed project has not been completed.

### 2.5.4. Catholicon latin-français: mss. Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine H110 and Stockholm, KB N78

The alphabetical Latin-French dictionary found in two manuscripts: Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine H110 (**MP**) and Stockholm, KB N78 (**ST**), represents another stage in the progress of French lexicography. **MP** dates from c.1370–1380, and **ST** from the mid-fifteenth century (Merriëlls 1994c: 10). The two versions seem to derive from the same original but the differences between them suggest that **ST** was compiled independently and is not simply a variant of **MP** (*id.* 1994c: 11). This early lexicon is important in terms of both its size (292 folios) and its complex microstructure. These features are evident in the following comparison of lemmata in **MP** with those in **A1**, the oldest manuscript of the Aalma series, which also dates from the end of the fourteenth century:

**Exhibit 21: Comparison of the Catholicon français in mss. Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine, H110 (MP) and the Aalma glossary in ms. Paris, BN lat. 13032 (A1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ms. Paris, BN lat. 13032</strong></th>
<th><strong>Ms. Montpellier, Fac. Méd. H110</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ablacto.</strong> tas. tavi. tare. tatum. sever du let</td>
<td>a. <strong>Ablacto.</strong> as. ex ab et lacto. as oster du lait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ablativus.</strong> tiva. tivum. ablatif</td>
<td>o. <strong>Ablativus.</strong> ab affero. fers. dicitur ablatius. a. um. et hic ablativus. ivi. ablatif case et ablativus. va. vum. celui qui oste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abiligurigo. ginis. ab abiligurio. ris. folle largesse ou degastemens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abligurio. ris. ex ab et ligurio. ris. mengier gloutement ou degaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ablego. as. avi. re. condempner ou desrompe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abluelda. de paille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abluo.</strong> is. lui. luere. lutum. laver</td>
<td>a. <strong>Ablusio.</strong> onis. mondacion, lavement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ablucio.</strong> cionis. lavemens</td>
<td>p. <strong>Abluo.</strong> is. ui. lutum. ex ab et luo. is. laver ou purger ordures. Inde ablutus. a. um. lavé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ablutinacio. ris. ex ablutivo. nas. quod componitur ex ab et lutino. as. absconsion de lumiere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ablutes. tium. vel ablucia. cionum. lieux pleins de eau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abluvio. onis. ab abluo. is. nestoyeure d’ordure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abnegacio.</strong> cionis. denoiemens</td>
<td>b. <strong>Abnego.</strong> gas. avi. re. refuser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abnego.</strong> abnegas. negavi. negare. negatum. denoiier</td>
<td>a. <strong>Abnego.</strong> is. ui. negare. negatio. negare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abnepos.</strong> tis. tiers nepeve</td>
<td>m. <strong>Abnepos.</strong> is. filz du filz ou filz au nepveu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abnormis in norma exponitur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abnuo.</strong> nuis. nui. nuere. nutum. recuser</td>
<td>a. <strong>Abnuo.</strong> is. utum. ex ab et denuo. is. refuser ou deffendre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source is another difference between MPST and the Aalma series, in addition to the increased macrostructure and more complex microstructure. The Aalma manuscripts are derived entirely from the Catholicon of John Balbi, while the sources of MPST also include the Elementarium of Papias. Nobel (1986: 161) calculates that of the first 232 entries in MP, 148 (64%) occur in the Catholicon and the remainder derive from Papias. It should be kept in mind that some lemmata occur in both sources, as the following comparison of lemmata in MP with corresponding lemmata in Papias and/or the Catholicon illustrates:

Exhibit 22: Sources of the Catholicon français in ms. Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine, H110 (MP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementarium</th>
<th>Catholicon</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aceo</td>
<td>120 Aceo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acephali</td>
<td>120 Acephali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer</td>
<td>122 Acer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceratus</td>
<td>123 Aceratus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acerus</td>
<td>124 Acerus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acerno</td>
<td>125 Acerno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreronitus</td>
<td>126 Acreronitus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrera</td>
<td>128 Acrera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acerau</td>
<td>129 Acerau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accris</td>
<td>130 Accris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreries</td>
<td>131 Acreries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessio</td>
<td>132 Accessio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acestes</td>
<td>133 Acestes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acervus</td>
<td>134 Acervus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acesco</td>
<td>135 Acesco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetabulum</td>
<td>136 Acetabulum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetum</td>
<td>137 Acetum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achacia</td>
<td>138 Achacia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acha</td>
<td>139 Acha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achademia</td>
<td>140 Achademia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaia</td>
<td>141 Achaia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaia</td>
<td>142 Achaia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achalantia</td>
<td>143 Achalantia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achar</td>
<td>145 Achar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acharon</td>
<td>146 Acharon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nobel 1986: 170
Another observation which may be made from this example is that, while some lemmata appear in both sources, it seems the compiler has taken large blocks alternately from each. Merrilees (1994c: 12) notes that, although the two manuscripts are very similar, MP includes more Latin (etymologies and Latin definitions) than ST. The edition of the Catholicon français which is being prepared by Pierre Nobel of l’Université de Strasbourg III with Brian Merrilees and William Edwards of the University of Toronto for the Nouveau Recueil des Lexiques latin-français du Moyen Age, will present MP and the most important variants from ST.

2.5.5. Glossarium gallicolatinum: ms. Paris, BN lat. 7684

The problems attached to teaching Latin in the vernacular were addressed in various ways by medieval instructors throughout western Europe. One of the most popular methods was the adaptation and translation of common didactic texts: grammars – most frequently Donatus’s Ars minor, legal texts; formularies; and administrative texts such as Robert Grosseteste’s ‘Rules’ and Walter of Henley’s ‘Husbandry’.41

Another tool was the Latin-vernacular glossary, of which we have ample evidence. However, the need to access Latin forms through the vernacular was also obviously felt, and one solution appeared to be the reversal of the usual entry order of Latin lemma and French gloss. Lists of French headwords followed by Latin glosses (usually not in alphabetical order) are found in a number of manuscript collections; for example, 116 French nouns and adjectives and their Latin equivalents on ff.18b–19d of ms. Glasgow, Hunter 292 (formerly U.6.10, R.7.14). The Latin synonyms are grouped under their respective French headwords, in no apparent order.42 The following examples are taken from Hunt (1991: I, 403):

---

### Exhibit 23: Some French-Latin synonyms from Glasgow, ms. Hunter 292, ff.18b–19d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bataille</td>
<td>Cheval</td>
<td>Aide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoc bellum</td>
<td>Hic equus</td>
<td>Hoc auxilium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoc duellum</td>
<td>Hic quadrupes -pedis</td>
<td>Hoc subsidium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoc prelium</td>
<td>Hic sonipes</td>
<td>Hoc presidium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hec mars</td>
<td>Hic caballus</td>
<td>Hoc suffragium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hec pugna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opp(us), opem ab ope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felonie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoc facinus -noris</td>
<td>Vent</td>
<td>altus -ta -tum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoc scelus -leris</td>
<td></td>
<td>celsus -sa -sum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hec iniquitas</td>
<td>Hic aura</td>
<td>excelsus -sa -sum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hec nequitia</td>
<td>Hec phala -ie, turris lignea</td>
<td>precelsus -sa -sum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hec et hec subiimis, et hoc sublirnis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>summus -ma -mum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hunt 1991: I, 403

Other examples include an alphabetical list of about eighty French verbs accompanied by their Latin equivalents in ms. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce n° 88 (folio number is not identified in Lindemann 1994: 131); an alphabetical list of French verbs, each glossed by several Latin synonyms, on ff.102–107 of ms. Paris, BN lat. 7692 (Littre 1852: 26, Roques 1936b: xxii, Merrilees 1990: 287); a list of French verbs with Latin synonyms in ms. Lille, BM n° 147 (formerly n° 388, n° 369) (Merrilees 1990: 287).

The wordlists cited in the previous paragraph date from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Also dating from the fourteenth century is ms. Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine H236 (see 2.5.2.), which contains a Picard-Latin glossary written in the margins of an earlier Latin-Picard compilation and accessed through a unique sign system referring the user to the location of the Latin gloss in the text (see p. 95 infra).

Merrilees (1994c: 14f.) describes another glossary, in ms. Angers, BM n° 497/498, which uses a sign system to direct the reader from French headwords to Latin definitions. The lexicon, which comprises two volumes, is incomplete. It includes the letters G–Z; letters A–F are lacking. The reference system, which is described on p. 96 infra, is necessary because the articles are alphabetical only to the first letter. The Angers manuscript is very large – 621 and 561 folios respectively in the two volumes – but the number of French lemmata is relatively small. The Latin definitional material is extensive, and the author randomly inserted extracts from Christian authors as well as French and Latin verses.
The only large French-Latin glossary known from the Middle Ages is conserved at the Bibliothèque nationale as ms. lat. 7684, and was named *Glossarium gallico-latinum* (GGL) by an eighteenth-century cataloguer (Merrilees 1992b: 331). The GGL contains 132 folios, and is set out two columns per page, thirty-four to thirty-six lines per column. It comprises some 9500 French lemmata.

It is evident from the macrostructure of GGL that the anonymous compiler sought to create a French-Latin lexicon by abridging a larger Latin-French text and then reversing the canonical order of the selected entries. It appears that he wanted to arrange the French lemmata alphabetically but was not able to break the order of the Latin words in his source (Monfrin 1988: 31; Merrilees 1990: 287, 1992b: 331, etc.).

Latin was the organizing force in the creation of GGL; the order of French lemmata is determined by their Latin equivalents and, with few exceptions, Latin constitutes the metalanguage. At a superficial level, French lemmata are ordered alphabetically only to the first letter. At a deeper level, it is possible to see the remains of derivational groups, sometimes in a classic unit such as verb/participle/noun:

- **Beneistre** - benedico .cis .xi .ctum
- **Benaist** - benedictus .a .um
- **Beneisson** - benedictio .onis

or adjective/adverb/noun:

- **Cauteleux** - callidus .a .um et comparatur
- **Cauteleusement** - callide - adverbium et comparatur
- **Cautelle, malice** - calliditas .tatis

To find a particular French word, a user would be obliged to search successive French lemmata. Despite this difficulty, GGL is a remarkable attempt to give priority to French in a lexicon.

The Latin-French text which is the source of the GGL has not been precisely determined. However, it is certain that the GGL is closely related to two other bilingual lexica: a large Latin-

---

43 Littré (1852: 30) mentions that BN ms. lat. 7684 does not exactly follow alphabetical order, but it seems that he did not know the precise reason for this lack.
French manuscript dictionary, the *Dictionarius* of Firmin Le Ver (see 2.5.6.) and a Latin-French incunable, the *Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus* (see 5.0.). The exact nature of the relationship among the three texts is not known but the examples in Exhibit 24 show that the links are undeniable.

**Exhibit 24: Article *Ardeo* in the *Glossarium gallico-latinum*, the *Dictionarius* of Firmin Le Ver and the *Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GGL</th>
<th>DLV</th>
<th>VFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ardoir</td>
<td>Ardeo .es .si .sum n</td>
<td>Ardeo .es .si .sum - ardoir, coupoiier accendere vel cupere - inde Ardens .tis ardant, convoitant succens vel cupidus - comparatur et Ardentier, adverbiun ardament - comparatur et Ardor .oris ardeur ou couvoitise et Ardesco .scis .conmencer a ardoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardaumnent</td>
<td>Ardeo .ardens .tis .cupiudus o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

French, which is lemmatic in the *GGL* and definitional in the other two dictionaries, affords another approach to comparison of the three texts. An analysis at this level is attached as Appendix 1, from which it will be seen that roughly 75 percent of the articles examined are identical or nearly so. While this figure confirms that these texts belong to the same family, there are sufficient differences that each retains its distinct character. In particular, French terms in *GGL* which are lacking from *DLV* and *VFC* (e.g. aclinouer, administour, admonnesteresse, amenteresse, chevaucheresse, conmeneuseuse, conmemusresse, espelement, estraigneur, fletrisseure, fornicaresse, etc.) illustrate its innovative nature.

The *GGL* appears to be somewhat closer in order and content to the *VFC*, but there are elements in common with the *DLV* that are absent from the latter. All three appear to have drawn upon a common source for part of their French vocabulary, but the disparity in size among the three texts makes it difficult to draw precise conclusions about the lines of transmission.

Godefroy used *GGL* in the *Dictionnaire de l’ancienne langue française*, as did Charpentier in his edition of Du Cange’s *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*. 
GGL has not been printed previously, but an edition is currently being prepared by Brian Merrilees and William Edwards for inclusion in the *Nouveau Recueil des Lexiques latin-français du Moyen Age*.

### 2.5.6. *Dictionarius* of Firmin Le Ver

Firmin Le Ver was born c.1370–1375 into an aristocratic family of Abbeville in northern France. In 1386 he entered the Carthusian foundation of St-Honoré in Thuison, near Abbeville in the diocese of Amiens. Except for a short absence, Le Ver passed his life there, including two periods as prior, and died there on April 13, 1444 (Merrilees 1994a: vii).

Marks (1974: iv), describing the Carthusian rule, tells us, "The monks must be truly devout, because there is no opportunity in the Carthusian way of life for worldly notoriety — the monk is alone with himself and with God in the cell of his hermitage. Although the hermitages are attached in rows within the monastery walls, the monks see one another only during the offices in the church and converse only during their brief weekly walk." He continues (1974: v), "Mysticism as a practical way of life [...] came to replace the speculative mysticism of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. [The Carthusian] rule expressed the ideals of practical mysticism\(^{44}\), and their writings and the books that they collected were a mirror of these ideals. [...] It was through their books that the silent Carthusians carried their message to the world, or as Guigo I, the fifth prior of the Grande Chartreuse put it:

> "We desire that books, because they are as the everlasting nourishment of our souls, be most carefully preserved and most zealously copied, so that while we cannot preach the word of God with our mouths we may do so with our hands. As many books as we copy, so many heralds of the truth do we seem to make for ourselves...."

It was in this environment and within the framework of this ideal,\(^{46}\) that Firmin Le Ver spent some twenty years compiling and writing his dictionary, finishing it on April 30, 1440.\(^{46}\)

---

\(^{44}\) Le Ver's practical side is evident in his knowledge of agricultural and vinicultural vocabulary.

\(^{45}\) Le Ver's attachment to the rule is revealed by the fact that his first term as prior came to an end when monks at St-Honoré complained of his unpopular decision to restrict visits from outsiders. (Merrilees 1994a: vii).

\(^{46}\) Explicit: "[...] ego Firminus Verris de villa Abbatisville in Pontivo Ambianensis diocesis oriundus, religiosus professus, ac huius domus beati honorati prope dictam villam Abbatisville Cartusiensis ordinis prior indignus, per viginti annorum curricula et amplius cum maxima pena et labore insimul congregavi, compilavi et conscripsi. [...] Qui dictus dictionarius anno domini millesimo ccccº quadragesimo mensis Aprilis die ultimo completus fuit et finitus. ..." (id. 1994a: 543).
The *Dictionarius* of Firmin Le Ver (DLV) is the largest and the most important bilingual dictionary of the pre-print era written in France. It is a worthy successor, visually and intellectually, to the long line of medieval Latin lexica which preceded it. Several circumstances contribute to the importance of the DLV:

1) the fact that it is dated and localized, and the name of the author is known;
2) its size: 478 folios, of which 467 contain the dictionary; a total of 540,609 words, of which 88,000 (16.3%) are French (Merrilees 1991: 36f.);
3) its unique lexicographical methodology;
4) its French element, which provides some unparalleled examples of one individual’s language in northern France at the beginning of the fifteenth century.

The DLV exists in a single manuscript, conserved as Paris, BN nouv.acq.fr. 1120. The dictionary occupies ff.1r–467r, set out two columns per page, forty-three lines per column; f.467v is blank; and ff.468r–478v contain a copy of Donatus’s *Ars minor* in Latin and in French, the conjugation of some main verb types, noun and pronoun declensions, a fragment of a syntactic treatise, and a list of morphological exceptions (*id.* 1988: 181). The combination of these texts in one manuscript illustrates once again the close relationship of lexicon and grammar, evident from antiquity through the medieval period.

In his Incipit and Explicit Le Ver acknowledges his debt to Balbi, Hugutio, Papias and Brito, and "other grammatical books". The last-named include, among others, the *Graecismus* of Eberhard of Bethune, the *Doctrinale* of Alexander of Villedieu, and the *Opus synonymorum* (*Synonyma*) of John of Garland (*id.* 1994a: xi).

Whether directly or indirectly, the greater part of the lemmata and Latin definitions in DLV are drawn from the *Catholicon*. Many proper nouns and archaic terms are omitted, and material from other sources, both Latin and French is added. Le Ver adopted the alphabetical-derivational organization used by Balbi, but separated the two principles and recombinend them to create a unique and easily consultable macro-structure (see p. 90 *infra*). Le Ver’s main sources are shown in Exhibit 25, which also illustrates his method of organizing macro-articles.

---

47 "Incipit dictionarius a Catholicon et Hugucione atque a Papa et Britone extractus atque a pluribus aliis libris gramaticalibus compilatus...” (*id.* 1994a: 1).
Exhibit 25: Sources of the *Dictionarius* of Firmin Le Ver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementarium</th>
<th>Catholicon</th>
<th>DLV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1 a</td>
<td>AALMA</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 a aa</td>
<td>AARON</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1 abba</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 abacus vel abax</td>
<td>ABAKTUS</td>
<td>Ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Abacuc</td>
<td>ABACUC</td>
<td>ABACTUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 abactus</td>
<td>ABACUS</td>
<td>Abactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 abactor</td>
<td>Abacus</td>
<td>ABACUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Abai</td>
<td>Abax</td>
<td>Abax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Abi</td>
<td>ABALIENO</td>
<td>ABALIENO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 a ab abs</td>
<td>ABAMITA</td>
<td>Abalieno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 abaddir</td>
<td>ABARIM</td>
<td>Abalienatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Abaddon</td>
<td>ABATIS</td>
<td>ABAMITA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 abanech</td>
<td>Abatis</td>
<td>ABATIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Abarim</td>
<td>ABAX .. vide in Abacus</td>
<td>Abatis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 abartenum</td>
<td>ABBA</td>
<td>Abbas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 abaso</td>
<td>ABBAS</td>
<td>Abbas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 abbas</td>
<td>ABBACIA</td>
<td>Abbatissa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Abas</td>
<td>ABBATISSA</td>
<td>Abbatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 abatis</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABBAVUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 abavus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

dea Angelis 1977, l: 1–6 | Mainz 1460; reprint Gregg: | Merrilees 1994a: 1
                     | Westmed 1971       |

It is likely that a manuscript belonging to the series of bilingual dictionaries which Roques (1938: xiv) named *Aalma* (see 2.5.3.) is one of the sources of the French material in the DLV. Merrilees (1994a: xvi) estimates that more than fifty percent of the French forms occurring in the letter 'A' probably derive from an *Aalma* manuscript; however, the percentage varies as Le Ver's work advances.

Additional evidence that Le Ver used an *Aalma* manuscript when compiling his dictionary comes from the sign system which he adopted to indicate grammatical information such as gender and voice (see p. 99 *infra*). More particularly, it is the location assigned to these abbreviations which is revealing. By the fifteenth century, the use of abbreviations to convey grammatical details was not new; however, these indicators were usually included in the text of an article. In the *Aalma* manuscripts, abbreviations for gender and voice are invariably placed at the right-hand margin of a column, and it is in this location that they are also found in DLV.

Although it is not possible to identify the *Aalma* manuscript from which Le Ver drew his French material, we have used **A1** for various comparisons of French glosses with those in DLV, attached as Appendix 2.
As far as is known, Le Ver's manuscript remained in the library at St-Honoré for centuries. In 1790 the manuscript, together with all the possessions of the Carthusians of St-Honoré, became the property of the municipality, and in 1804 it was acquired from them by Louis-Augustin, Marquis Le Ver, a descendant of the same family as Firmin Le Ver. The printer and bibliophile Ambroise Firmin-Didot purchased the DLV from the Marquis' estate in 1860 and it remained in his possession until his death in 1878. The Bibliothèque nationale, at the instigation of its chief Librarian, Léopold Deslisle, purchased the manuscript in 1880 (Merrilees 1994a: vii f.)

As we have remarked earlier (see p. 60 supra), DLV is related to two other bilingual lexica: the manuscript French-Latin glossary found in ms. Paris, BN lat. 7684 (see 2.5.5.), and an incunable, Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus, printed in Rouen c.1490 by Guillaume Le Talleur (see 5.0.).

It was apparently the intention of Mario Roques to include an edition of DLV in his Recueil général des lexiques français du moyen âge,48 but his project did not go that far. An edition was published by Brian Merrilees (with William Edwards) in 1994 as the first volume in the Nouveau Recueil des Lexiques latin-français du Moyen Age.

2.5.7. Catholicon breton (Catholicon en trois langues)

Ms. lat. 7656 of the Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, contains a unique glossary: Breton lemmata followed by French and Latin equivalents. According to internal evidence, the manuscript was written by J. Lagadec in 1464. It is incomplete, however, and ends with the entry: Pres, gall. presse, lat. frequentatio (SBB 93).

The glossary was printed at Tréguier in 1499; this edition contains 106 folios, two columns per page, forty-five lines per column. The prologue on f.1r of the 1499 edition reads:

"Cy est le Catholicon en troys langaiges Scavoir est breton francoys et latin selon lordre de la b. c. d. etc."

The Incipit on f.1v, bottom of the second column, indicates the purpose of the dictionary:

48 Roques' papers include a transcription of Latin lemmata and French glosses from the first 250 folios of the DLV (Merrilees 1994a: viii and n.22).
"Incipit dictionarius britonum continens tria ydiornata. videlicet britanicurn secundum ordinem litterarum alphabeti. gallicum et latinum superaddita a M. I. Lagadec diocesis trecorensis. compositus ad utilitatem clericorum novellorum britanie."

The didactic objective of the text is reiterated in the epilogue on f.105v, col.2:

"Cy finist ce present libvre nomme le catholicon lequel contient trois langaiges Scavoir, breton, franczoys, et latin lequel a este construit compile et intitule par noble et venerable Maistre auffret quoatqueveran en son temps chanoine de treguier. recteur de Ploerin pres morlaix previoians que c estoist une chose propice et utile de mettre ces trois langaiges concordens lung a laultre quant affin et pour instruire les simples gens a avoir la cognoissance desditz langaiges ainsi que le libvre le demonstre Et Imprime a la cite de lantreguier par Jehan calvez le cinquiesme jour de novembre. Lan mil cccc. iii. vingzt et dix neuf."

Three lines in the Breton language follow the epilogue; they are translated in SBB: 92 as, "Yvez Roperz de Kerdu, croyez-le bien, le composa et le continua jusqu’à la fin, sans qu’il y manquât rien d’aucun côté."

The inclusion of the names of three individuals has led to confusion about the name of the author. Beaulieux (1904: 374) lists the work under the rubric ‘Auffret de Quoatqueveran’, and describes it as "Le Catholicon breton, par Jehan Lagadec, Auffret de Quoatqueveran et Yves Roperz". SBB: 93 proposes a simple solution: Auffret de Quoatqueveran is the principal author of the dictionary; he had the idea, outlined the plan for it, and drew up the list of Breton words, while Jehan Lagadec supplied the French and Latin equivalents for each word. However, Auffret and Lagadec did not finish the work (Auffret was dead in 1499 when this edition was printed); their joint work, drafted in 1464, stopped at the word ‘Pres’. In the opinion of R.F. Le Men, archivist of Finistère (cited in SBB: 92), when Calvez wanted to print the text, Roperz, a typographer in the maison Calvez, took charge of it and finished it according to the original plan.

As to its use of the name ‘Catholicon’, Wallis (1981: 74) remarks that its "connection with the Catholicon appears limited to adopting its title as a generic term for ‘dictionary’ – testimony in itself to the popularity of Balbi’s book".
The 1499 edition is one of the earliest printed trilingual dictionaries, although the genre would become popular in the sixteenth century. According to Brunet (1865: 16f.), two abbreviated versions were printed c.1500–1501. Beaulieux (1904: 374) identifies an edition 's.l.n.d.', corrected and revised by 'Magistro Johanne Corre, Trecorensi', and another edition printed in Paris in 1521. The 1499 edition was abridged and reprinted in 1867 by R.F. Le Men, Lorient, Ed. Corfmat, libraire (SBB: 92; Beaulieux 1904: 374).
3.0. **TYPOLOGICAL SUMMARY**

The history of lexicography is the story of its progress, often faltering, from the explanation of difficult words in the works of Attic poets through its long attachment as an integral part of grammar, to its gradual emergence as a related science with its own rules and principles. The scope of this study does not include a detailed scrutiny of lexicographical history, and we limit our observations in this chapter to: a) the scope and composition of the nomenclature, and b) the evolution of the techniques of presentation.

3.1. **Consultability**

The formal architecture of the text which is the dictionary is expressed on two planes: the *vertical*, which is the ensemble of entries (lemmata) making up the nomenclature, also called the macrostructure or macrotexst, and the *horizontal*, which is the ensemble of information concerning the entries and presented in the form of articles, usually called the microstructure or microtexst (Collignon/Glatigny 1978: 74; Wooldridge 1977: 97).

By reason of its bidimensional structure, a dictionary is also read in two directions: first, a *vertical* search of the macrostructure to locate an article, then, a *horizontal* reading of the article to find information. This bidimensional reading is called ‘consultation’ and the less time devoted to the search for information, the more ‘consultable’ is the dictionary (Wooldridge 1977: 97).

The modern user of a general language dictionary expects to locate the entry he is looking for in his vertical search of the macrostructure. In other words, he expects that:

- the nomenclature contains the basic lexicon of his linguistic community,
- the entries are ordered alphabetically,
- there are visual aids such as column titles, demarcation of letter sections, etc.

In 3.1.1. we identify the main classes of words represented in the nomenclature of lexica dating after the tenth century, and in 3.1.2. we look at some of the techniques of presentation of the macrostructure.

---

49 In the preparation of this chapter, we are especially indebted to the work of Professors B.S. Merrilees and T.R. Wooldridge.
3.1.1. **Classes Represented in the Macrostructure**

It is not possible to know the extent of the entire lexicon of any past state of a language, and still less possible to determine the quantity of that lexicon which was recorded in various inventories. Early Greek and Latin glossaries contained only difficult or unusual words, and most of those documents were related to a selected author or a particular field, such as medical terms or flora and fauna. Even the more ambitious collections, although perhaps representative of the general lexicon, could not have been complete, at least insofar as the open classes are concerned (nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs). Added to this, of course, is the fact that, in many cases, only portions of the early lexica have come down to us and these, very often, in far from the original form.

Medieval lexicographers appear to have felt a desire to include as many entries as possible in the nomenclature of their dictionaries. In the preface to the *Elementarium*, Papias explains that he has "undertaken a work which has, to be sure, already been elaborated for a long time by many others and has also been added to and amassed by me more recently as best I could over a period of ten years". Papias does not claim to have included all human knowledge but it is plain that he regards "this work which has been excerpted and compiled from all the writings which I have found" as an extensive and important collection.

John Balbi, on the other hand, announces proudly "*Incipit Summa quae vocatur Catholicon*", and stresses its comprehensiveness in his preface. John the Grammarian’s aim is expressed in the title of his compilation, which he calls *Comprehensorium*.

Firmin Le Ver calls his work a "dictionary" and claims that it includes "all the words" appearing in the *Catholicon*, Hugutio, Papias, Brito, and other writers. (This claim is not
strictly true; Le Ver omits many entries included by his predecessors, and shortens definitions, as well. His work is an example of the transition from encyclopaedia to dictionary.)

Robins (1989:212) explains: "In the grammatical analysis of languages words are assigned to **word classes** on the formal basis of **syntactic behaviour**, supplemented and reinforced by differences of **morphological paradigms**, so that every word in a language is a member of a word class". He continues (1989: 214):

"Word classes may be **open** or **closed** in membership; all languages have open classes and most have some closed ones as well. An open class is one whose membership is in principle unlimited [...] Closed classes contain a fixed and usually small number of member words, which are the same for all the speakers of the language, or the dialect, and which do not lose or add members without a structural alteration in the grammar of the language as a whole. In English, nouns, adjectives, adverbs, and verbs are open classes; pronouns, prepositions and conjunctions are closed classes..."\(^{55}\)

Exhibit 26 (adapted from Wooldridge 1977: 83) is a model for subdivision of word classes. It is more appropriate as a tool for analysis of the nomenclature of modern dictionaries, and we have attempted to use it only to test the representative character of our corpus.

\(^{55}\) These categories apply as well to Latin and to French. Articles constitute an additional closed class in English and French.
Exhibit 26: Word Classes of a Lexicon

- lexicon
  - closed classes
    - (grammatical words, affixes)
  - open classes
    - (lexical words)
  - functional
    - formal
      - (compounds, derivatives, etc.)
  - marked words
    - (specialization of use)
      - temporal
        - (archaisms)
      - quantitative
        - (frequency of use)
      - spatio-linguistic
        - (foreign words)
      - stylistic
        - (level of language)
      - socio-professional
        - (technical terms)

Adapted from Wooldridge 1977: 83. Translation is ours.
3.1.1.1. Grammatical words

Lindemann (1994: 3) contends that the basic difference between dictionaries and glossaries is that dictionaries contain the central vocabulary, and particularly the common words, of a language, or of a specific field of a language, while glossaries contain difficult or unfamiliar words. Her claim is supported by the fact that grammatical terms (which must be considered among the most common of words) are generally absent from the macrostructure of early Latin glossaries.

Grammatical words are not numerous and are difficult to find in the macrostructure of medieval Latin lexica using a derivational approach to their compilation, e.g. the Panormia of Osbern and the Magnae derivationes of Hugutio, due to their basic organizing principle and to the fact that entries are in first-letter alphabetical order.

Prepositions, conjunctions and pronouns are included in the macrostructure of Latin and Latin-vernacular dictionaries whose first principle of organization is alphabetical, although the extent of their presence varies widely, depending on the dictionary.

Not surprisingly, given its 'specialist' content (i.e. difficult words from the Bible), few grammatical words are included in the nomenclature of Brito’s Summa.

The status of ‘glossary’ is confirmed for the Latin-French Abavus, since the nomenclature generally includes few grammatical terms although, as may be expected, they occur more frequently in the later manuscripts (Ab4 and Ab5) than in the early ones (Ab1 and Ab2).

In contrast to the other bilingual lexica in our corpus, the language of the macrostructure of the Glossarium gallico-latinum (GGL) in ms. Paris, BN lat. 7684 is French. A substantial portion of its macrostructure consists of locutions, paraphrases and definitions, and a large number of grammatical words appear in them many times without having entry status. Taking the entry ‘De quel gent ou de quel pais’ as an example, neither ‘de’ nor ‘quel’ nor ‘ou’ occurs as an entry.
Only six conjunctions are included:

*C'est assimil* - *scilicet* - *adverbium vel coniunctio*
*Mais i. sed, attamen - coniunctio*
*Pour ce - proin vel proinde - coniunctiones*
*Quar - quia - coniunctio causalis*
*Siccomme - prout - coniunctio vel adverbium i.i. sicut*
*Toutevoies - tamen - coniunctio adversativa*

as are six prepositions:

*Apres - post - prepositio*
*De dessus - desuper - adverbium vel preposition servant a accusatif*
*De coste, de joust - penes - prepositio accusativo casui deserviens*
*Environ - circum entour - preposition quando<que> adverbium loci*
*Envers - erga - prepositio - apud, iuxta*
*Outre - ultra - adverbium loci, et ultra eciam preposicio servent a l'accusatif et significat outre*

One pronoun appears as an entry in the macrostructure of the GGL: *Soy mesmes* - *sese* - pronomen.

Grammatical terms also occur countless times in the microtext of all medieval lexica without appearing as entries in the macrostructure. It would be long before the notion of a 'closed' text, in which every word occurring in the microstructure also appears in the macrotext, was realized.

Some sixty-five prepositions and seventy conjunctions are found in the macrostructure of the remaining six important dictionaries in our corpus: the *Elementarium* of Papias, the *Catholicon* of John Balbi, the *Comprehensorium* of John the Grammarian, *Aalma, MPST*, and *DLV*.

Appendix 3 shows the distribution in these six texts of a representative sample of each of these categories of grammatical terms. The results are much as might be expected: the less extensive dictionaries, *Aalma* and MPST, have fewer terms, and the *DLV*, which is the latest and the most highly organized dictionary of the group, has the greatest number, either as entries or sub-entries. The lack of a number of forms from the macrostructure of Part V of the *Catholicon*, which is the dictionary, may be accounted for by the fact that grammar is dealt with in the first four parts.

Demonstrative, relative, interrogative and indefinite pronouns are well represented, and the intensive *ipse, ipsa, ipsum* also occurs. Personal pronouns and reflexive pronouns are rare,
which is an indication of Latin’s synthetic structure. However, the suffix -\textit{met} is added to personal pronouns as an intensifier, e.g. \textit{egomet}, \textit{memet}, \textit{semet}, \textit{sibimet}, etc.

The variable presentation of pronouns – from one dictionary to another and within the same dictionary – makes comparison difficult. In some cases, the paradigm of nominative singular forms is shown in one entry and inflected forms also occur as separate entries. In other cases, the nominative singular forms do not appear as one entry, but the masculine, feminine and neuter forms are found as separate entries.

\textbf{3.1.1.2. Affixes}

The nomenclature of each of the six dictionaries discussed in 3.1.1.1. contains a number of affixes, although the quantity varies widely among the texts. Prefixes make up the greater part of the affixes. They include five of the six Latin prepositions which are found only in composition: \textit{am}, \textit{con}, \textit{di}, \textit{dis}, and \textit{se}. The sixth, \textit{re}, occurs very often in the microtext of all the dictionaries in the group but does not have its own entry in any of them.

Several Greek prefixes, which also usually occur only in composition, have entry status, e.g. \textit{idro}, \textit{iper}, \textit{ipos}, \textit{macros}, \textit{sin}, etc. Most of the free-standing Latin prepositions having entry status are used in composition as prefixes, for example: \textit{ab}, \textit{ad}, \textit{ante}, \textit{circum}, \textit{de}, \textit{e}, \textit{ex}, \textit{extra} and so on.

Suffixes found in the macrostructure of \textit{DLV} include the enclitic conjunctions: -\textit{ne}, -\textit{que}, -\textit{ve}, as well as the pronoun \textit{met}.

\textbf{3.1.1.3. Compounds}

Compounds are signalled in most texts in our corpus by the connectors \textit{componitur}, \textit{compositum est} and \textit{dictio composita}. However, in Papias’s \textit{Elementarium} (where the components of compound words are not usually noted), the more common connectors are \textit{dicitur}, \textit{nam}, or \textit{Ø}. In \textit{Aalma} the connector is almost invariably \textit{dicitur}, and in \textit{GGL} it is \textit{componitur}.

Compounds occur in the corpus in two ways. Firstly, they may be included in the macrostructure as separate entries, as in the following examples:
a) preposition +: **Acheron** fluvius inferorum, interpretatur tristitia; nam a, sine; cheronta gaudium; id est infernum (Papias).

b) conjunction +: **Siquando** - coniunctio .i. si aiquando et est una dictio composita de si et quando (DLV).

c) adjective +: **Magniloquus**. a magnus et loquor componitur (Catholicon).

d) noun +: **Manubrium** dictum eo quod manu teneatur. Et est compositum a manu et bria, quod est mensura (Brito)

e) pronoun +: **Hodie** - adverbium temporis - .i. hoc die huy et pro semper ponitur et componitur ex hoc et die (DLV).

f) complex unit: **achirológia** a sine, chir vel chiros manus, logos dictio transfertur (Papias).

Secondly, compounds appear in the microstructure of most dictionaries as examples of the use of an element of composition:

**Aqua** componitur *aquaevomus*, et *aquaebibus*, bi, qui saepebibit aquam (Osbern).

**Maculentus**, ta, tum dicitur valde macer, macie plenus. Et componitur a macie et lentos, quod est plenus. Et nota quod lentos frequenter venit in compositionem nominum latinorum et *sompnoentus* plenus somno, *sanguinoentus* sanguine plenus etc. (Brito).

**Fateor** componitur cum con et dicitur *Confiteor*. Item cum dis et dicitur *Diffiteor*. Item cum in et dicitur *Infiteor*. Item cum pro et dicitur *Profiteor*. Item cum re et dicitur *Refiteor* (DLV).

Wooldridge (1977: 83) points out that the compounds in the second category constitute a potential nomenclature. Whether they also appear in the macrostructure depends on the dictionary. Those in *DLV*, for example, are included more consistently than in any of the others. Those in the derivationally-organized dictionaries (i.e. Osbern’s *Panormia* and Hugutio’s *Magnae derivationes*) are usually not included.

### 3.1.1.4. Derivatives

As we have observed (see p. 7 **supra**), etymology is the search for the original word, and the principal connectors used in our corpus to express the ascending relationship between derived form and etymon are *dirivatur/derivatur, dicitur, descendit*, and certain prepositions, usually *a, ab, de.*

**Abusus.** abusus [...] et descendit ab abutor abuteris (Catholicon).

**Armentarium** .rii - aumaire locus ubi arma reponantur - ab arma dicitur (GGL).

**Affatus.** a .um araisonnés allocutus de affor .raris (DLV).

**Mandibula** inferior maxilla dicitur a mando, mandis, mandui vel mandi, dere, mansum, quod est comedere (Brito).
Derivation, on the other hand, is the descending relationship between a base word and a derived form. Derivatives in alphabetically-ordered dictionaries may precede or follow the root word in the nomenclature, as in the following example from Aalma manuscript A1. (It is apparent that full alphabetization was not always achieved.)

famulamen. minis
famularis et hoc re
famulicium. cii
famullulus. ii
famulula. le
famulula. le
famulor. laris. latus sum
famulus. la. lum

Occasionally, derived forms appear as sub-entries in the articles of alphabetical dictionaries. They are frequently introduced by the adverbs unde and inde:

Absens tis. componitur ex ab et sensus [...] unde absenter adverbium et hec absencia, cie [...] et absento, tas [...] et absentanus. na. num... (MPST).

abutor commune apud antiquos [...] unde abusus et abusio unde abusitor -taris abusitat tus [...] inde etiam abusive... (Papias).

Mansueo. sues. suevi [...] et inde mansuesco. scis (Aalma)

In the Catholicon, an alphabetical-derivational dictionary, derivatives may be either separate entries or sub-entries. Since the articles are lengthy constructions, connectors are frequently (although not invariably) used to introduce sub-entries:

ADULTER. ab adulor laris dirivatur hic adulter. teri unde hec adulter a. tere. et quandoque ponitur adjective adulter adulter a. adulterum. [...] Et inde adulterinus. a um. [...] et hoc adulterium... ADULTERO. ras. ravi. dicitur ab adulter [...] unde adulterasco. cis. inchoativum. et adulteror aris. deponens [...] veli adulterator adulteratrix. adulteracion et adulteratorius. ris. rium...

In another alphabetical-derivational dictionary, the DLV, derivatives are organized more methodically. With few exceptions, derivatives are sub-entries of the root-word which is the entry. Entries are in alphabetical order and sub-entries are arranged according to Le Ver’s plan (see p. 90 infra):

ADULTER - ab adulor .laris dirivatur hic
Adulter .teri
Adultera .re
Adulterinus .na .num
Adulterium .rii
Adulteror .ras .ratum
Adulterasco .scis - inchoativum
Adulteror .taris .atus sum .ari
Adulteratus .a .um
Adulteratio .tionis
Derivatives in dictionaries organized according to the derivational approach, i.e. Hugutio’s *Magnae derivationes* and Osbern’s *Panormia*, follow the entry in a lengthy string:

Aqua, ae; inde haec aquula, lae, parva aqua; et aquosus, a, um [...] et aquativus, a. um, et hic, et haec aquatilis et hoc aquatile, et hic aqualis, is... (Osbern).

Item ab augeo hec autrix et hec auccio [...] unde hic autionarius... (Hugutio).

### 3.1.1.5. Unmarked words

Apart from a brief discussion of proper nouns and inflected forms, we do not feel that an analysis of unmarked words is useful here.

#### 3.1.1.5.1. Proper nouns

Proper nouns in our corpus fall into the broad classifications of persons and places, and both can be further divided into actual/historical and mythical/literary names. In the ‘people’ category, biblical names are common, from Aaron to Zorobabel. Historical names include philosophers, emperors and warriors, among others, and mythical and legendary names include gods and heroes. Geographical names and, in many cases, their derivatives, are especially common. They include cities, provinces, regions and countries, rivers and mountains. Proper nouns also include the names of the months and the signs of the zodiac. Proper nouns are rarely qualified as such in Papias’s *Elementarium*; in the *Catholicum* and its derivatives they are usually identified *proprium nomen*.

The large number of proper nouns in early compilations attests to their encyclopaedic nature. As dictionaries become more ‘linguistic’, the quantity of proper nouns is less. This trend is borne out by the number of proper nouns included in the macrostructure of our corpus. Using the section Aa- to Abs-, we find that in Papias (c.1050) there are twenty-six proper nouns, in the *Catholicum* (1286) there are eleven, in the *Comprehensorium* (late thirteenth or early fourteenth century) there are fifteen, and in manuscript A1 of the *Aalma* (late fourteenth century) there are five. In the *DLV* (first half of the fifteenth century) there is only one – an example of the way in which Le Ver reduced his nomenclature.
3.1.1.5.2. Inflected forms

Forms of lemmata in the earliest glossaries were those in which the lemma appeared in the source text. In Papias, inflected forms still sometimes occur, although verbs are usually in the infinitive, and nouns in the nominative singular. Lemmata only rarely include flexional suffixes. Beginning with the twelfth century, lemmata and sub-lemmata include the paradigm of inflections customarily found in dictionaries.

The inflected forms which most often occur are the third personal singular of the imperative mood of a verb: *Fer .i. porta. imperativi modi* (*Comprehensorium*), and the third person singular of an impersonal verb: *exstat - il est. verbum impersonale* (*Ab5*). The latter forms are frequent in *Abavus* but less so in *Aalma*.

In alphabetical-derivational dictionaries, an inflected form which coincides with a base form, irrespective of whether the two belong to the same family, may be treated in the latter’s article:

- *Ei - interiectio dolentis - unius sillabe*
- *Ei - eciam dativus de is, eius, ei - per duas sillabas* (*DLV*)

- **SINE** - *preposition qui sert a l’ablatis - .i. absque, ut: sine timore sans cremeur*
- *Sine eciam est imperativus modus de sino, sinis...* (*DLV*)

3.1.1.6. Marked words: specialization of use

Compilers of medieval dictionaries were far from consistent in pointing out archaisms, foreign terms, common language, and the like. Nonetheless, there are indicators, particularly in the large collections, which inform the user about the properties of certain terms.

3.1.1.6.1. Temporal markers

Words which are not marked by a temporal indicator are assumed to be part of the lexicographer’s vocabulary at the time he wrote the text. The quantities of citations found in all of the large collections may well support either contemporary or earlier use, but here we are concerned with the words selected by the author to serve as temporal markers (Wooldridge 1977: 87). The markers in our corpus almost invariably relate to grammatical status.
A past state of the language is marked *antiqui* or *secundum antiquos*, and current use (in contrast with the past) is marked *secundum usum modernum, in usu moderno*, or *nos dicimus*.

 [...] Antiqui in tali compositione solebant mutare d prepositionis in r, ut arvolare, arvenire, arcire. Sed nos dicimus advolare, advenire, accire, mutantes d in c sequente c [...] Ab arcio secundum antiquos habemus verbum desiderativum arcesso, arcessis (s.v. Cio) (Hugutio).

 [...] Et dicit Priscianus quod acus quarte declinationis est, quod tam masculini quam feminini invenitur. In usu moderno est tantum feminini generis (s.v. ACUS) (Brito).

 **PERIURO** .ras .ratum [...] nam dicimus deiero .ras et peiero .ras et hoc verum est secundum usum modernum, sed antiqui dicebant periuro .ras (DLV)

 **FATISCO** .scis [...] antiqui dicebant: fatiscor .sceris, fessus sum. quod nos non dicimus (DLV)

 Occasionally, *nunc ... dicitur* appears as a temporal marker:

 **Acharon** civitas Palestinae quae nunc Caesarea dicitur (Papias)

 **Cum me** sic dicebant et cum te quod nunc elegantius dicimus tecum mecum (Placidus Glossary)

### 3.1.1.6.2. Spatio-linguistic markers

A number of foreign words occur as entries in our corpus. They are most frequent in Papias, which has a substantial quantity of foreign proper nouns. Indeed, most of the foreign words in the *Catholicon* and in those dictionaries based on it, derive originally from Papias. Greek is the foreign language most often referred to in all the texts, and Hebrew ranks in second place. Syrian, Chaldean, Macedonian, Medean and Parthan are mentioned by Papias.

Lemmata of foreign origin are marked in two ways in our corpus. In the first method, the expressions *interpretatur* (< *interpretatio* – the explanation of a word in a different language) and *dicitur* are used. Foreign words may appear with or without an indication of the source language, and with or without stressing its opposition to Latin.

 **labin.** interpretatur sapiens ou sens ou prudence (A1)

 **Abdenago** lingua chaldaea interpretatur serviens taceo (Papias)

 **MALON** grece, latine dicitur rotundum (DLV).

In the second method of marking foreign lemmata, a connector is not used; the language of origin functions as the marker. The opposition to Latin may be implicit or explicit.

 **Abcida** de. grecum est [...] (MPST)

 **achas** grecae tristis (Papias)

 **Agios** grece latine sanctus... (Catholicon)
In Aalma, the source language of foreign lemmata is identified in Latin where there is a Latin definition, but may be in Latin or French where there is a French definition:

- **Argos** grece quedam civitas (A1)
- **manu** adverbium admirantis apud Grecos vel Hebreos (A1)
- **fasmus.** grece apparicion (A1)
- **lapes** en grec ignorance ou laidure (A1)

Language markers identify foreign words appearing in the microtext of many of the dictionaries:

- **abaddir** deus dicitur [...] dicitur quoque abdilier vel abdira vel abderites quem Graeci badelion vocant (Papias).
- **Alietus.** avis, quae gallice vocatur smerillum (Osbern).
- **MATER.** matris - .i. genitrix mere; Greci matros dicuntur quod autem dicitur mater (DLV).

Occasionally, foreign words do not have a marker:

- **Accidannus.** avis quae dicitur widercoe (Osbern).

Language markers also can identify Latin terms used by foreigners which differ from those in common use:

- **abies** dicta quod prae ceteris arboribus longe eat, hanc quidam Gallicum vocant propter candorem (Papias)

French stands in the position of a second language in Latin-French glossaries and dictionaries, and its opposition to Latin is implicit in its status as the language of exit. However, it is sometimes marked in the early bilingual glossaries, as in this example from the *Doctrinale* of Alexander of Villedieu in ms. Cambridge, Trinity Coll. R.3.29, ff.137r-168r (Hunt 1991: I, 90):

- **renis, rayns, anglice mideride**
- **acerls, escurayl**
- **vervecis, mutun gallice**
- **restim, hart**
- **verubus, espei gallice**

French forms in the glossary found on ff.34–35 of ms. Tours no 789 (Delisle 1869) are preceded by ro. for romane, instead of the more common gall. or gallice.

- **Gariofilum, ro. geolies**
- **Zeduarum, ro. citaux**
- **Galange, ro. garingauz**
- **Cerussa, ro. blanches**
French forms are only occasionally marked in the *Aalma* dictionaries:

- **preposition** in *gallico du* (A8)
- **Eruca** eruce. *vers qui mengue les choux: chenille*. vel est herba quedam gallice *rue* (A8)

and in MPST:

- **Abs** in quibusdam pro ab cum dictionibus insipientibus a .c. componitur ut abscondo. abscondo et hunc a, ab, abs fere eandem significationem, galice *de* (MP)

They are marked slightly more often (169 occurrences) in *DLV*, where *gallice* may introduce a precise translation following a more general Latin definition (Merrilee 1991: 59):

- **AMA**, ame .i. quedam avis nocturna, gallice *rua vosoris*...
- **Beta**, bete - herba quedam *beta* gallice (s.v. BETA).
- **DIVIDICULUM** .li - .i. castellum in divisione terrarum positum [...] Item quandoque dicitur gallice *pour boume entre terres*.

### 3.1.1.6.3. Socio-professional markers

Wooldridge (1977: 90) explains that, in principle, this category concerns particular vocabularies relating to the various areas of human activity, which may be called ‘technical’ vocabularies. The areas themselves are fairly easy to define and to organize in notional fields, but the vocabulary is much less so. If an activity is common or known to all members of a linguistic community, terms used to talk about it will belong to the common language. To use Wooldridge’s example, everyone dresses himself, but not everyone makes his own clothes. The vocabulary relating to their fabrication will be more or less known to each speaker, and thus more or less technical. The part of the vocabulary which is not understood by non-makers of clothing will be the most technical.

John Balbi announced the inclusion of terms bearing on scientific and theological matters in his Preface to the *Catholicon*; however, these words are not specially marked in the text. Not surprisingly, the largest semantic fields in our corpus, which is based mainly on the *Catholicon*, reflect medieval preoccupations: agriculture and husbandry, viniculture, domestic objects and animals, artisanat, mercantile, medicine, arms and warfare, feudalism and rank, religion and the Church. There is also a fairly large inventory of marine terms, including shipbuilding.

---

56 "[...] Invenies etiam hoc multas utiles questionaes naturalis. theologicas. motas et declaratas..." Mainz 1460
Technical words are not marked in any medieval dictionary, and it is difficult to differentiate between 'notional' and 'functional' membership in a particular vocabulary. Names of trades, for example, which are normally less technical than the tools or processes used in those trades, are presented on the same plane as the latter (id. 1977: 91). Tools whose use is reserved to a particular trade may be considered as technical words in our corpus. In the following examples, we find both equivalents and syntagms consisting of a generic term and a specific term:

ANCHORA, anchore - ancre .i. instrumentum nautarum ... (DLV)
BOLIS, bolidis - plommet a maronnier .i. massam plumi quam naute submittere solent in mare ... (DLV)
Clistere, clisteris - clistere .i. instrumentum medicorum ... (s.v. CLISTERE) (DLV)
Galla, galie instrument a purger et appareillier cuirs (A1)
MALLEUS est instrumentum fabri quo maileat et cudit et producit ferrum dum calet (Brito)

3.1.1.6.4. Stylistic markers

Stylistic markers concern the level of language, and the markers most frequently used in our corpus are communiter, vulgo and vulgariter, which refer to a more popular level of language. In most cases, they refer to vulgar Latin:

adoreum tritici genus quod vulgo dicitur semen [ador] (Papias)
Abactor est fur iumentorum et pecorum, quem vulgo abigeium vocant... (Isidore, 10)
Fimus, mi. stercus quod per agros facit quod vulgo letamen dicitur (Comprehensorium)
Bageniosiades que vulgo dicuntur Maierica et Minorica (MPST).

However, they may also refer to the French language:

Clientes vulgariter dicitur sergius, ut dicitur: ille cliens regalis (s.v. CLIENS) (DLV).
Apotheca .the<ce> communiter dicitur espicherie gallice (s.v. APOTHECA) (DLV).

The word plebes also functions as a stylistic marker:

LAOS - grece, latine dicitur lapis vel populus quasi lapideus quia non sequitur rationem, unde layci plebes dicuntur (DLV).

3.1.1.6.5. Quantitative markers

This class of marker relates to frequency of use and the markers most often found are non est in usu and raro invenitur:

MERX, mercis [...] Iste nominativus merx non est multum in usu (Brito).
Acer ras non est in usu. sed conponitur exacer ras... (Comprehensorium).
ALPIS .pis - ab alius dicitur, sed raro invenitur in singulari sed pluraliter ALPES, alpium .i. alti montes hautes montaingnes (DLV).
3.1.2. Presentation of entries

3.1.2.1. Arrangement of lemmata

The arrangement of lemmata in early glossaries might be local, thematic, or alphabetical. Some medieval compilers followed strictly alphabetical arrangement; some combined alphabetical order with other systems. Hugutio of Pisa and Osbern of Gloucester combined the derivational principle with first-letter alphabetical order. John Balbi and Firmin Le Ver combined full alphabetization with the derivational system. The anonymous compiler of the Latin-German Vocabularius brevilogus arranged his material in three categories – Nomina, Verba, Indeclinabilia, and arranged each of them alphabetically.

3.1.2.1.1. Local arrangement

"The explanation of glosses, obsolete or dialectical and so ‘hard’ words, at first frequently followed the order in which the words occurred in the texts in which they were found" (Daly 1967: 28). Most early Greek glossaries were arranged according to the occurrence of the source words in a text (local order), for example, the Homeric glosses (Hessels 1910: 124) and Erotian’s collection of technical terms in Hippocrates (Daly 1967: 34).

Late classical and early medieval glossaries developed from interlinear and marginal glosses on classical texts, the Bible and Christian authors, assembled in the order of their appearance in a text. Collison (1982: 40) notes, "The late ninth-century Leiden Glossary extracted glosses from a number of classical works, keeping each set distinct and in the order of the original text. This was useful when the text was available, but its use as a general dictionary was practically nil." Other glossographers collected glosses and arranged them in alphabetical order (often only to the first or second letter), or combined two or more glossaries into one. However, glosses removed from their context in this way frequently lost their meaning (id. 1982: 40; Hunt 1991: l, 4).

While large collections were becoming alphabetical, small glossaries based on local order arrangement continued to be compiled throughout the Middle Ages. Those relating to the Scriptures formed a particularly rich field. For example, the lemmata in one part of the Reichenau Glossary are arranged in order of their occurrence in the Bible. The text of the
Mammotrectus super bibliam of Johannes Marchesinus, a manual for the clergy, follows the progression of books in the Bible, and also the Church year, that is, the regular progress of scriptural readings in the Church calendar.

The scant evidence remaining to support the use of local order arrangement in Latin-French glossaries in the late Middle Ages is discussed in 2.3.

3.1.2.1.2. Thematic arrangement

Some early glossaries were also arranged systematically by subject, "since this was a more logical method than alphabetical arrangement which brings topics together only by the accident of initial letter order" (Collison 1982: 40). Subject order appears to have been followed by Aristophanes (third century B.C.) in the compilation of his Lexeis (id. 1982: 26), and by Phrynicus Arabius (second century A.D.) (id. 1982: 40). Glossaries might also follow an order which the author deemed to be logical, as is the case with the Onomasticon of Julius Pollux (Daly 1967: 28).

As we have seen in 2.2., works such as Nequam’s De utensilium nominibus and John of Garland’s Dictionarius, intended for teaching Latin, were written from the twelfth century onwards. Vernacular glosses were either integrated into the text or added between the lines and in the margins. From the thirteenth century, vernacular glosses on a variety of subjects were compiled independently (see 2.4.) and grouped under headings such as parts of the body, household objects, weapons, domestic and wild animals, etc. Doubtless these glossaries had a didactic purpose.

Collections of botanical terms, often collocated in manuscripts with medical receipts, were intended for pharmaceutical or medical use. A few of these glossaries are arranged alphabetically; in the main they are in random order, although it is possible that the glosses occur in the order in which they were extracted from some botanical text(s).

3.1.2.1.3. Simple alphabetical arrangement

Daly (1967: 11r.) tells us,

"Alphabetization depends upon the existence of an established sequence of the letters of the alphabet itself. This sequence was already established at the time when the alphabet was learned from the Phoenicians by the Greeks. [...] Whether or not the
Romans, in turn, originally accepted the full set and pattern of symbols we do not know from extant abecedaria, but we do have evidence for their continued respect for the sequence, if not for the names, of the symbols.’

Evidence of alphabetical order in the arrangement of glossaries comes as early as the third century B.C., when Zenodotus compiled an alphabetically-arranged glossary of the difficult words in Homer (Collison 1982: 26). Contrary to the more customary local arrangement, Apion’s Homeric glosses (first century B.C.) are arranged alphabetically to the first letter (Daly 1967: 31), as are most of the extant lexica compiled by the Atticists; for example, the work of Pausanius (second century A.D.) (id. 1967: 33). It is difficult to know whether Pamphilos (first century A.D.) arranged his dictionary alphabetically, but Hesychius wrote that the epitome made of it by Diogenianus in the second century observed alphabetical order to the third or fourth letter of each word (id. 1967: 33 n.5). The bilingual Pseudo-Cyril (fifth century) and Pseudo-Philoxenus (sixth century) glossaries are alphabetical to the first two or three letters (id. 1967: 67).

The only examples of nearly perfect alphabetical order in Greek lexicography are Galen’s collection of *Hippocratic Glosses* (second century), the *Ethnica* of Stephanus (fifth century), and *Suda* (early eleventh century) (id. 1967: 95).

The extent to which Varro (first century B.C.) used alphabetical order in his lost works is uncertain, but two lists of Greek writers on agriculture contained in Book I of *De re rustica* are in first-letter alphabetic order (id. 1967: 52). Judging from the ninth-century extract of Festus’s second-century epitome, Verrius Flaccus (fl. 10 B.C.) followed at least first-letter, and possible second- or third-letter order in his vast *Libri de significatu verborum* (id. 1967: 58). The elder Pliny (first century A.D.) also observed first-letter order in numerous wordlists contained in his *Historia naturalis* (id. 1967: 38). However, since Pliny copied his material from mainly Greek sources, it is possible that the entries were already in this order in the source documents. Another instance of first-letter order is found in the lexicographical parts of *the De compendiosa doctrina* of Nonius Marcellus (fourth century A.D.) (id. 1967: 52).

The principles of alphabetical order, known in Antiquity, were later forgotten and were rediscovered in the Middle Ages. Miethaner-Vent (1986: 90) explains that the first step was
grouping together all the words beginning with the same letter. Next came organization to the second letter, which was not always the second letter of the word but rather the vowel of the first syllable. Words whose initial syllable was pronounced in the same way were grouped together. It is this arrangement which is found in the Affatim Glossary (ninth century) and described by Daly (1967: 70): "[the order] is determined by the first letter and by the first vowel following the first letter of each word, regardless of what other letters may intervene. It results, for example, that words beginning in fla- and fra- may precede words beginning in fa-, and that 144 glosses intervene between affatim and affecta."

For the letter 'U', continues Miethaner-Vent (1986: 90), glossaries distinguished words beginning with a vowel from those beginning with a consonant; 'H' was often not taken into consideration; 'Ph' might be confused with 'F', and 'K' with 'C'. The determining factor in ordering entries was the syllable, not the letter.

The base manuscripts of the Placidus Glossary edited in CGL V date from the eighth or ninth centuries and full alphabetical order is generally observed. However, it is not possible to know whether this arrangement originated with Placidus. It is very likely the result of later rearrangement since the glossary exhibits the usual medieval practice of ignoring double consonants and medial 'h': Achates Acecurate Accentus Acceptorem Acerac Aceris Accipienser, etc. (CGL V: 43f.).

The Abavus Glossary, edited in CGL IV: 301ff. from four ninth-century manuscripts, is in virtually absolute alphabetical order, as is the Liber glossarum or Glossarum Anseleub? (end of the eighth century).

Papias (fl.1053) states that his Elementarium doctrinae erudimentum (eleventh century) is composed according to the alphabet, not only in the first letters but in the second, third and sometimes even further. He carries out this intention fairly accurately, although he ignores

---

57 The editors of Glossaria latina enthuse: "O admirabilem Anseleubum qui tam accurate tam vastam congeriem ordinandam curaverit!" (GL I: 7).
58 "Notare quoque culibet aliquum citius invenire volenti oportebit quoniam totus hic liber per alphabeta non solum in primis partium litteris verum etiam in secundis et tertius et ulterius interdum ordinabilis litterarum dispositione compositus erit. [...] Cum vero earundem litterarum primus, secundus, tertius reordens observatur fuerit, idem in sequentibus litteris non adeo custodiri poterit quod non prepostere quis eas posuerit. In ipsis quoque primis, secundis vel tertii modis, propter diversarum litterarum scripturam, interdum ratio variabitur.
double consonants and medial 'h' in determining the order, for example, *acetum Achialon aciare accida*.

When writing his *Summa*, William Brito (mid-thirteenth century) "followed the precedent of alphabetic arrangement but applied it more thoroughly [than Papias and Hugutio]. The general scheme is that of absolute alphabetization." (Daly/Daly 1975: xxxv). However, Brito occasionally departed from absolute order; for example, derivatives sometimes follow their primary word: *onix onichinis, vermis vermiculatus*; double consonants are often ignored in determining order: *Melchon melodía melota Mello*; as is internal 'h': *cantus chaos capparis*. There are also lapses which are not attributable to any apparent reason: *magnatus magispluris magi magister malagma*.

Most bilingual glossaries follow a simple alphabetical arrangement. Lemmata in the Latin-French *Abavus* series (thirteenth-fourteenth centuries), which is based largely on Papias, follow alphabetical order for the root, then tend to follow derivational order for the suffixes. Lemmata in the *Aalma* series (fourteenth-fifteenth centuries), which is based on the *Catholicon*, follow full alphabetical order, with only occasional variations. Exhibit 27 compares alphabetical order in the two glossaries.

**Exhibit 27: Alphabetical order in *Abavus* and *Aalma***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abavus</th>
<th>Aalma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Paris, BN lat. 7692 (Ab4)</td>
<td>Ms. Paris, BN lat. 13032 (Al)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fastidire</td>
<td>Fastidio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fastidium</td>
<td>Fastidiositas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fastidosus</td>
<td>Fastidiosus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatuo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatuitas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatuus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| placere | Placens |
| placidus | Placeo |
| placenter | Placidus |

Roques 1936b: 334, 433

---

The compiler of MP generally applied the principles of alphabetization; however, there are lapses. Some are due to disregard for medial ‘h’: Abolla Abhominor Abhorigenes, and double ‘c’: Aceries, Accessio, Acestes. Other errors are due to misreadings of the word in the source text, either the Elementarium or the Catholicon.

Alphabetical order in the Glossarium gallico-latinum is essentially first-letter only, as a result of the method which the author of ms. Paris, BN lat. 7684 used to compile his text. He obviously wanted to take some of the French forms from an unknown Latin-French dictionary and use them as lemmata in a French-Latin glossary. He first searched the letter ‘A’ in his source and extracted French glosses beginning with ‘a’, listing them in the order in which they occurred. Then he searched the letter ‘B’ for French words beginning with ‘a’ and added them on to the end of his first list. Next he searched the letter ‘C’ for French words beginning with ‘a’, adding them to the list, and so on. When he had completed his list of French words beginning with ‘a’, he applied the same technique to those beginning with ‘b’, and continued in the same way through the alphabet.59

As a consequence, French lemmata overall in GGL are only in first-letter alphabetical order, but within each letter-section where derivatives of one word-family succeed one another, groups of French forms follow second- or third-letter order. Latin equivalents frequently follow derivational order, and then are roughly in alphabetical order.60 This phenomenon may be observed in the following sample from GGL.

Exhibit 28: Alphabetical order in the Glossarium gallico-latinum

| Avorté | abortus .ta .tum | Absténir | abstineo .nes .nui |
| Acourcer | abbrevio .as .atum | Abstinent | abstinens .antis |
| Aurone | herba, abrotanum .ni | Abunder | abundo .das |
| Absent | absens .tis | Abundaument | abundanter - adverbium |
| Absenté | absentatus .ta .tum | Abundance | abundantia |
| Aluyne | absinthium .thii herbe | Abusion | abusio .onis |

Ms. Paris, BN lat. 7684

60 Hunt (1989: xxiii) describes a similar situation: “London, B.L. Add. 17866 ff. 43ra-45rc. An early-fourteenth-century MS largely composed of Middle English medical receipts in both prose and verse and a verse herbal. The list of synonyma has a red rubric Hic incipiunt nomina herbarum. The arrangement is disordered. In principle there is an English headword (initial letter in red) and listed below it are synonyms in Latin and English with a few in French. A peculiarity is that, although the list is divided into alphabetical sections (each preceded by a large red capital), the alphabetical principle really applies not to the English headwords, but to the first synonym given for each entry, which is usually Latin.”
Another difficulty in ordering the macrostructure of GGL arises from the syntagms and paraphrases which replace synthetic Latin forms. Analytic forms are usually arranged according to the first letter of the paradigm:

Under 'D'
D'oressenavant amodo - adverbium
Du tout trencher amputo .tas .tatum
De an en an annuatim - adverbium

Under 'F'
Faire avouterie adultero .ras
Fausse accusacion calompnia .nie

Occasionally, they are placed under the principal lexical unit:

Under 'F'
Petit fevre fabriculus .li
Celuy qui fait faux falcarius .rii

3.1.2.1.4. Alphabetical-derivational arrangement

Compilers of lexica based entirely on etymological and derivational principles applied alphabetization only to a limited extent. The alphabetical arrangement in Book X (De vocabulis) of Isidore of Seville's Etymologiae (beginning of the seventh century) is to the first letter only. Lemmata under letter 'B', for example, begin: Beatus Bonus Benignus Beneficus Benivorus, etc.

The Liber derivationum or Panormia of Osbern of Gloucester (twelfth century) consists of Derivationes in which articles compiled according to the derivational method are grouped in first-letter alphabetical order, and Repetitiones (glossaries) which repeat some lemmata from the derivational sections. The glossaries, too, are in first-letter alphabetical order, because they follow the original order of the lemmata in the derivations.

Daly/Daly (1975: xxxv) note that in arranging the lemmata in his Magnae derivationes, Hugutio of Pisa (end of twelfth century) "adopted an alphabetic order which took account of only the first two letters of each word, but in words beginning with a consonant [he] placed combinations of the consonant with the vowels before combinations of the consonant with other consonants" (see p. 86 supra). Because the articles in Hugutio's work are based on etymological relationships, as are those in the Panormia, they also contain sub-lemmata which

61 Also see Miethaner-Vent 1986: 90.
cannot be accessed alphabetically. It was not long before alphabetical tables were added to manuscripts of *Magnae derivationes* to improve its consultability (see p. 95 infra).

John Balbi created the first Latin dictionary in Part V of his grammatical treatise, *Summa grammaticalis quae vocatur Catholicon*, combining alphabetical and derivational arrangement.

Balbi carefully describes absolute alphabetical order in the lengthy preface to his work.\(^ {62} \) Daly/Daly (1964: 237) remark that it "may be a long-winded explanation of absolute alphabetization but it is at least clear, and it was put into practice." Balbi follows alphabetical arrangement with very few lapses. He often includes derivatives as lemmata in the alphabetically-ordered macrotext, rather than as sub-lemmata in the article headed by the base form. These derivatives may be treated as lemmata, or they may contain a reference to the base word, e.g. *Abigeatus ab abiges gis dicitur. vide in abigeus; Abnomis. in norma exponitur.*

Firmin Le Ver applies absolute alphabetical order in arranging the lemmata in his *Dictionarius* (mid-fifteenth century). Each lemma begins at the left-hand column margin. In most articles, there are sub-lemmata (derivatives), each of which also begins at the left column margin on a separate line. Le Ver also adds derivatives which logically complete the macrostructure (Merrilees 1994a: xiv). Exhibit 29 compares alphabetical-derivational arrangement in the *Catholicon* and *DLV*.

---

\(^ {62} \) "In hac autem quinta parte procedas ubique secundum ordinem alphabeti, itaque ex tali ordine de facili haberi poterit orthographya cuiuslibet hic positi dictionis. ut verbi gratia. Intendo tractare de amo et bibo. primo tractabo de amo quam de bibo. quia .a. est prima littera in amo. et .b. est prima littera in bibo. et .a. est ante .b. in alphabeto.

"Item tractare volo de abeo et adeo. primo tractabo de abeo bis quam de adeo aids. quia .b. est secunda littera in abeo et .d. est secunda littera in adeo. et .b. est ante .d.

"Item determinare intendo de amatus et amor. prius determinabo de amatus quam de amor. quia .a. est tercia littera in amatus et .o. est tercia littera in amor. et .a. est ante .o.

"Item agere volo de imprudens et impudens. ante agam de imprudens quam de impudens. quia .r. est quarta littera in imprudens. et .u. est quarta littera in impudens. et .r. est ante .u.

"Item agere intendo de iusticia et iustus. prius agam de iusticia quam de iustus. quia .i. est quinta littera in iusticia. et .u. est quinta littera in iustus. et .i. est ante .u.

"Insuper determinare intendo de polisintheton et polissenus. primo determinabo de polisintheton quam de polissenus. quia .i. est sexta littera in polisintheton. et .s. est sexta littera in polissenus. et .i. est ante .s. Et ita a simili intelligas de omnibus aliis dictionibus in hac parte positis. ex quibuscumque litteris constant. quia semper est ibi ordinacio secundum ordinem alphabeti. ut opinor ... Hunc autem ordinem cum magno labore et ardentiu studio adinveni." Mainz 1460.
Exhibit 29: Comparison of alphabetical-derivational arrangement in *Catholicon* and *DLV*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catholicon</th>
<th>DLV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marcidulus.</strong> la. lum. aliquantulum marcidus. a marcidus dicitur</td>
<td><strong>MARCIDUS</strong> - a marceo, marces dicitur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marcidus.</strong> a marceo. ces. dicitur <strong>marcidus.</strong> da. durn. putridus, arescens, languens. Et comparatur. dior. simus. Unde hec <strong>marciditas.</strong> tatis. et marcidus. das. .i. marcidum facere. et est activum et corripitur ci</td>
<td><strong>Marcus</strong> .da .dum .i. putridus, arescens, languens .i. <strong>flamis, come florettes, pales, languissans, matis, secs ou pourris</strong> - comparatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainz 1460; reprint Westmead: <strong>Gregg 1971</strong></td>
<td><strong>Marcide</strong> - adverbium - matemant, palement comparatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marciditas.</strong> tatis - flamissure, come de florettes, paleur, mateur ou langueur</td>
<td><strong>Marciditas.</strong> tatis - flamissure, come de florettes, paleur, mateur ou langueur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marcidus</strong> .das .datum - marcidum facere .i. faire flamir, sequier, palir, matir, languir</td>
<td>act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marcidatus.</strong> a .um .i. marcidus factus</td>
<td><strong>Marcidus</strong> .la .lum .diminutivum - aliquantulum marcidus aucunement flamis, matis, come florettes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marcidulus.</strong> la. lum. diminutivum - aliquantulum marcidus</td>
<td>Merriees 1994a: 3, 293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lemmata are ordered alphabetically in *DLV*, while sub-lemmata are arranged hierarchically according to an order which is determined by derivation. At the first level of derivation, substantives tend to generate adjectives, and verbs to generate participles, e.g.

**MARCIDUS** — Marcidus. At lower levels, adjectives and participles often generate adverbs and derived nouns, e.g. **Marcidus** — **Marcide** — **Marciditas** — **Marcitudo** (Merriees 1992: 79).

Derived forms also appear at times in the macrostructure in *DLV*, usually in cases where the orthography of the derivative is much different from that of the root, e.g. **ABITIO** .tionis - *In Abeo, abis dicitur*; **LANUTUS** .ta .tum - *In Lana dicitur*.

3.1.2.2. **Visual aids**

Typography is an indispensable aid to consultability in modern dictionaries. Variations in the size of type and changes in fonts, signal the change from macrotext to microtext and also indicate certain types of information – etymological, grammatical, historical, etc. Other factors affecting consultability include format, weight of paper, number of columns, width of margins, headings, and so on (Bray 1989: 137f.).

Here we examine the visual measures developed by lexicographers before the age of printing to establish or improve the consultability of their dictionaries.
3.1.2.2.1. Page layout and text division

An important aspect of the physical layout of lexica is the separation of text into vertical chunks or columns. Descriptions of lexical manuscripts indicate that, irrespective of type, they are usually set out in two columns to the page. This arrangement includes the large Latin and bilingual compilations: Papias, Hugutio, Catholicon, MPST, and DLV. However, if we are to judge from the only printed edition of Osbern of Gloucester’s Liber derivationum (Mai 1836: Tome VIII), the manuscript was laid out in two ways, just as the content was divided into two parts. The Derivationes occupy the page from margin to margin, while the glossaries in the Repetitiones are arranged two columns per page.

The two-column layout was also commonly used in the smaller bilingual lexica: thematic glossaries, the Abavus series, and all but one of the manuscripts (A8) in the Aalma series. The text of A8 is laid out in a single column, and there is blank space between the lemma and the definition, and again between the definition and the grammatical sign against the right margin. A8 is the source manuscript for the first printed Latin-French dictionary, the Catholicon abbreviatum (see 4.0.).

Variations in letter size and ink colour were the most common methods of indicating text division. When used in lexica, they were combined with alphabetical order to achieve the desired effect. In the prologue to his Elementarium, Papias describes a somewhat complex system of subdivision to accomplish alphabetization,63 where the breaks of the alphabet were to be marked by three sizes of letters (Rouse/Rouse 1982: 203). Ms. Paris, BN lat. 17162 illustrates the way in which a thirteenth-century scribe interpreted Papias’s instructions. An ornate capital is located at the beginning of each letter division, at ‘A’, ‘B’, etc. Smaller capitals occur at the points where the sequence of words progresses from one letter to another in the third position, e.g. at Abba, Abdias, Abia, Ablactare, etc. However, there does not appear to be

63 “... Notare quoque cuilibet alliquid citius invenire volenti oportebit quoniam totus hic liber per alfabetum non solum in primis partium litteris verum etiam in secundis et tertiis et ulterius interdum ordinabilis litterarum dispositione compositus erit. Prima igitur divisionis notatio per .a.b.c. et ceteras sequentes fiet litteras, que in secundo quidem distinctionis ordine per eadem ab.c. ceterasque maiores litteras ante quasi libet commutatas subdividetur. In terto vero subdivisionis ordine, quicquid sub una trium litterarum specie continetur, ut in toto ipso spatio inveniatur quod queritur, uno paragraphe tertio subdistinguetur. ...” Cited in Daly/Daly 1967: 231.
an initial to mark the progress of words from one letter to the next in second position (Daly/Daly 1964: 234).

Coloured ink is also used in ms. Paris, BN lat. 17162 (Papias) to distinguish the subdivisions of the text, a practice which Carruthers (1990: 226) tells us had been in use at least since the fourth century A.D. In this manuscript, combined red and blue initials occur in the first lemma of each primary letter division, for example, at 'B'; then red and blue initials alternate with each change of letter in second and third position: a red 'B' for Babel, a blue 'B' for Baccha, a red 'B' for Baculus, a blue 'B' for Badium, and so on (Daly/Daly 1964: 234).

The scribe of ms. Paris, BN lat. 7678 (Comprehensorium) used a similar technique. The capital letter of the beginning of letter-section 'A' is combined red and blue ink and illuminated in gold. Then the capital at the beginning of each second-letter change alternates blue and red, i.e. the 'A' in the first word in 'Ab-' is blue, in 'Ac-' is red, in 'Ad-' is blue, and so on.

The Magnae derivationes of Hugutio of Pisa, despite its usefulness, is not an easy work to consult and, beginning in the thirteenth century, various attempts were made to render the dictionary more consultable. Simple aids include the use of ink in different colours, and of capital letters in different sizes, similar to those found in manuscripts of Papias's work. In ms. Paris, BN lat. 16217, for example, each lemma begins with a large red capital. Each derivative is preceded by a black paraph (¶) whose final right-facing stroke underlines the derived form. The latter begins with a smaller capital in blue, splashed with red. The body of the text is in black ink.

Wallis (1981: 17f.) notes that two important changes in the methods of compiling and presenting reference works were especially pertinent to Balbi's Catholicon. The first was the growing acceptance of and familiarity with alphabetical order and the second concerned the layout of the manuscript page. She remarks (1981: 19) "Balbi was particularly interested in the use of prominent initials and alternating colours to facilitate 'looking things up'".

---

64 Ms. Vatican lat. 3256, Virgilius Augusteus.
65 "Ut autem quod querit exemplo animo lectoris occurat, quocienscumque prima littera vel secunda diccionis mutabitur, primam literam diccionis faciam de aizuro." From the prologue to part 5 of the Catholicon; cited in Wallis 1981: 20.
Hunt (1991: 1) frequently mentions the use of coloured ink for initials, paragraph marks, and capital letters throughout the text, in his detailed descriptions of manuscripts containing Anglo-Norman glosses.

Roques (1938: xi) describes the appearance of A1, the earliest manuscript of the Aalma series. The lexicon begins with a large coloured initial (blue, lilac and gold), and large red and blue letters begin each alphabetical section of the text. Smaller red and blue initials were intended to mark subdivisions determined by the second letter of the words: Ac-, Ad-, etc., but this arrangement was not always observed.

According to Nobel (1986: 157f.), in MP, large initials mark the first lemma in each letter-section as well as at each second-letter subdivision. The scribe apparently intended to place paragraph marks at third-letter subdivisions, but did not do so consistently.

The visual aspect of the DLV is consistent with its organization. Lemmata begin with a large coloured initial, alternating red and blue, sometimes just red. Sub-lemmata are set against the left column margin, and begin with a normal-sized capital letter, written in the same brown ink as the text (Merrilees 1990: 288).

Columns of text in some manuscripts are further divided by the use of rubrics. Wallis (1981:20) mentions such an arrangement in the Catholicon in ms. Paris, BN lat. 7627, in which changes in the second letter are announced a ante b, a ante c, etc. Manuscript A8 of the Aalma series separates the end of one letter-section from the beginning of the next: Et hec de -. Running headlines were used as early as the twelfth century. Rouse/Rouse (1982: 209) describe a manuscript written c.1170–1176 by Herbert of Mosham containing Peter Lombard's Magna glossatura: “At the top of the page is a running headline in alternating red and blue, giving the number of the psalm contained on that page; the running headline changes over the proper column, where the text of a new psalm begins.”

---

66 Also see Miethaner-Vent 1989: 90.
3.1.2.2.2. Reference systems

The creation of subject indexes in rational or alphabetical order was another step in improving consultability. They were developed initially for access to the Scriptures or to canon law compendia (Rouse/Rouse 1982a: 204), but later used in conjunction with other texts.

A common type of reference system is the alphabetical index or *repertorium*. Such an index accompanies the *Mammotrectus super biblum* of Johannes Marchesinus, in which the text is written in the order of the books of the Bible. Several kinds of alphabetical *repertoria* are found in many manuscripts of *Magnae derivationes*, and it is quite common for a manuscript to include two or more *repertoria*. A simple model involves repetition of some of the lemmata and derivatives in the margins of the pages. More complex models are found in the form of tables, which may precede or follow the dictionary.

One of the best-known reference systems of the Middle Ages is that used by Parisian scholars from the beginning of the thirteenth century to subdivide the chapters of the Paris text of the Vulgate written about 1190 (of which Stephen Langton, future archbishop of Canterbury, was the principal architect), into seven paragraphs of roughly equal length (Châtillon 1985: 31). William Brito adapted this system and applied it regularly in his *Summa or Expositiones vocabulorum biblie* for references to books of the Bible, and frequently for Juvenal, Lucan, Ovid, and Virgil (Daly/Daly 1964: 238).

Hauréau (1885: 594f.) was the first to describe the numerical reference system used by the compiler of the ‘reverse’ French-Latin dictionary in ms. Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine H236 (see 2.5.2.). The scribe divided each page of the Latin text in half horizontally, and assigned each half-page a Roman numeral. Thus the upper half of the first page is A I and the lower half is A II, the upper half of the second page is A III, the lower half A IV, and so on. The

---

67 The Dominican Hugh of Saint-Cher, who became Master of theology at Paris in 1230 and who used the system in his biblical concordance, *Concordantiae Sancti Jacobi*, is usually credited with creation of this system of subdivision (e.g. Daly/Daly 1936: 236; Rouse 1981: 118). Châtillon 1985: 32 points out, however, that research by G. Théry, *"Saint Antoine de Padoue et Thomas Gallus"*, *La vie spirituelle* 38, 1934, Supplément, 32, and *"Thomas Gallus : Aperçu biographique"*, *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* XII, 1939, 165, relative to another Master, Thomas Gallus, who taught at Paris at the beginning of the thirteenth century before moving to Italy in 1219, shows that Thomas used this system in a commentary on Isaiah composed before leaving France.
numbering recommences with each change of letter-section, at 'B', 'C', etc. French glosses are written in the margins of the manuscript in first-letter alphabetical order, and each is preceded by a number corresponding to the location of the entry in the text. For example, the entries for 'Il Aloine' and 'Il Amertume' are found in the bottom section of the first page:

Hoc absincium. crii, est quedam herba amarissimi suci, gallice aloine, et accipitur pro amaritudine, amertume.

Merrilees (1994: 14f.) describes another numerical reference system used in ms. Angers, BM n° 497, n° 498. A list of French words in alphabetical order appears at the beginning of each letter-section, and each word on the list is followed by a Roman numeral: 'Habile III', 'Habit XXVI', etc. The number refers to the folio of the letter-section where the French form is the lemma of an entry providing a Latin definition. The reference system is necessary because the lemmata are in first-letter alphabetical order only, and there is no discernible order in the articles themselves.

3.1.2.2.3. Marginal notations

Another method of assisting the reader to locate a word quickly is through the use of marginal notations, that is, material written on the part of the page which is outside the main body of the text. The earliest glosses were written in all the margins, as well as between the lines. In medieval lexica, marginal notations are frequently intended to convey the source of a word or phrase. For example, in the Liber glossarum the source of each lemma is marked in the margin, e.g. ISID., VIRGL., DE GLS = DE GLOSSIS, various glossaries (GL I).

Papias says in his prologue to the Elementarium that he intends to identify some of the authors he cites by writing in the margin an abbreviation consisting of the first few letters of the name.68 The extent to which his intention was carried out depends on individual scribes; however, in ms. Paris, BN lat. 17162, abbreviations are written in the margins in red ink, e.g. hy, pris, ser, aug, etc.

---

68 "At vero quorundam etiam auctorum nomina ad eorumdem verborum autenticum primis quibusdam litteris, quorum quosdam subnotabimus, prescribentur: Hisidorus hi, Augustinus aug, Ieronimus ier, Ambrosius amb, Gregorius gg, Priscianus pris, Boetius bo. ...." Cited in Daly/Daly 1964: 231.
In the *DLV*, notations appear in the margin to draw attention to a particular point (*nota*), an exemplary verse (*versus*) or an authority (Merrilees 1991: 39). *Versus* are signalled in the *Aalma* manuscripts which we have examined by a symbol in the right- or left-hand margin next to the location of the *versus* in the text.

Here we have discussed material found in the margins of lexica which is intended to assist a reader to locate information contained in the microtext. Another use of the term 'marginal' concerns the location (at the end of the text line, against the right-hand margin) of grammatical information which is part of the content of the document (see p. 106 *infra*).

*3.1.2.2.4. Underlining*

The text of didactic and grammatical treatises was usually written from margin to margin across a full page. Marginal commentary and glosses often drew the reader’s attention to items of interest in the proximate text but, frequently, glosses integrated into the text are underlined. Such is the case in ms. Paris, BN lat. 11282, a thirteenth-century copy of the *Dictionarius* of John of Garland, where the French glosses are underlined in red.

It is unusual to find the French forms underlined in a Latin-French lexicon; however, in MP, the French terms are consistently underlined (Nobel 1986: 158). In the first three folios of *DLV*, a later hand has underlined the French glosses and definitions (Merrilees 1991: 41).

*3.1.3. Structure of the article*

In his horizontal reading of an article, the modern dictionary user expects to find (in a monolingual dictionary):

- information on pronunciation, grammar and etymology,
- a definition or definitions for each meaning of the entry (such entries being ordered in a pre-determined hierarchy),
- usage notes concerning style, frequency of use, etc.,
- examples, and possibly,
- citations (including the title of the work and the name of the author),
- antonyms and synonyms.

If the user is consulting a bilingual dictionary, he expects the articles to include:

- information on pronunciation and grammar,
- an equivalent or equivalents in his own language for each meaning of the entry and for each use of the entry in a syntagm or locution,
- examples of the entry in its various uses.
Irrespective of the type of dictionary, the user expects the different components to occupy the same location in each article of the dictionary. In this section we discuss the principal aspects of the construction of articles in our corpus.

Wooldridge (1977: 149f.) explains that modern lexicography distinguishes between, on the one hand, the headword (see 3.1.1.) and its implicit treatment through examples of use, which concern language, and on the other hand, the explicit treatment of the headword by definitions and orthographic, phonetic, etymological, grammatical and stylistic information, which concern metalanguage. We look briefly at each of these modes of treatment.

3.3.1. Language

3.1.3.1.1. Citations and examples

The use of citations to illustrate terms in a glossary probably goes well back into Antiquity (Della Casa 1981: 36). Certainly it was established in Greek lexicography by the beginning of the modern era. Apion used a quotation to illustrate each term in his collection of Homeric glosses (Daly 1967: 31). In the first or second century A.D. Valerius Harpocration included quotations from the works of poets, historians and other scholars in his Technical Terms of the Ten Orators (Collison 1982: 33). The Onomasticon compiled in the second century by Julius Pollux of Naucratis cites works where examples of the use of the more specialized words and phrases are to be found (id. 1982: 34). Near the end of the first century B.C. Verrius Flaccus quoted extensively from contemporary writings in his De significatu verborum (id. 1982: 34).

Quotations were common practice in medieval lexicography, beginning with Isidore. Quotations from classical authors are especially plentiful in Osbern and Hugutio. Brito’s references to the Vulgate are frequent, and he also cites a large number of classical authors, as well as Papias and Hugutio. Balbi often completes articles with citations from the Bible, classical authors, Hugutio and Papias, and contemporary grammarians such as Peter of Riga.

Le Ver rarely names his principal source, the Catholicon, but he frequently mentions Papias, and occasionally Hugutio and Brito. His chief grammatical source is the Graecismus of Eberhard of Bethune, and he also draws from the Doctrinale of Alexander of Villedieu and the
Opus synonymorum of John of Garland; however, he seldom attributes his citations. Citations from the Vulgate are numerous in DLV, but there are few references to classical authors.

An example is often used to illustrate the meaning of a term in the Catholicon: Adversus [...] ut: adversus eum i. contra eum and in the DLV: LAR [...] unde dicitur: video larem per larem laris, gallice dicendum: je voy le feu par le treu de la maison.

3.1.3.2. Metalanguage

3.1.3.2.1. Grammatical Information

Latin possessed eight parts of speech, according to medieval grammarians: noun, pronoun, verb, adverb, participle, conjunction, preposition and interjection. (Adjectives were considered to be part of the 'noun' category.) All categories are present in our corpus, but marking as to function and grammatical attributes varies considerably.

Papias includes as articles in the Elementarium lengthy descriptions (drawn from the Graecismus, whose source was Priscian) pertaining to many aspects of grammar: cases, parts of speech, prosody, and so on. Balbi devotes four sections of the Catholicon to grammatical matters, and the Comprehensorium and DLV include similar material, either in articles or commentary.

Papias only infrequently marks lemmata with grammatical indicators, but marking was followed more consistently in later texts. Nouns and adjectives are usually marked for gender in Catholicon, Comprehensorium, Aalma and DLV by abbreviations: m or mas.ge. (masculini generis), f or fe.ge. (feminei generis), n or n.ge. (neutri generis), c or com.ge. (communis generis), o or o.ge. (omnis generis – for adjectives). In the other lexica the markers are written in full.

The term nomen is rarely used except when qualified for some reason: grecum nomen, nomen indeclinabile, verbale nomen, nomen collectivum, nomen proprium or proprium nomen, etc. Nomen occasionally appears in a definition, e.g. Altiris nomen est avis (Placidus).

69 Dionysius Thrax identified six parts in his grammar; these were later changed to four by one of his pupils. Apollonius Dyscolus (first century BC) held that there were eight parts of speech (Sandys 1921: I, 320).
Verbs are qualified in all texts as *activum, deponens, neutrum, inchoativum, frequentativum, desiderativum, defectivum, impersonale*, and so on. They are also marked in *Catholicum, Aalma* and *DLV* by abbreviations: *a* or *act* (*activum*), *n* (*neutrum*), *d* or *de* (*deponens*), *inch* or *incho* (*inchoativum*), *np* (*neutropassivum*) and *f*, *ff*, *fre*, *fr* (*frequentativum*), etc.

Adverbs, marked *adverbium*, occur infrequently in Papias. They are frequent in the *Catholicum*, usually as sub-lemmata, although they are not always marked. Adverbs are invariably marked as such in *Aalma* and *DLV*. *Adverbium* is frequently marked for comparison (*comparatur*) in *DLV* and may also be qualified as to meaning or function: *adverbium loci, adverbium temporis, adverbium quantitatis, adverbium personale, adverbium discretivum*, etc.

Past participles, treated as adjectives, and present participles, which are considered to be adjectives/nouns, are included as lemmata in the *Aalma* manuscripts, and as either lemmata or sub-lemmata in the treatment of a verb in the *Catholicum, MPST* and *DLV*. The term *participium* occasionally qualifies both past and present participles.

Some conjunctions and prepositions occur as lemmata in all of the glossaries and dictionaries in our corpus (see 3.1.1.1.), and are usually marked *conjunctio* or *prepositio*. Conjunctions may also be qualified: *affirmativa, adversativa, appellativa, causalis, copulativa, disiunctiva*, etc. In *Aalma*, *MPST* and *DLV*, prepositions are usually identified (either in Latin or in French) by an indication of the case which they govern (see examples on p. 109 *infra*).

Grammatical terms are especially likely to be assigned more than one function (see Appendix 3) or to be incorrectly identified. Confusion of identification is not uncommon since the functions of parts of speech are not firmly fixed in Latin or Latin-vernacular dictionaries at this time.\(^7^0\) It seems that adverbs were the part of speech considered to have more than one function.

Interjections are found as lemmata in all lexica, marked as *interiectio* and occasionally qualified, e.g. *interiectio dolentis*.

\(^7^0\) Also see Wooldridge 1977: 130 and n.109.
3.1.3.2.2. Phonetic and orthographic information

Phonetic and orthographic information is not common in Papias and is virtually nonexistent in Osbern. It appears occasionally in Brito, Hugutio and the Comprehensorium, and occurs very frequently in the Catholicon and DLV. By reason of the simple nature of their structure, the Aalma, MPST and GGL only rarely include details on phonetics and orthography.

Vowel length is indicated by absolute expressions such as media correpta and penultima producta, e.g. Accola .le - media correpta (DLV), or by the corresponding verbs, corripitur, producitur, e.g. Maioro [...] Et product io (Catholicon).

The verbs acuitur and accentuatur point out the location of the accent: UNA adverbium congregandi [...] et acuit in finem (DLV); Maginas [...] Et accentuatur in fine (Catholicon).

Orthographic information is usually introduced by a form of scribere, e.g. AMMAUM per duplex m debet scribi et proferri... (Brito); or may appear without a connector, Abscissus .sa .sum per geminum s... (Catholicon).

3.1.3.2.3. Internal references

Lemmata which are marked with instructions to look for details in another location are common in the Catholicon and DLV but are uncommon or missing entirely from the other lexica in our corpus. The references are, of course, the result of the fact that both the Catholicon and the DLV group members of one word family in an article. The markers are exponitur, dicitur, vide.

In the Catholicon there are two kinds of instructions: to refer to another lemma in Part V: Accesso sis. vide in Actio tis., or to refer to another part of the Summa: Acrologia est impropria dictio et supra dixi in quarta parte in capitulo De viciis annexis barbarismo et solecismo.

In DLV the lemma is usually followed by a definition in Latin or French or both, as well as the reference marker: ABITIO .tionis .i. recessio in Abeo, abis dicitur.

3.1.3.2.4. Polysemy

One of the major steps in the construction of the dictionary article is the assembly of all of the meanings for one entry. In the early inventories, based on the association of one form and one
meaning, each lemma is considered to have one meaning (Quemada 1972: 104). In Latin glossaries, multiple meanings for one form are usually expressed in multiple articles:

- **Acies** ordo vel prima pars exercitus
- **Acies** extensa militum inpugnatio
- **Acies** exercitus, hostis
- **Acies** ex. sive acumen
- **Acies** ex. Acumen gl., intuitus oculorum
- **Acies** instructus ordo militum ad bellandum

*Abavus Glossary, CGL IV*  
*Liber glossarum, CGL IV*

Papias’s *Elementarium* is a mixed text in almost every respect. At times, multiple meanings are indicated by multiple articles, while at other times two meanings are grouped in one article. Where multiple meanings are listed in one article, connectors are *vel* or *autem*.

- **acies** ferri summitas vel acumen oculorum, ab acuo
- **acies** exercitus dictus quod ferro sit armatus
- **acantis** graece dicitur qui latine carduelus: est autem avis quae spinis et carduis pascitur unde nominatur

Multiple meanings are noted in *Magnae derivationes*:

[...] *inde author* id est ligator. similiter est communis generis et sine c. Secondum primam significationem. Imperatores proprie debent dicit auctores ab augendo rempublicam. Secundum secundam significationem philosophi et inventores arciun et plato aristoteles et priscianus. et quelibet magne persone debent dicit auctores. Secundum vero terciam virgilius et lucanus et ceteri poetae debent dicit auctores qui ligaverunt carmina pedibus et metris (s.v. AUGE0).

In the *Catholicon*, diverse meanings of one lemma are grouped in one article. They are often introduced by *nam*, *item* or *sed est*.

- **Acies** aciei ge. dicitur ab acuo. is. et signat tria. Nam acies est ferri summitas. Item acies. oculorum acumen. Item acies exercitus. eo quod armatus eat ad bellum acutis armis. Versus. Est acies oculi ferri belli que caterva.

The various meanings of a form are usually grouped in one article in the *Comprehensorium*, where they are introduced by *item* or *vel*:

- **Baccatus** a um fructus baccarum habundans vel baccis gemmis adornatus.
- **Bactrus** mons est in Oriente. Item bactrus fluvius iuxta dictum montem. Item bactrus nomen cuiusdam Regis.

Early manuscripts of the Latin-French *Abavus* series tend to give only one meaning of polysemic lemmata, while later manuscripts show several meanings and combine them in one article, using the connector *vel*.

- **calculus** calliaus (Ab1)
- **calculus** petit pois vel pierre vel espee vel reson vel nombre vel cherbon vel sentence (Ab4 & Ab5)
In A1 of the Aalma series, we find multiple meanings in one article. The connectors are usually ou or a punctus:

- *calamus*. mi rosiau ou penne a escrire
- *calculus*. li caillo ou petite pere ronde et tres dure. nombres ou computacion.
- *escheras*. pere en la vecie ou escharboocle

Treatment of multiple meanings in DLV is, predictably, well-organized. They sometimes are grouped under one entry but, more often, are shown as sub-entries within an article. Various meanings are usually introduced vel or eciam dicitur:

- **AUXILLA** - lie - .i. olla pot de terre vel mensura parum maior quam iusta et dicitur ab augeo .ges
- **DACTILON** - grece, laten dicitur digitus, unde

3.1.3.2.5. Techniques of definition

We do not feel that an analysis of Latin techniques is relevant to this study, and therefore limit our examination to definitions in which French is the language of exit. Our corpus includes Abavus, Aalma, MPST and DLV.

The essentially traductive nature of bilingual dictionaries is clearly revealed by the simple definitional methods used in our corpus. These may be classified as follows:

1. One term.

   - [...] ab onancia, cie discordance (s.v. Absono) (MPST)
   - **OBTURO** - ras .ratum estouper... (DLV)
   - **Acerbitas** aegresce (Ab4 & Ab5)
   - **Tabere** desenir (Ab1)

2. Two or more terms, which are approximately equivalent.

   - **Accendo** dis, di, dere, ex ad et candeo, des et mutatur d in c alumer ou embraser (MP)
   - **BELLAX** - lacs bateilleur, combateur, guerrieur (DLV)
   - **Cedere** taillier vel batre (Ab3)
   - **FLUMEN** - minis - fleuwe, riviere .i. ipsa aqua decurrens, rivus, fluvius ... (DLV)

At times, multiple terms express nuances of meaning:

- **Acies** otage vel pointe de soc vel comet de l’uel (Ab4 & Ab5)
- **Amplare** - ris cecla, signum campana signe ront ou cloche ou cercle (MPST)
- **Argutia** - tie cautelle, malice, sagesse, eloquence .i. calliditas, astucia, versutia, disertitudo... (s.v. ARGUTUS)(DLV)

The Latin source may frequently be detected in these strings of equivalents.
3. **Syntagm or verbal locution.**

- *Abnepos* *tiers nepveu* (A1)
- *Caballus* .li a cabo *vielx chevaux* (MP)
- *Casualiter* *d'aventure* (Ab3)
- *Edentulus* .la .lum *sens dens* (A1)
- *Exterrefacio* .facis .feci *faire espaenter* (s.v. EXTERREO)(DLV)
- *Invideo* .des avoir *envie* (A1)

4. **Relative clause.**

- *Alatua* .ta .tum *qui ha eles* (A1)
- *Fugillator* .toris *qui fait feu au fuisil* (s.v. FUGILLUS) (DLV)
- *Historicus* .ca .cum *qui raconte histoires ou qui les escript* (A8)
- *Osten* .ostinis *qui chante comme celui qui prent les oisiaux au bray* (A8)

5. **Definition.**

- *Acholiti* [...] *acolites portans les cierges quant on dit l'euvangile* (MP)
- *Amentum* .ti la *corroie ou le lacet qui est ou milieu du javelot pour geter* (A1)
- *Anchille* .lis *ab an quod est certum et chele quod est brachium un escu tout ront que en jouant on tourne par dessus ses bras et le appelle on talenas* (MP)
- *Fescinnine* .ninaram [...] *chansons que femmes dit pour endormir petis enfans es bercheux* (DLV)

6. **Equivalent + explanation.**

In this sequence, the first term translates the lemma, and the second clarifies the nature of the object defined. Wagner (1967: 105) notes that this procedure is well suited to situations in which the equivalent is a calque, especially if there are two meanings:

- *epitaphium* .phi *epitaphes. c'est ce qui est escript ou pourtrait sur la tumbe* (A1)
- *perpendiculum* .li *perpendicles. un instrument a maçon de quoy il fait le mur droit ou ance de chauderon* (A1)

7. **Mixed methods.**

Association of different types of definition in an article is common throughout our corpus. We often find an equivalent combined with a generic term, in French or Latin:

- *Acer* .eris *herable. un arbe* (A1)
- *Acetosae oseille herba quedam* (A8)
- *Ambra* .e *ambre species quedam medicinalis* (A8)

Other examples of mixed definitions are:

- *AVEHO* .his .xi .ctum .i. *asportare loings porter, absenter, muchier...* (DLV)
- *Excellens* .tis *soumontans, mieux vaillans precellens, prefulgens, altus. eminens, sublimis et comparatur* (s.v. EXCELLEO)(DLV)
- *Peragro* .gras [...] .i. *sine mansione circa huc et illuc ire, circuire [...] .i. vaguier, aller cha et la* (s.v. PERAGRO)(DLV)

---

71 ‘Talenas’ is an illustration of the hidden nomenclature which is found in all early lexica. It does not occur as a lemma in MP.
Wagner (1967: 106) observes that words having an abstract or notional character are often calqued on the Latin lemma:

- **Amaritas** .tatis *amerture* (DLV)
- **Dignitas** .tatis *dignete* (A1)

Lemmata which are somewhat technical in nature may be glossed by a generic term followed by a specific feature which indicates its purpose or use (id. 1967: 101):

- **Acetabulum** .li [...] *vaissel a mettre vin aigre* (MP)
- **Bombis** *viers qui fait soie* (Ab1)
- **Amussis** *pions a macon* (Ab1)

In early manuscripts, it is common to find a generic term without a specific marker. Such instances frequently relate to natural history:

- **Agrimonia** *une herbe* (A1)
- **Camparis** *uns arbres* (Ab1)
- **Gurgulio** .i. *poisson* (Ab1)

or to proper nouns:

- **Cesarea** *nom de cite* (A1)
- **Chain** *propre nom de homme* (A1)

In speaking of seventeenth-century dictionaries, Quemada (1972: 119) notes that the enrichment of previous definitions through addition of supplementary markers is standard practice. We find examples of the same progress in our corpus:

- **Falco** *faucon* (Ab4 and Ab5)
- **Falco** .conis *faucon. un oisel* (A1)
- **Falco** .conis *faucon, oisel de proie* (DLV)

### 3.1.3.2.6. Location of Information

Very slowly, and by no means systematically, certain types of information came to occupy particular locations within articles. Merrilees (1994a: 50f.) identifies the positions commonly used in medieval lexica for both definitional and metalinguistic material. Basic positions are: lemma, post-lemmatic, definition, post-definitional, and marginal (i.e. at the right-hand edge of the text column). There are, of course, a number of possible variations, depending on the complexity of the article and on whether the dictionary is monolingual or bilingual.

There does not appear to be a privileged position for information in Papias. In Hugutio grammatical information usually follows the definition. Etymological and grammatical information is usually found post-lemmatically in Osbern, the *Catholicum* and MPST. In *Aalma*
the scarce etymological information usually follows the definition. Grammatical details occasionally follow the definition but are usually found in abbreviated form at the right-hand column margin. The abbreviations are those described on p. 99 *supra*. Etymological information is usually found post-lemmatically in *DLV*, and grammatical information may occur in post-lemmatic, post-definitiona1 and marginal positions. *GGL* and *DLV* use the same grammatical sign system as *Aalma*.

Definitions usually directly follow the lemma or sub-lemma in Hugutio, while in the *Catholicon* they commonly follow post-lemmatic grammatical information. Although the lemma at the head of an article is commonly followed in *DLV* by etymological information, the sub-lemmata are often directly followed by their definitions.

### 3.2. Rôle and Status of French

The basic purposes of Latin-vernacular lexica were to assist in translation and teaching the meaning of Latin words to students and to clerics whose knowledge of Latin was weak. It is the primacy of Latin which informs every aspect of bilingual dictionary production. It is: a) the source of the nomenclature around which the dictionary is structured, b) the principal language for grammatical and other metalinguistic information, c) one of the languages of definition, and d) the foundation of most French forms, whether in definitions or metalanguage.

#### 3.2.1. Use of French in definitions

The *Abavus* and the *Aalma* are essentially bilingual collections, where Latin is the entry language and French the exit language. Even so, there are a number of articles in which the glosses are entirely in Latin. The quantity of such cases varies from one manuscript to another. *A8* and *A14*, for example, contain more Latin glosses than does *A1*. In letter-section 'F' of *A1* we find twenty-three articles with only a Latin gloss; in the same section of *A8* we find thirty-nine such articles. Some of this difference is accounted for by new articles which do not appear in *A1*; others are articles which are glossed in Latin in *A8*, but are glossed in French in *A1*.

It is not uncommon to find definitions containing both languages, often expressing different meanings of the lemma:
At times, a definition begun in one language is completed in the other:

- **Gala le.** *instrument a curer et appareillier cuir vel dicitur fructus quercus glan* (A8)
- **thiara.** *are mitre vel pileum sacerdotale. chapiau de feutre* (A1)

MP contains more Latin text than *Aalma*, but it is basically a bilingual dictionary. The quantity of Latin is chiefly accounted for by the fact that the author included a substantial amount of grammatical and other information from his source text. In addition, fifty-five of the 232 entries edited in Nobel 1986 are glossed entirely in Latin. (More research is needed to be conclusive, but from a brief survey it appears that the entries lacking a French gloss are drawn mainly from Papias.) However, in most articles the compiler substituted French glosses for the Latin terms in his sources. An important contribution of MPST is that the manuscripts are proving to be sources of new attestations of form and new attestations of meaning (Nobel 1986: 165f.)

The influence of Latin is inescapable in *GGL*. We have already remarked (see p. 60 *supra*) that Latin affects the ordering of the French entries. Its influence is even more noticeable in the number of syntagms and paraphrases, for which no single French equivalent is given: *Mouche qui fait le miel* – apes, apis; *Areur de terres* – arator oris.

The *DLV* is entirely different from the other lexica containing French forms. Although we have called it ‘bilingual’, the *DLV* should rather be called a Latin-Latin/French dictionary (Merri- lees/Edwards 1989: 39). Latin lemmata are supported by a principally Latin metalanguage and glosed mainly by Latin definitions. French equivalents or definitions may or may not be included in individual entries, and French is not often used in the metalanguage (see 3.2.2.). However, the character and originality of French in *DLV* are far more important than its quantity. Rather than annex French forms *mot-à-mot* to Latin lemmata, Le Ver endeavours to translate the underlying concepts into the vernacular. Moreover, the quantity of neologisms and first attestations in the *DLV* gives ample evidence of Le Ver’s linguistic awareness (*id.* 1989: 47f.; Merrilees 1994a: xxvi f.).
The principal importance of the French forms in bilingual lexica lies not in their quantity but in their variety, as they record Middle French in the fourteenth and fifteenth century. To use just one example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French Form</th>
<th>Latin Form</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>murrare</td>
<td>murmurer</td>
<td>Ab3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murmureare</td>
<td>murmurer</td>
<td>Ab4 &amp; Ab5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murmuriun</td>
<td>murmurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murmuras.rav.rare</td>
<td>murmuremens</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murmura.ris</td>
<td>noise</td>
<td>A8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>munuro.as</td>
<td>murmurer</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murmura.ris</td>
<td>murmusement, noaise</td>
<td>A15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>munuro as.</td>
<td>noaiser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murmura.ris</td>
<td>murmure</td>
<td>MPST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>munuro.ras.ratum</td>
<td>murmurer</td>
<td>DLV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For *murrare*, *murmuris* we find *murmuremens*, *murmurement*, *noise*, *noaiser*, and for *murrare* we find *murmurer* and *noaiser*.

### 3.2.2. Use of French in metalanguage

The *Abavus* manuscripts contain little metalanguage, and Latin is the language for that small amount: *vel, id est, scilicet, verbum impersonale*, etc.

There is a greater quantity of metalanguage in the *Aalma* series, although the extent varies among the manuscripts. Latin, of course, is its primary language but there are some examples of the use of French. In MPST the metalanguage is entirely in Latin, although the quantity is greater in MP than in ST. The most extensive metalanguage is found in *DLV*, with a small but important percentage of it in French.

The definitional connectors *vel* and *aut* found in *Abavus*, are generally replaced by *ou* in the later collections. As a result, *ou* fills two functions: it is part of the language of definition, e.g. *fasceuma. me. cloture de bois. palis environ chastiaus ou citez* (A1), or it is part of the metalanguage, e.g. *faselus. li. petite nef ou une yle ou une maniere de lun* (A1). Other French definitional connectors are *signifie, aussi* and *vaulet autant a dire*: 
The definitions of parts of speech are almost entirely in Latin in our corpus. The exceptions are prepositions, which are often described in French in Aalma and DLV:

- de. une preposition qui sert a l'ablatiz (A1)
- SECUS. preposition servans a l'accusatis ... (DLV)

and conjunctions, which are occasionally identified as such in French in Aalma:

- aut. ou. une conjonction (A1)

The most striking fact is that all of the French grammatical and similar information pertains entirely to Latin:

- facio. is faire et est neutres transitis et fait en son imparatis fac (A1)
- Farao vele Pharaon. nonis propre non d'un roy d'Egypte. et est appellatis (A1)
- hinnitus. tus. tui. henissement. et doivent estre escript hinnio et hinnitus par deux n (A1)

3.3. Conclusion

The linguistic and lexicographical heritage from Greek Antiquity consisted (apart from the conviction that Greek was a superior language) of the technique of glossing texts and the principles of grammar, of etymological theory and of alphabetical order. The study of grammar and the origin of words became part of the Latin tradition, while first-letter alphabetical arrangement is found in grammatical and lexicographical works from Varro to Isidore. Glossing of texts, long considered to be a part of literary activity, passed into Roman Antiquity and the glossing of literary, Biblical and Patristic writings continued throughout the Middle Ages. Isidore of Seville, Hrabanus Maurus, Bede and other early medieval scholars preserved the Latin grammatical and lexicographical inheritance in their writings. It was read, rearranged and expanded by the grammarians of the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries: Papias, Peter Helias, John of Garland, Alexander of Villedieu, Eberhard of Bethune, Hugutio of Pisa and John Balbi of Genoa, among others. They were the most important scholars of their day and in ensuing centuries their works were copied, abridged and translated, but little original material was added to their productions.
The late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century lexicographer, who was no longer necessarily a cleric, stood at a turning-point in European technological and intellectual history. His legacy from the Middle Ages included presentation techniques which would adapt well to printing, but also included a nomenclature dating from the thirteenth century and a microstructure imbued with scholasticism, neither of which was in accord with humanist thought. The creator of a bilingual dictionary inherited as well a framework based entirely on Latin, which would hamper efforts to respond to growing nationalism through creation of dictionaries focused on vernacular languages. These vestiges of medieval Latin lexicography influenced European dictionary-making for at least a century.

---

72 Rouse/Rouse (1982: 209) observe: "The utility of the devices of layout worked out in the twelfth century is evident: we still use virtually all of them, save that we have moved the marginalia to the foot of the page."
B. EARLY PRINTED LATIN-FRENCH AND FRENCH-LATIN DICTIONARIES

"[T]he introduction of the press came at just the proper moment, when a material sufficiently cheap (paper) had proved its suitability for the production of books (whether manuscript or otherwise) and a sufficient literate population was at hand. Printing made possible a cheap product to meet a heavy demand." (Bühler 1960: 124, n.8). Although opinions differ as to the extent of literacy in Europe in the fifteenth century, it is certain that a ready market existed for copies of well-established works.

In the first half-century of printing, virtually every ancient and medieval grammar and lexicon (with the exception of Hugutio’s Magnae derivationes) appeared in print at least once (Collison 1982: 55f.). Gutenberg first printed the Ars minor of Donatus in 1452, and subsequently printed twenty-three further editions of it. He also printed the first dictionary, the Catholicon of John Balbi, in 1460. By 1500 the Catholicon had been reprinted twenty-four times. Other popular early linguistic texts include Alexander of Villedieu’s Doctrinale (at least ten editions by the end of the century), Pliny’s Historia naturalis (many editions between 1469 and 1498), Varro’s De lingua latina (printed at least seven times between 1471 and 1500) and Seutonius’s De grammaticis et rhetoribus (first printed in Padua in 1473). The De proprietate sermonum of Nonius Marcellus was printed at least nine times between 1471 and 1500. In some editions it is combined with Festus’s epitome of De verborum significatu and Varro’s De lingua latina. As we have noted earlier (see p. 32 supra), the first book printed in Spain (1475) was the Comprehensorium, a Latin dictionary compiled in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century.

Greek lexica were equally popular with early printers. The Suda (late tenth–early eleventh century) was first printed in Milan in 1498, and the twelfth-century Etymologicon magnum, whose contents derive chiefly from Photius, was printed in Venice in 1499. The second-century Onomasticon of Julius Pollux was printed in Venice in 1502.

More contemporary Latin works include the *Orthographia* of Gasparino of Barzizza (1370–1431), printed in Paris in 1470 or 1471, and the *Commentarium grammaticorum libri duo* of Joannes Tortellino and *De elegantia latinae linguae* written by the Italian humanist Laurentius Valla (c.1407–1457), both first printed in Italy in 1471. The *Elucidarius carminum et historiarum, vel, Vocabularius*, a dictionary of proper nouns and their allusions compiled by the classical scholar Hermann Torrentius (d.1520), was printed in 1498. This text was revised by Robert Estienne and published in 1530 (id. 1982: 57).

Scholars also created new comprehensive Latin dictionaries for the new medium, although most of them drew material from earlier lexica. Included among the new Latin works are the *Vocabularius breviloquus* compiled by the German humanist and reformer Johannes Reuchlin and first printed in Switzerland in 1475; the *Vocabularius* of Nestor Dionysius, first printed in Milan in 1483; and the *Dictionarium* compiled by Ambrogio Calepino and first printed in Reggio nell’Emilia in 1502.

Printed editions of bilingual lexica were also much in demand. Not surprisingly, many of them were copied, entirely or in part, from manuscript glossaries and dictionaries. The earliest printed Latin-vernacular dictionary was the *Vocabularius Ex quo*, a Latin-German dictionary based on the fourteenth-century Latin-German *Vocabularius brevilogus*. It was first printed by Heinrich Bechtelse in Eltville in 1467. The *Gemma gemmarum*, another Latin-German dictionary based on earlier manuscripts, was printed before the end of the century. The Spanish grammarian and humanist Antonio de Nebrija wrote an original Latin-Spanish dictionary, the *Lexicon o diccionario latino-español* (see 6.0.), which was printed in 1492. In 1495, Nebrija reversed his dictionary, making Spanish the entry language and Latin the exit. As far as we know, this is the first printed vernacular-Latin dictionary. In England, Wynkyn de Worde printed an alphabetical Latin-English dictionary, *Ortus vocabulorum*, founded on the *Medulla grammatica* and the *Catholicon*, in 1500. John Stanbridge printed two thematic Latin-English glossaries, *Vocabula* in 1496, and *Vulgaria* in 1508.

In France, three series of bilingual dictionaries dominated the field until the 1530s, when Robert Estienne printed his first lexicographical works. Two of these were based on
earlier manuscripts: the *Catholicon abbreviatum*, whose source is the *Aalma* series of glossaries (see 2.5.3.), was first printed in Paris c.1482; and the *Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus*, which is closely related to the *Glossarium gallico-latinum* (see 2.5.5.) and the *Dictionarius* of Firmin Le Ver (see 2.5.6.), was printed in Rouen c.1490. The third Latin-French dictionary in this group is the *Vocabularius Nebrissensis*, based on the Latin-Catalan adaptation of the Latin-Spanish *Lexicon* written by Antonio de Nebrija. It was first printed in Lyons in 1511.

B.S. Merrilees and W. Edwards have been examining and analyzing *the Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus* (*VFC*) for some time, and have presented partial results of their findings in several articles, especially Merrilees/Edwards 1989 and 1995. They are currently preparing an edition of the *VFC* for publication in the *Nouveau Recueil des Lexiques latin-français du Moyen Age*. It will, of course, include a detailed description of the dictionary’s sources, organization and structure.

M. Lindemann and B. Lépinette have studied the *Vocabularius Nebrissensis/Epithoma vocabulorum* (*VN/EV*) closely, and their findings published so far (Lindemann 1985, and 1994: 250f.; Lépinette 1992) shed valuable light on this little-known dictionary.

The *Catholicon abbreviatum* (*CA*), on the other hand, has not been the object of detailed analysis, although Lindemann’s work (1985: 58f., and 1994: 222f.) is capital in pointing the way to further study. Due to the lack of previous study, we examine in detail the *CA*’s printing history and the contribution of the editions. Our discussion of the *VFC* and the *VN/EV* is more general, because of the excellent previous and current work on them.
4.0. CATHOLICON ABBREVIATUM

The Catholicon abbreviatum, also called Catholicum abbreviatum, Catholicum parvum, Catholic minus, Vocabularius brevidicus, and Vocabularius breviloquus, was the first printed Latin-French dictionary. Although rudimentary in terms of its consultability (see 8.1.), the CA obviously filled a niche in the market for pedagogical texts, with a printing history covering some forty years and twenty-eight editions. (For details, see Bibliography C: Editions and Existing Copies of the Catholicum abbreviatum.)

GKW (VI, 258) notes that editions of the CA printed at Rouen and Paris after 1492 differ from the rest of the editions through addition of a prologue, addition of an article concerning the spelling of the word Christus, and rearrangement of articles in the letter 'Z'. GKW also remarks that the colophon to some of these later editions, claiming the lexica of Papias, Hugutio and other authors as sources, is modelled on that of another, larger work, the Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus. Lindemann (1994: 223) speaks of twenty-four known editions of the CA, and divides them into several categories according to title and colophon.

Based on external and internal evidence, we have divided the editions of the CA into two series: Series 1 comprises those printed in Paris, Geneva and Lyons between c.1482 and c.1508, and Series 2 includes those printed in Rouen and Paris from 1492 on.

To date we have identified twenty-eight editions by twenty-one printers. Even allowing only a modest production of each edition, there must have been at one time several thousand copies in circulation, yet so far we have found nineteenth- and twentieth-century references to only thirty-two copies. Three of the copies referred to are now missing, and there are only

74 We refer to 'editions' for the sake of convenience. We must stress, however, that editions in the modern sense of the word did not yet exist. Each page of every copy was pulled off the press separately, and it is not uncommon to find changes from one copy to another of the same 'edition'.
75 Thibaudeau (1921: 88) estimates an average printing of 300 copies.
76 There are some bibliographical errors.
1.OBL, Pre-1920 Catalogue 99. Reu to Rind.: 123, includes the following reference:
REUCHLIN (Johann)
Vocabularius breviloquis <sic> ... Catholicon... vulgo dictus [by J. Reuchlin. Lat.-Fr.]
Par., 1510, 4°
Douce v.182
Douce v.182 is a copy of Nicolas de la Barre's edition of the CA, which he called Vocabularius breviloquus.
2.Arnoult (1979: 95) includes the following references under CATHOLICON ABBREVIATUM:
422. Catholicon abbreviatum. Lyon, Matthias Huss. 31. ill 1489/1490. 4°
... Troyes BM 3229
fragments of two pages of a fourth. There are, therefore, only twenty-eight complete (or nearly complete – some copies are imperfect, lacking certain quires) remaining copies of the CA: twenty-seven in Europe and one in North America.

The CA is a small dictionary, with just over 13,000 entries, usually printed in-quarto. Thus, it was easily portable, and the scanty number of surviving copies points out its popularity; many copies were doubtless ‘used to death’. The dictionary had a didactic purpose, as had its manuscript predecessor, the Aalma glossary (see p. 51 supra). The CA’s objective is outlined in the prologue to the texts in Series 2 (see p. 132 infra).

Our research in 4.1. and 4.2. is based on examination, either directly or on microfilm, of the title page, preliminary pages, colophon and printer’s plaque (where these elements exist) of twenty-seven of the remaining copies of the CA.

4.1. Sources of the Catholicon abbreviatum

4.1.1. Vocabularius brevidicus: ms. Metz, BM n° 510 (A8)

In his edition of A1, Roques (1938: xx) remarks that an abridged Aalma manuscript was printed in Paris in 1485 and reprinted in Geneva in 1487, and that the printed version contains features which he has found only in the manuscript held at the Bibliothèque municipale of Metz as n° 510 (A8).

Roques’ conclusion that A8 is the source for the CA is absolutely correct, although apparently he had not seen any edition earlier than 1485. The physical correspondence in page layout between A8 and Caillaut’s first edition is explored in 4.2.1.1.

The compiler of A8 is clearly identified in the colophon as Antoine Caillaut:

\[
\text{Vocabularius brevidicus exponens dictiones rerum multitarum. Exaratus feliciter parasius <sic> in vico sancti iacobi per anthnium <sic> cayllaut}
\]

The shelf number for this document is n° 329.

424. Catholicum parvum. Rouen, Martin Morin pour Jean Alexandre à Angers, 17 Kal. aug. [16 VIII] 1500. 4°. .... Troyes BM 244.

Troyes, BM n° 244 is not a copy of the CA. It is a copy of Martin Morin’s 1500 edition of Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus. Further, it is in-folio, not in-quarto.
Caillaut probably wrote A8 c. 1482, at the beginning of his career as a printer, although the colophon does not give any indication of the date or of his occupation. We believe that he copied his manuscript from an earlier (as yet unidentified) Aalma manuscript. Our conclusion is supported by its similarity to A1, the oldest and most extensive manuscript in the series. In a comparison of the two manuscripts, we find that A1 contains 13,680 Latin lemmata, and A8 contains 13,070 lemmata. For example, of 844 Latin headwords under the letter ‘A’ in A8, only fifty-four do not occur in A1, and of 828 headwords under the letter ‘A’ in A1, only thirty-eight do not occur in A8. French definitions (leaving aside orthographical variants) are very close, and often identical. Forty of the fifty-four entries under the letter ‘A’ which do not occur in A1 include French definitions. This suggests that Caillaut’s bilingual source was more extensive than A1. Also, he may have added material from his own lexical stock. A Latin dictionary was possibly the source for the remaining fourteen entries, which are glossed only by Latin definitions.

A8 is rather carelessly compiled. The script is untidy, there are many spelling errors in both Latin and French, and large sections are out of alphabetical order (see example on p. 188f. infra). There are also layout errors such as two entries on one line, copying errors such as two articles combined in one, and a number of faulty readings. Some mistakes were corrected in time by various printers, beginning with Caillaut himself; other persisted throughout the life of the dictionary. In all editions an absurd reading (pointed out by Merrilees 1990: 290) is that one of the definitions for Dactilus is the French word miel. It seems certain that this is a misreading of anel. The correct spelling appears in several other Aalma manuscripts, but the identical error occurs only in A8:

\[
\text{Dactilus li date fructus palme vel pes metrificandi ou miel} \quad m
\]

4.1.2. Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus

An important contributor to the nomenclature of the CA is the Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus (VFC), a large Latin-French dictionary first printed in Rouen c.1490 by Guillaume Le Talleur (see 5.0.). Le Talleur’s atelier was taken over late in 1491 or early in 1492 by his
former associate, Martin Morin, and in June 1492 Morin published a new edition of the CA (see 4.2.11.).

Morin added a substantial quantity of new material to Caillaut’s first edition to produce a revised dictionary which became the genesis for Series 2. He added or substituted new French terms in many existing articles, and he added a quantity of new articles. Through comparison with VFC it is clear that this text is the source of many of the additions to the CA.

Additions and substitutions occur throughout the text:

Exhibit 30: Comparison of lemmata in Catholicum abbreviatum c.1482, Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus and Catholicon abbreviatum 1492

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CA c.1482</th>
<th>VFC c.1490</th>
<th>CA 1492</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Changes in French forms.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluta te. alene ou cordovan</td>
<td>Aluta .te cordoven, cuir ...</td>
<td>Aluta/te. cordoven, cuir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amentum .ti. la courioie ou le lacet qui est au milieu du javelot ou du glaive</td>
<td>Amentum .ti lachet qui est loyé au milieu du dart pour mieulx darder ...</td>
<td>Amentum/ti. la courioie ou lacet qui est au milieu du dart ou du glaive pour mieulx darder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apto tas avi atum. appareiller ou affetier, enformer ou essayer</td>
<td>Apto .as appareiller, ordener, faire convenable aptum facere ...</td>
<td>Apto/as/avi/atum. appareiller/ordener/faire convenable. aptum facere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. New articles.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amatorius .a .um d’amour</td>
<td>Amatorius/a/um. d'amour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anguillaris et hoc .re d’anguille ut: cibus anguillaris</td>
<td>Anguillaris et hoc re. d’anguille. ut cibus anguillaris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anguillarium .rii lieu ou les anguilles sont</td>
<td>Aguillarium &lt;sic&gt;/illarii. le lieu ou les anguilles sont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

but it is in the letter ‘Z’ that the greatest concentration of changes occurs. Morin lifted all of the articles beginning with ‘Z’ from the VFC and substituted them, with only minor changes, for the articles beginning with ‘Z’ in Series 1. A comparison of lemmata in the letter ‘Z’ in the three texts is attached as Appendix 4.

4.2. **Filiation of the Editions**

The filiation of the editions of the CA is complex, especially since printers freely borrowed material without acknowledgment. In addition, the CA underwent a ‘revival’, with an infusion of new material, part way through its history. Finally, it is not possible to judge accurately the place occupied in the descent of the CA by the editions which are now missing.
Exhibit 31 illustrates the complicated path as we believe it to be at the present time. Series 1 begins in Paris c.1482, then goes on to Geneva, and ends in Lyons c.1508. Series 2 begins in Rouen in 1492 and flows in two streams – one through Rouen ending c.1519, and the other through Paris, ending in the mid-1520s. Title pages from fourteen editions of the CA are attached as Appendix 5; Section C of the Bibliography lists the locations of existing copies; and a summary of the sigla we have attached to the editions is shown here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series 1</th>
<th>Series 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 = Caillaut c.1482</td>
<td>MM = Morin 1492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 = Caillaut c.1482-84</td>
<td>UP = Unknown, Paris c.1492-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 = Caillaut c.1482-84</td>
<td>M1 = Morand 1497/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V = Vérard 1485/86</td>
<td>M2 = Morand c.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1 = Garbin c.1485</td>
<td>LN = Le Noir 1497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2 = Garbin c.1487</td>
<td>T1 = Tréperel 1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU = Huss 1489/90</td>
<td>T2 = Tréperel c.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL1 = Unknown, Lyons c.1490</td>
<td>B = de la Barre 1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S = Schultis c.1495</td>
<td>HE = Hérouf c.1520-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA = Havard 1499/1500</td>
<td>LB = Le Bourgeois 1497/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV = de Vingle c.1500</td>
<td>HO = Hostingue c.1511-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL2 = Unknown, Lyons c.1508</td>
<td>GA = Gaultier 1519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An interesting aspect of the diagram in Exhibit 31 is that it also reflects the spread of printing in the three French cities. Paris was the first to receive the new technology – in 1470, and Lyons was the second – shortly after that date, while Rouen got its first printer in 1487.
Exhibit 31: *Catholicicon abbreviatum*: Filiation of the Editions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paris</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>Lyons</th>
<th>Rouen</th>
<th>Paris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Metz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caillaute c. 1482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caillaute c. 1483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caillaute c. 1484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verard 1485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbin c. 1485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbin 1487</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huss c. 1489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown c. 1490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schultis 1495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morant 1492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown 1492-96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Bourgeois 1497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morand 1497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Noir 1497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morand c. 1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morand c. 1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de la Barre 1510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostinquel 1511-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautier 1519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Héroux 1527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing: Unknown, c. 1487
Missing: Lyons, printer of *Ars Memoriam*, c. 1500
Missing: Rouen, c. 1500
Missing: Paris, Jehan Lambert, 1506
4.2.1. Antoine Caillaut, Paris

The bookseller-printer Antoine Caillaut was established in the rue St-Jacques c.1482, and operated a printing business in Paris until at least 1505. Caillaut was the creator of the CA. He wrote the source document and subsequently printed three editions of the dictionary. Neither the manuscript nor any of the printed texts bears a date. (Apparently the omission of a date was not uncommon with Caillaut. BMC: VIII, 40 observes that "only about one in five of his known productions is dated").

4.2.1.1. Caillaut c.1482 (C1)

Caillaut named his dictionary Catholicum abbreviatum, as shown on the title page of the only existing copy of his first edition (see p. 218 infra). This edition is dated c.1492 by GKW (VI: 259, n° 6233), but we believe this dating to be incorrect. We conclude, from careful scrutiny of Caillaut’s manuscript and all of his editions, that this edition was the earliest of the three, and we have provisionally assigned it a date of c.1482.

The text duplicates virtually every error and inconsistency in the manuscript. Plates 1 and 2 on p. 121 and 122 infra reproduce, respectively, folio 2r of A8 and folio a.ii.r of C1. Identical errors occur on line 7 of both pages: two articles occupy one line, and the word ael is omitted from one of the definitions in both manuscript and print.

Abavus avi. tiers <ael> m. Abbas abbe m

Plate 3 on p. 123 infra compares the colophon in the manuscript (upper half of the page) with that in the printed edition. They are clearly identical, even to the errors in orthography.
Plate 1: Aalma, ms. Metz, BM n° 510, folio 2r
Plate 2: Catholicum abbreviatum, Antoine Caillaut, Paris, c.1482, folio a.ii.r
Vocabularius brunnicus exponens dictiones rerum multarum. Eratatur feliciter parafrasus in dioceesi Jacobi praemium capit"
Some of the mistakes are corrected in the second edition, and still others in the third. While we can easily imagine that Caillaut might have corrected obvious faults in the manuscript before first setting it in print, we feel it is illogical to suppose that, after having printed two editions with many corrections, he printed a third as late as 1492 with all of the original errors intact.

4.2.1.2. Caillaut c.1482–1484 (C2)

The title page is missing from the only known copy of Caillaut’s second edition, which must have followed the first printing fairly closely. The exact date is not known but is generally accepted to be c.1482–1484.

The colophon, which is very brief and does not mention Caillaut, now notes the inclusion of French translations:

Vocabularius brevidicus gallice exponens dictiones rerum multarum finit feliciter.

C2 corrects many of the errors in the first edition. Plate 4 on p. 125 infra, for example, reproduces folio a.ii.r of the second edition and illustrates the fact that the errors previously noted on line 7 have now been corrected. Some French definitions are changed in C2 and a few new articles are added.

4.2.1.3. Caillaut c.1482–1484 (C3)

A short time later, Caillaut printed his third and last edition of the CA. The only existing copy also lacks a title page. The colophon again contains changes, including mention of Caillaut once more:

Vocabularius brevidicus gallice exponens dictiones rerum multarum: finit feliciter. Exaratum in alma universitate Parisiensi per Antonium Caillaut.
Plate 4: Catholicon abbreviatum, Antoine Caillaut, Paris c.1482-1484, folio a4.r
There are a number of orthographical variants in C3 but few changes in the macrostructure.

Printing of the CA passed into the hands of another Parisian printer, before moving to Geneva and Lyons.

4.2.2. Antoine Vérard, Paris

Antoine Vérard, who established his business c.1485 (Clair 1976: 67; Renouard 1965: 424), was one of the most prominent Parisian booksellers of the late fifteenth century. A number of printers produced books for him, including Jean du Pré (Clair 1976: 64), who had been in business in Paris since 1481 (Renouard 1965: 130).

4.2.2.1. Jean du Pré pour Antoine Vérard 1485/86 (V)

The printer of this new edition of the CA is not named, but is accepted to be du Pré, who "worked for many of the leading booksellers and publishers, among them Vérard, Tréperel, Caillaut, and Denis Meslier" (Clair 1976: 65). The title page is lacking from the only remaining copy and it is not possible to know whether Caillaut’s title was changed.

V is the first dated printing of the CA, and also the first with a French colophon:

Ce present vocabulaire fut acheve le .iii. jour de fevrier Mil quatrecent quatrevingt et cinq pour anthoine verard libraire demourant a l’ymaige saint jehan l’evangeliste. sur le pont nostre dame. ou au palais devant la chapelle ou l’en chante la messe de messeigneurs les presidens.

This printing is a copy of C3 but, in addition to significant layout changes (see 8.1.2.2.1.), many definitions are shortened and others are changed (see 4.3.2.). There are also a substantial number of typographical errors.

Vérard’s edition, which was the last CA of Series 1 printed in Paris, was soon copied in Geneva.

4.2.3. Loys Garbin, Geneva

The most important of the early Genevan printers was Aloys (or Louis) Cruse, otherwise known as Louis Guerbin (Garbin), said to have been the son of a doctor named Guerbin de la Cruse (Clair 1976: 82). He was engaged in printing in Geneva from c.1479 until 1513 (BMC: VIII, 364). Garbin printed two editions of the CA; the only ones printed outside of France.
4.2.3.1. Garbin c.1485 (G1)

Only one copy now exists of Garbin’s first edition of the CA, and both title page and colophon are missing from it. It is dated c.1485 by GKW (VI, n° 6229).

Garbin copied Vérard’s edition of the CA very closely, including all of the changes in both macro- and micro-structure, and many of the typographical errors as well.

4.2.3.2. Garbin 1487 (G2)

Garbin’s second edition, dated June 15, 1487, is preserved in two copies. Although the title page is lacking from both, each copy is catalogued as Catholicum parvum. The colophon still exists in both:

\[
\text{Ce present vocabulaire fut acheve le .xv. jour de Juin Mil quatre cens quatrevingtz et sept pour maistre Loys garbin Imprimeur demourant a geneve.}
\]

There are few changes in G2 apart from variations in orthography and correction of some of the typographical errors in V. However, other typographical errors inevitably occurred.

Garbin did not reprint the CA but his second edition moved to Lyons where its reproduction followed two different paths.

4.2.4. Matthias Huss, Lyons

Clair (1976: 62) writes, “Lyons proved to be a good market for printed books and before the end of the fifteenth century more than 160 printers had worked there, among whom Germans were predominant to such an extent that printers as a class became known in that city as ‘les allemands’.” This group included Matthias Huss (Husz), who established himself at Lyons c.1482 (Vingrinier 1894: 67).

4.2.4.1. Huss 1489/90 (HU)

Two copies of Huss’s edition survive. The title page and colophon are intact in both copies, and the title is Catholicon parvum (see p. 219 infra). The colophon, again in French, is very similar to that in V and in G1:

\[
\text{Ce present vocabulaire fut acheve le dernier jour de mars Lan .m ccccixxxix. par maistre mathis huss citoyen de Lion.}
\]
Huss was apparently an innovator. His edition is the only one of the CA in which text of second and succeeding lines of an article is indented from the left margin (see 8.1.2.2.3.), and it is the only edition of Series 1 to have a printer’s plaque on the last page.

Huss copied G2 closely, but he changed some of the French definitions (see 4.3.4.). Orthographical variants are common.

The Bibliothèque nationale in Paris holds a copy of the CA which it attributes to Huss. We do not believe it is his work, and discuss it in 4.2.9.

4.2.5. Unknown [printer of Guido, Casus Longi], Lyons

Printing of the CA continued at Lyons in a line deriving from an unknown printer, identified by GKW77 as the printer of Casus Longi.

4.2.5.1. Unknown c.1490 (UL1)

At about the same time that Huss printed his edition of the CA, an unknown printer combined Caillaut’s first edition (C1) with material from Garbin’s second edition (G2), to produce an excellent dictionary. He restored some of the definitions eliminated in V, combined some definitions from C1 and G2, and selected the remainder from one or the other. He also corrected a number of typographical errors although, inevitably, he committed others.

The title page is still intact in the only surviving copy of this edition. It reads: Catholicum parvum (see p. 220 infra), and it is this title which is used at Lyons until the end of Series 1. The last page is also intact but it does not include a colophon. The text simply ends at the bottom of the last column: Laus deo, a motto which persists in several later editions.

4.2.6. Engelhard Schultis, Lyons

The British Library has an undated edition of the CA which it attributes (BMC: VIII, 309) to Engelhard Schultis. Schultis was another German printer, who began printing at Lyons c.1491 (Vingtinier 1894: 29).

---

77 In private correspondence with the Newberry Library, Chicago, July 27, 1937.
4.2.6.1. **Schultis c.1495 (S)**

The title page of Schultis's edition bears the words *Catholicum parvum* (see p. 221 infra), and the text closes *Laus deo* at the bottom of the last column. The edition is a close copy of *UL1*, and variants are, for the most part, orthographical changes or typographical errors.

This edition of the CA was the predecessor of three different editions before printing of Series 1 came to an end.

4.2.7. **Martin Havard, Lyons**

It appears that Havard (Havart) began printing at Lyons near the end of the fifteenth century, probably c. 1499 (*id.* 1894: 136). If this is the case, the CA must have been one of his earliest productions.

4.2.7.1 **Havard 1499/1500 (HA)**

The only adornment on a title page in Series 1 is found in HA: an elaborate woodcut initial 'C' (see p. 222 infra). *Catholicum parvum* is the title of Havard's edition, just as it is in *UL1* and *S*. Unlike them, however, the colophon includes the printer's name and a date:

```
Impressum lugduni per Martinum havard. Anno domini.
M.xcix. die vero xiii. mensis martum.
```

HA is a very corrupt edition. It includes most of the typographical errors from *S*, as well as a substantial quantity of new ones. A number of articles are omitted entirely, and some French glosses are left out of other articles.

4.2.8. **Jean de Vingle, Lyons**

Jean de Vingle, Picard by birth, printed at Lyons from 1494 to 1511 (*id.* 1894: 117). The only existing copy of his CA is attributed to de Vingle and dated c.1500 by Péligry (1982: 95).

4.2.8.1. **de Vingle c.1500 (DV)**

The surviving copy of this edition lacks a title page and is catalogued as *Catholicon abbreviatum*. There is not any indication of the printer or the date, and the text ends:

```
FINIS. Laus deo.
```

This edition appears to descend directly from *S*, and corresponds closely to it.
4.2.9. Unknown, Lyons

A copy of the CA held by the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris under the shelf number Rés.8°Z Don 594(360), is attributed to Matthias Huss and dated c.1508. We have not inspected this text and rely in our remarks on notes taken by Prof. B.S. Merrilees during his recent examination of it.

4.2.9.1. Unknown c.1508 (UL2)

The title of this edition is Catholicum parvum and it is attributed to Matthias Huss. However, we assign it the siglum UL2.

As we remarked earlier (see 4.2.4.1.) Huss’s edition of 1489 differed from other editions of the CA in its typography and in some of its French forms. These innovations are absent from the edition c.1508. Firstly, all of the text is set flush to the left margin, i.e. there is no indentation. Secondly, there are a number of articles in which the definitions do not correspond to those in HU. More importantly, they correspond to definitions in S. Thirdly, the title of Huss’s edition is Catholicon parvum.

It is possible that Huss may have printed another edition of the CA without indenting the text, and also that he changed the title of the dictionary. However, we do not believe that he would reject his own alterations in definitions and replace them with the very words he had changed earlier when he took G2 as his source text.

Schultis adopted UL1 for his edition (S), and Havard and de Vingle based their editions (HA and DV) on S. Many articles are identical in S, HA, DV and some of them, at least, are found in the edition which we call UL2. We are certain the latter is in the line of descent from S, but without further analysis we cannot say whether it came directly or through HA or DV. In Exhibit 31 we show it as an independent successor to S.

---

78 In response to our request for a microfilm of this edition, we are advised by the Service de la reproduction de la Bibliothèque nationale that it is not able to grant it because the copy is too tightly bound to permit reproduction.
4.2.10.  *Missing Editions of Series 1*

In addition to the twelve editions described above, we have found two other bibliographical references to editions which certainly belong to Series 1 but whose present locations we do not know.

**4.2.10.1. Catholicum parvum, c.1487**

Beaulieux (1904: 378) has a terse reference under the rubric *Catholicum parvum* which reads: “Autre édition. – (Catal. J. Bignon)”.

The note refers to a document conserved by the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris as n° 7335. Its title is:

> Catalogue de la bibliothèque de feu M. Jérôme Bignon, composé d’un choix considérable de livres rares, curieux et singuliers, manuscrits et imprimés. 
> Dont la vente aura lieu le 8 janvier 1849. 
> Chimot, libraire 
> Paris, 1848

and the specific reference is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belles-Lettres</th>
<th>1. Linguistique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Origine et formation des langues, grammaire générale</td>
<td>894. Catholicum parvum (ou Dictionnaire franç.-Lat.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.l.n.d. (vers 1487), in-4°. goth.. vél.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We treat this reference as defining an original edition, although it is possible that the document described is a copy of another edition (for example, *G1*), from which the colophon is lacking.

**4.2.10.2. Unknown, printer of Ars memoriae, Lyons, c.1500**

*GKW* (VI: 262, n° 6240) attributes an undated edition of the *CA* by an unidentified printer, to the printer of Baldovinus Sabaudiensis, *Ars memoriae*, Lyons, with a date of c.1500. According to the description in *GKW*, the document is entitled *Catholicum parvum* and concludes *Laus deo*, which would seem to put it in the line descending from *UL1*, but we cannot be sure of its precise location in the filiation.

The dictionary was apparently in the collection of the Zentralbibliothek of Solothurn but is noted as missing by *GKW*. The Chief Librarian confirms that the document is missing and
speculates that it may be "a second or third item in a volume with several titles, in the uncatalogued part" of the Library's collection.

Before printing of Series 1 ended at Lyons, printing of Series 2 had begun at Rouen.

4.2.11.  **Martin Morin, Rouen**

Clair (1976: 71) writes, "Although Rouen had no press until about 1487, it was not long before it became important in the history of French printing." Indeed, from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century Rouen was the third-ranking printing centre in France, after Paris and Lyons. It shared some of the same characteristics as Lyons: both lacked a University but were very active commercially (Girard 1986: 464f.).

Rouen's first printer was a native of the town, named Guillaume le Talleur, whose first dated work, *Les Chroniques de Normandie* was published in May 1487 (Clair 1976: 71).

Among Le Talleur's work is a large Latin-French dictionary, *Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus* (*VFC*) (see 5.0.), probably printed c.1490.

Martin Morin, who exercised his trade in Rouen until 1523 (Girard 1986: 470), acquired Le Talleur's atelier on the latter's death, likely "towards the end of 1491 or the beginning of 1492" (*BMC*: VIII, 389). As we have illustrated in 4.1.2., Morin very soon used the *VFC* in preparing a new edition of the *CA*.

4.2.11.1.  **Martin Morin pour Pierre Regnault 1492 (MM)**

In contrast with the simple title pages of Series 1, those in Series 2 are much more elaborate. Morin, the initiator of Series 2, introduced a title page with the words *Catholicon abbreviatum* above the plaque of Pierre Regnault, for whom he printed the dictionary (see p. 223 *infra*).

Morin's own plaque is found on the last page of the text.

Morin included a prologue which outlines the dictionary's objectives and describes some of its features:

**Prologus.**

*Cum etenim nullatusus ad artes pertingere valeant ignorantes partes Et ignoratis principiis (philozopho teste) ignorantur et conclusiones: pro novellorum rudiumque iuvenem introductione cuius generis cuius proprietatis fit. quidve significet dictio queque vernacula lingua utcunque dignum arbitrati sumus explicare: ut ipsi matris bone ac nutricis prime grammatices lac suave suggant, pregustent, pregustantes in doctrina crescant, docti et iam adulti: superiorum artium leti vinum eebiant. In hoc*
siquidem opusculo lectitantes sese plurimum oblectabunt. In se parum habebit
fructus quis enim artifex suo in opere non presupponat itaque materiam
tum ad orationes congruas, tum ad propositiones veras vel falsas terminos seu
dictiones esse ignorat nullus. Quem etiam latet ex propositionibus syllogismos ac
disputationes componere tam logici quam oratores? Si attente sollicitaque hunc legas
libellum, vigilansque consyderes, tenacter memorie commendes: radicem tibi scienti-
tiarum ministrabit. Luce clarius compendioseve per ordinem litterarum
docebit ut prediximus cuius generis sit cum significato eius quilibet pars declinabilis.
In partibus igitur per articulos declinandis littera sola in fine linee posita genus
docebit, in verbis quoque pariter idem demonstrabit. Vide igitur et perlege perutiel
pernecessarium singulius et omnibus in artibus edoceri cupientibus librum quern tibi
impressum correctumque ac emendatum insignis illa urbs metropolitana
Rothomagensis viris illustribus omnimodis scientiis edoctis referata reddit parat et
tradit ut fructum in eo percipias optatum, studiose vivas, ac tandem felicitatem
consequaris eternam. Amen.
Nota igitur in partibus per articulos declinabilibus: si in extremo seu fine linee ap-
pronatur una sive quedam litterarum sequentium genus significabit. videlicet. m. masu-
clini <sic> generis. Item. f. feminini generis. n. neutri generis. c. communis generis.
Item. o. omnis generis. du. dubii generis. epi. epiceni generis. In verbis etiam a. in
fine linee et post significatum posita significabit quod activum est, seu activi generis
est. n. neutrum vel neutri generis. de. deponens vel deponentis generis est. com.
commue <sic> vel communis generis. ad. significabit quod est adverbium.

The colophon is modelled on that of the VFC:
Vocabularius familiaris brevidicus ex summa ianuensi ac Papia. Hug. Necnon quamplurimi
aliis autoribus excerptus et diligenter emendatus exaratusque Rothomagi per Magis-
trum martimum morin ante prioratum sancti laudi commorant finit feliciter. Anno domini millesimo quadrigentesimo
nonagesimo secundo. ultima die mensis Junii.

Morin used Caillaut's first edition (C1) as his basic text, correcting some (although not
all) of the faulty readings, and added new material taken from VFC.

Morin published a new edition of the VFC in 1500 (see p. 154f. infra), but he did not
reissue the CA. However, his 1492 edition was the source for another thirteen editions, flowing
in two streams, one from Paris and the other from Rouen. We will first examine the Paris
filiation.

4.2.12. **Unknown [type used by Jean Bonhomme], Paris**
The title page and colophon are lacking from the only copy of this edition, but judging by the
inclusion of the prologue from MM, Aquilon (1990: nº 198) concludes that it was printed after
June 30, 1492. He remarks that the type, with two minor exceptions, is identical to that used
by the Parisian bookseller-printer Jean Bonhomme until he gave up printing in 1490.

We have put this edition into a timeframe of c.1492–1496 because its first successor
was printed in Paris early in 1497.
4.2.12.1. Unknown c.1492–1496 (UP)

There is a faulty reading (shown in italic) in the prologue which is repeated in all later Parisian editions of the CA until 1510:

CUm etenim nullatenus ad artes pertingere valemant ignornantes partes Et ignotis principiis philosopho teste ignornantur et conclusiones: pro novellorum tediumque iuvenum introductione ...

The reference to Rouen (urbs metropolitana Rothomagensis) in the prologue to MM appears in this edition and in some later Parisian editions. The two typographical errors in the last paragraph of MM (masuclini and commue) have been corrected, but another such error (in Italic) occurs in the same paragraph in this edition:

Item .f. feminini generis .n. neutri generis .c. communi generis...

The dictionary ends with the word: *Finis* at the bottom of the last column of text.

Apart from minor typographical errors and some omissions of French equivalents, UP is a fairly careful copy of MM.

4.2.13. Jean Morand, Paris

Jean Morand (Maurand, Mourand) printed in Paris from 1493 until c.1500 (Renouard: 1965, 301). He produced two editions of the CA, the first in 1497 for Jehan Petit and the second c.1500 for the Frères de Marnef.

4.2.13.1. Morand 1497/98 (M1)

The title page of Morand’s first edition bears a large woodcut of a priest and two assistants offering mass, above the title ¶Catholicum panmm / Pour Jehan Petit (see p. 225 infra). Petit was a prominent bookseller, operating in Paris from c.1492 until c.1530 (id. 1965: 339).

M1 contains the prologue from UP, with changes shown in italic. For the first time a paraph (¶) introduces the second paragraph, an innovation which is repeated in all later Parisian editions having a Prologus.

¶Nota igitur ... item. o. omnis generis. du. dubii generis. epi. epicheni generis...
The colophon is nearly identical with that in MM:


M1 is a copy of UP, with some further omissions of French forms, and new typographical errors.

4.2.13.2. Morand c.1500 (M2)

Morand reprinted his dictionary c.1500 for the de Marnef brothers (Geoffroy, Jean and Enguilbert), founders of a bookselling business which operated in Paris from 1485 until 1595 (id. 1965: 296f.). The title of M2 is changed to Catholicon / abbreviatum and it appears above the plaque of the Frères de Marnef (see p. 228 infra).

The prologue has two changes from that in M1; pregustat is omitted, and Rothomagensis is changed to Parisiensis:

... ut ipsi matris bone ac nutricis prime grammatices lac suave suggant [pregustat] pregustantes in doctrina crescant, docti et iam adulti: superiorum artium leti vinum eibant... Vide igitur et perlege perutilem pernecessarium singulis et omnibus in artibus edoceri cupientibus librum quem tibi impressum correctumque ac emendatum insignis illa urbs metropolitana Parisiensis...

The dictionary ends simply:

¶Et sic est finis.
¶Laus deo.

Morand’s second edition of the CA includes a number of orthographical changes, and a few changes in French definitions, as well as a large quantity of additional typographical errors.

4.2.14. Michel Le Noir, Paris

Morand’s first edition was quickly copied by Michel Le Noir, bookseller-printer in Paris from 1486 to 1520 (id. 1965: 265).

4.2.14.1 Le Noir 1497 (LN)

LN’s title page is set out Catholicon ab/breviatum above Le Noir’s plaque (see p. 226 infra). The prologue is copied from M1, but contains several orthographical changes and typographical errors:

Nota igitur in partibus per articulos declinabilibus si in extremo seu fine linee apponatur una sive quedam litterarum sequentium genus significabit, videlicet. m. masculini generis. f. feminini generis. n. neutri generis. c. communis generis. o. omnis generis. du. dubii generis. epi. epici generis. In verbis etiam a. in fine linee et post significatum posita significabit quod activum est, seu actui generis est: n. neutrum vel neutri generis. de. deponens vel deponentis generis est. com. commune vel communis gereris: ad. significabit quod est adverbium.

The colophon reads:

Et sic est finis.


The careless errors in the prologue are typical of the dictionary, which is a copy of M1. with few changes.

4.2.15. Jean Tréperel, Paris

Le Noir's edition was reproduced twice by bookseller-printer Jean Tréperel (Trepperel), in business in Paris from 1491 to 1511 (id. 1965: 413).

4.2.15.1. Tréperel 1499 (T1)

In T1 the title Catholicon ab/breviatom <sic> is placed above Tréperel's plaque (see p. 227 infra). The prologue is missing from the only remaining copy, but the colophon is identical with that of Le Noir except for the printer's name, location and date:
Et sic est finis.


**T1** is virtually a duplicate of **LN**, copying the orthographical variants and many of the typographical errors.

### 4.2.15.2. Tréperel c.1500 (T2)

Tréperel corrected the title in his second edition, to *Catholicon abbreviatum* (see p. 229 infra), again located above his plaque. The existing copy is incomplete, ending on folio 105, and therefore lacking a colophon. *GKW* (VI, n° 6241) gives it a date of c.1500.

The rapid appearance of **T2** may have been prompted by a desire to correct the earlier faulty edition. The text of the prologue in **T2** is a copy of that in **LN**, including *tedium* and *Rothomagensis*; however, it is flawless in execution, without typographical errors that we have found.

This care is evident throughout the text, where most of the errors in **T1** are corrected. Apart from these changes, **T2** is a copy of the first edition.

### 4.2.16. Nicolas de la Barre, Paris

Nicolas de La Barre, a former professor at l’Université de Paris, was a bookseller-printer from 1496 to 1528 (*id. 1965:* 228).

### 4.2.16.1. de la Barre 1510 (B)

B’s lengthy title is printed in alternating black and red lines at the top of an elaborate plaque which includes de la Barre’s name and address (see p. 230 *infra*). De la Barre changed the title of this edition to *Vocabularius breviloquus* and worked it into a statement of the dictionary’s purpose:

Vocabularius breviloquus (a compluribus tirunculis minus Catholicon vulgo dictus) qui vocabularum lingue latine significata continet vernaculo themate ad pueroer eruditionem in grammatica instruendorum explanata recentissime. Impressus Parisii. Opera magistri Nicolai de barra ibidem moram trahentis.
The Prologus is a copy of that in M2, including the substitution of Parisiensis for Rothomagensis. The faulty reading tedium is corrected to read rudium and there are a number of other changes:

Prologus


Nota igitur in partibus per articulos declinabilibus. si in extremo seu fine linee apponatur una sive quedam litterarum sequentium genus significabit. videlicet. m. masculini generis. Item. f. feminini generis. n. neutri generis. c. communis generis. Item. o. omnis generis. du. dubii generis. epy. epicheny generis. In verbis etiam a. in fine linee et post significatum posita significabit quod activum est. seu activi generis est. n. neutrum vel neutri generis. de. deponens vel deponentis generis est. com. commune vel communis generis. ad. significabit quod est adverbium.

The ending used in M2 is repeated in de La Barre’s edition:

¶Et sic est finis.
¶Laus deo.

and the colophon is modelled on that in LB (see 4.2.18.1.):


It seems that de La Barre’s sources were M2 and LN, as errors and changes from both dictionaries are present. Of course, this blend may have been made in 1506 by Jehan Lambert (see 4.2.21.2.) and B may descend from it. Until Lambert’s dictionary turns up, it is not possible for us to determine accurately.

B was the source for one further edition, printed in Paris in the 1520s.
4.2.17. Jean Hérouf, Paris

Some years later another edition of the CA was printed in Paris, by printer-bookseller Jean Hérouf (Heruf), who had his business there from 1501 to 1528 (id. 1965: 202).

4.2.17.1. Hérouf c.1520–28 (HE)

The title of Hérouf’s edition (set above his plaque) is a copy of that of B, apart from some typographical errors:

Vocabularius breviloquus (a compluribus tirunculis minus Catholicon vulgo dictus) qui vocabularum lingue latine significata continet venaculo themate ad puerorum eruditionem in grammatica instrumentorum explanat a recentissime. Impressus Parisii Opera Johannis Herouf ibidem moram trahentis.

The prologue is also a duplicate of that in B. And it seems from the fragment of the colophon which has survived (pasted at the bottom of column b on folio 80r) that it was also copied from B:

.......ogicus id est introductorius
.......apia Hugu. necnon quampluri-
.......datum exaratusque. Parisii in
.......e domine sub intersignio divi-
.......imo quingentesimo vigesimo

Because the date is incomplete, we assign HE to the period 1520–28.

Hérouf clearly copied B but the edition is very corrupt; a number of articles are omitted and there are many typographical errors.

Printing of the CA in Paris came to an end with Hérouf’s edition. We turn back now to Rouen and the other stream of editions flowing from MM.

4.2.18. Jean Le Bourgeois, Rouen

Jean Le Bourgeois was probably the second printer established in Rouen, after Le Talleur. He was active there from 1488 until c.1500 (Girard 1986: 470). In 1497, at about the same time that Jean Morand printed his first edition in Paris, Jean Le Bourgeois produced an edition of the CA at Rouen.

79 We do not have a copy of the title page of HE, or of any other part of the text. The Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève advises that the book is too fragile to permit reproduction by any means.
Le Bourgeois also called his edition *Catholicon abbreviatum*, and the title appears above his plaque (see p. 224 *infra*). He included the *Prologus* from *MM*, with few text changes. A paraph is inserted before the sentence beginning *in partibus igitur*, and the sentence beginning *Nota igitur* no longer introduces a new paragraph:

Cum etenim *nullatenus* ad artes pertingere valeant ignorantes partes. Et ignoratis principiis: philozopho teste ignorantur et conclusiones: pro novellorum rudiumque juvenum introductione cuius generis cuius proprietatis fit quidve significat dictio queque vernacula lingua utcunque dignum arbitri sumus explicare: ut ipsi matris bone ac nutritis prime grammatices lac suave *sugant*: pregustent pregustantes in doctrina crescant: docti et iam adulti: superiorum artium leti vinum eibant... Si attendite sollicitaque hunc legas libellum: vigilansque consideres: tenaciter memorie commendes: radicern tibi scientiarum ministrabit. Luce clarius succincte compendioseve per ordinem litterarum docebit ut preexistit cuius generis sit cum significato eius quamlibet pars declinabilis. ¶ In partibus igitur per articulos declinandisque littera sola in fine lineae posta genus edocebit... viris illustribus omninomadis scientiis. edoctis referatu reddat et tradat ut fructum in eo percipias optatum studiose vivas ac tandem felicitatem consequaris eternam. Amen. *Nota igitur* in partibus per articulos declinabilibus ...

The colophon, which repeats the dictionary’s pedagogical aim, was copied by Nicholas de la Barre in his edition of 1510 (see 4.2.16.1.):

*Vocabularius in eruditionem iuuenum ysagogicus id est introductorius familiaris et brevidicus ex summa ianuensi ac Papia Hugucione necnon quamplurimis aliis auctoris excerptus et diligenter emendatus exaratusque Rothomagi per Johannem le Bourgeois in vico magni pontis eadem in urbe commorantem. Anno domini millesimo quadrangentesimo nonagestimo septimo die xiii. marci. finit feliciter.*

Following the colophon, Le Bourgeois added an epigram in eleven distichs praising the inventor of the art of printing:

*Epygramma in artis impressorie
inventoris commendationem.*

*Tingere dispositis chartas quicunque metallis
Cepit: et insigne edidit ere notas:
Mercurio genitore satus genitrice minerva.
Preditus etheree semine mentis erat
Non illum Cereris non illum cura Iyi
Terrene tenuit non opis ullus amor
Copia librorum cupidis modo rara latinis
Cum foret: auspiciis illius ampla venit:
Improbus innumeris librariorum ante talentis
Quod dabat: exigua nunc stipe vendit opus
Hystorie venere Tiri se Plinius omni:
Gymnasio iactant tullius atque maro
Nullum opus: o nostri felicem temporis artem:
Celat in archano bibliotheca situ
Quem modo rex quem vix princeps modo rarus habebat
Quisque sibi librum pauper habere potest*
There are many orthographical changes in LB as compared with MM, as well as a number of typographical faults, but there is not any significant change in the nomenclature from Morin’s edition.

4.2.19. Laurent Hostingue, Rouen/Caen

According to Aquilon (1978: 17), Laurent Hostingue first exercised his profession in Rouen from 1499 to 1508, then in Caen from 1508 to 1512, again in Rouen from 1513 to 1516, and finally at Caen from 1517 until his death c.1527. Hostingue frequently printed for the booksellers Michael Angier of Caen, Jean Macé of Rouen, and his relative Richard Macé who was established at Rennes.

4.2.19.1. Hostingue c.1511–13 (HO)

The only existing copy of Hostingue’s edition of the CA lacks a title page and prologue. It is catalogued as Vocabularius. The dictionary ends with the epigram from LB with a few changes:

\[
\text{Epigramma in artis impressor}
\]
\[
\text{inventonis commendationem.}
\]

Tingere dispositis chartas quicunque metallis
Cept: et \text{insignes} edidit ere notas.3
Mercurio genitore satus genitrice minerva.
Preditus \text{ether} semine mentis erat
Non illum \text{Ceteris non illum cura lyei}
Terrene tenuit non opis ulius amor
Copia librorum cupidis modo rara latinis
Cum foret: auspiciis illius \text{amplat} venit
Improbus innumeris librarius ante talentis
Quod dabat exigua nunc stipe vendit opus
Hystorie venere \text{Titi} se Plinius omni:
Gymnasio iactant \text{Tullus} atque \text{Maro}
Nullum opus (o nostri felicem temporis artem)
\text{Cellat} in archano bibliotheca situ.
Quem modo rex quem vix princeps modo rarus habebat
Quisque sibi librum pauper habere potest
\text{Redditus ac etiam nunc nobis arte libellus}
Qui iuvenes doceat consiliate loqui.
\text{Ergo dum fuerit grato tibi commodus usu.}
Has memor assiduis plausibus ede preces
Artifici semper faveant pia numina sancto
Utilis effluxit cuius ab arte liber.
It is followed by a colophon which is modelled on that in LB and B, but does not include a date:

\[\text{Vocabularius in eruditionem iuvenum ysagogicus id est introductorius familiaris et brevidicus ex summa Januensi ac Papia. Hug. necnon quamplurimum aliis autoribus excerptus et diligenter emendatus exaratusque Rothomagi in officina Laurentii hostingue Impressis honestorum virorum videlicet Johannis mace Redonis commorant. Michaelis angier Cadomi commorant. necnon Richardi mace Rothomagi commorant.}\]

Aquilon dates this edition c.1511–13 (id. 1978: 46).

Hostingue drew some definitions as well as the epigram and colophon from LB; however, his primary source was Morand’s second edition. Apart from repeating some of the faulty readings from M2, Hostingue’s dictionary is carefully printed without notable changes or additions.

4.2.20. \textit{Raulin Gaultier, Rouen}

The bookseller-printer Raulin Gaultier was established in Rouen from 1504 to 1536. Surviving texts printed for or by Gaultier include two grammars (Remigius and Alexander of Villedieu) and an edition of the CA.

4.2.20.1. \textit{Gaultier 1519 (GA)}

The title of Gaultier’s edition, \textit{Vocabularius Sreviloquus <sic>}, is copied from that of B. It is printed in alternating black and red lines within a plaque which includes the name of Raulin Gaultier (see p. 231 \textit{infra})\textsuperscript{80}:

\[\text{Vocabularius Sreviloquus a compluribus tirunculis minus Catholicum vulgo dictus) qui vocabularum lingue late signifacata continet vernaculo themate ad puerorum: eruditionem in grammatica instruendorum explanata recen-tissime impressum. Impensis honesti viri Radulphi gaultier.}\]

There is no date, either on the title page or in the colophon. The customary prologue is replaced by an \textit{Epystola exortatoria} written for the benefit of youths by one Nicolai Cadier, and dated July 26, 1519. For this reason, Aquilon (1980: 22) gives GA a date of 1519.

The text concludes with the same wording as in B:

\[\text{Et sic est finis.}
\text{Laus deo.}\]

\textsuperscript{80} It will be seen from the copy of the title page that the red lines were lost in the reproduction on microfilm.
There are a number of changes in the epigram, which is the one appearing in LB and in

H:

\[\text{Epigraphma in artis impressorie iuuentonis commendationem.} \]

Tingere dispositis chartas quicunque metallis
Cepit: et insignes edidit ere notas.
Mercurio genitore satus: genitrice minerva.
Preditus ethere semine mensis erat
Non illum Ceres: non illum cura lyei
Terrene tenuit non opis ulius amor
Copia librorum cupidis modo rara latinis
Cum foret auspiciis illius ampla venit
Improbus innumeris librarius ante talentis
Quod dabat exigua nunc stipe vendit opus
Hystorie venere tibi le Pluieus omni:
Gymnasio iactant tullius atque Maro
Nullum opus (o nostri felicem temporis arte)
Cellat in archano bibliotheca situ.
Quem modo rex: quem vix princeps modo rarus habebat
Quisque sibi librum pauper habere potest
Redditus ac etiam nunc nobis arte libellus
Qui iuvenes doceat consilate loqui
Ergo dum fuerit grato tibi commodus usu
Has memor assiduis plausibus ede preces
Artifici semper faveant pia nomina sancto
Utilis enuixit cuius ab arte liber.

The colophon is the same as that in LB, B and HO but lacks the printer’s name and date:

\[\text{Vocabularius in eruditionem iuvenum ysagogicus id est}
\text{introductorius familiaris et brevidicus ex summa lanuensi ac}
Papia Hugu. necnon quamplurimus alius authoribus excerptus
et diligenter emendatus finit feliciter.

Although Gaultier copied his title from B, HO is the source for his dictionary.

4.2.21. Incomplete and Missing Editions of Series 2

4.2.21.1. Pour Pierre Regnault, Rouen, c.1500

Delisle (1903: 83) describes fragments of an edition of CA:

"90. Catholicon abbreviatum. s.d.?
Marque de Pierre Regnault.
Édition différente de la précédente [Morin 1492]. L'initiale C du titre est beaucoup moins grande que l'initiale du titre de l'édition imprimée en 1492 par Martin Morin.
De cette seconde édition, je ne connais que les premiers feuilllets conservés à la bibliothèque d'Avranches comme gardes d'une ancienne édition du Doctrinale d'Alexandre de Villedieu."

This edition is dated c.1500 by GKW (VI, n° 6244), and the fragments are still conserved in the Bibliothèque municipale d'Avranches. We have not seen these pages, and do not feel we can assign this edition a place in Exhibit 31.
In Paris, in 1867, the Librairie Bachelin-Deflorenne published the *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de M.N. Yemeniz*, which describes:

"1200. Catholicon abbreviatum. (A la fin:) Catholicon abbreviatum exponens vocabula multarum dictionum, exaratum per Johannen Lambert commorantem in vico Sancti iacobii ad intersignium due virginis marie anno domini millesimo quingentesimo sexto, die decima mensis Februarii."

Ambroise Firmin-Didot must have purchased this book very soon after publication of the catalogue, because in his *Observations sur l’orthographe ou ortografie française* (1868: 107) he writes:

"Je possède les trois autres glossaires:
1° Le *Catholicon abbreviatum*, pet. in-4 goth., imprimé à Paris, en 1506, par Jehan Lambert, sans nom d’auteur. Il ne contient que 3,500 mots; c’est un livre très-intéressant, puisqu’il nous représente l’état de la langue avant l’introduction de cette multitude de vocables savants, tirés du latin et même du grec à l’époque de la Renaissance..."

In 1881, in his preface to Sidney Herrtage’s edition of the *Catholicon Anglicum*, Henry Wheatley notes:

"A Catholicum Parvum, the first printed Latin and French Vocabulary, was published at Geneva in 1487, and a few years afterward appeared a *Catholicum Abbreviatum* at Paris, which was reprinted by Jean Lambert at the same place in 1506."

Beaulieux (1904: 378) refers to Lambert’s edition:


as does Moreau (1972: 187), although her details are outdated:

Éditions parisiennes – 1506
35. *Catholicon parvum*
   Catholicon abbreviatum – Jean Lambert. 10 février. 4°.
   *Vente N. Yemeniz* (1867), 1200

This copy would be an important contribution to establishing the filiation of the Paris editions, but its fate is unknown.

**4.3. Contribution of the Editions**

The nomenclature of the *CA* is based on a monolingual Latin dictionary finished in 1286, and the French glosses are copied from a bilingual Latin-French manuscript compiled in the late fourteenth century. Apart from the fact that lingering traces of Old French found in some of the
other *Aalma* manuscripts are missing from Caillaut’s copy, the French forms are nearly identical.

Thus the macrostructure was two hundred years old and the French forms in the microstructure were a century old at the time the first edition of the *CA* was published. Succeeding editions did not greatly alter the basic structure of the macrotext; indeed, the gross errors in alphabetical order found in Caillaut’s manuscript (see 8.1.2.1.1.) are still unchanged in Gaultier’s edition of 1519. The principal change in the nomenclature was made by Morin when he added articles taken from the *VFC*.

The first major change affecting the microstructure occurred in Vérard’s edition. When Vérard changed the page layout from one-column to two-column (see 8.1.2.2.1.), he shortened a number of the French glosses (which often affected the sense of the definition). He also added or substituted some new French forms. The second change affecting the microstructure occurred when Morin added or substituted new French forms. In addition to these large changes, there are additions of articles and additions or substitutions of French glosses in some editions.

The instability of Middle French orthography is clearly reflected in all the copies of the *CA* which we have examined. Spelling varies within each text, not to speak of changes from one edition to the next. However, it is not our purpose to conduct a language study and we do not discuss orthography. There are also a vast quantity of typographical errors (more in some editions than in others). We do not believe it is valuable to this study to examine them, with the exception of a few instances in which a persistent faulty reading is finally corrected. We regard such a correction as a contribution by the printer.

We feel the greatest interest lies in illustrating additions of French forms throughout the life of the dictionary. Our research is based on examination of the letter ‘A’ in seventeen editions of the *CA*. This represents between 840 and 850 articles (the number varies from one edition to another). Our method is to report the gloss as it appears in the text used as a base, followed by the gloss as it appears in the text under review.
4.3.1. Caillaut

C2 corrects some of the typographical errors in C1, and adds a small amount of new material.

a) Additions

(s.v. A) > premiere lettre de a b c
          la premiere lettre de a b c

(s.v. Alabrum) > instrument a femme pour devider le fil
                    le instrument a femme pour devider le fil

(s.v. Adversitas) > adversité contrareté
                    adversité ou contrariété

(s.v. Altitronum) > hault siege throne royal
                    hault siege ou trosne royal

b) Corrections

(s.v. Abavus) > Abavus avi tiers Abbas abbé
                Abavus avi tiers ael
                Abbas abbé

(s.v. Acetarium) > Acetarium rii vin aigre
                    Acetum ti vin aigre
                    Acetarium rii vaissiau a vin aigre

c) New articles

Attamen toutes fois

C3 also corrects typographical errors but adds only a small amount of new material:

a) Additions

(s.v. Afficio) > toumenter couvoiter ou informer
                toumenter ou couvoiter ou informer

(s.v. Attente) > attentement
                actamment attentement

4.3.2. Vérard

As we have observed (see p. 116 supra), most of the French forms in Caillaut's editions are based on his copy of a fourteenth-century manuscript. Vérard made a number of changes which, presumably, are more in line with contemporary French.

a) Substitutions

(s.v. Ab) > prepositio deservant a l'ablatif
            preposicio servante a l'ablatif

(s.v. Abdicativus) > refusé
                    privé
(s.v. Abdico) > refuser
       > priver

(s.v. Abiectio) > abiection despit ou ordonnance
               > abiection despit comme par desdain

(s.v. Abnegatio) > abnegation denoyement
                > denegacion denyement

(s.v. Accidiosus) > plain d'ennuy pereceux
                 > plain de parresse

(s.v. Attente) > actamment attentement
                > attentivement

(s.v. Attramentum) > ancre ou atrement qui est noir
                     > encre ou autre chose qui est noire

(s.v. Atrium) > atre a faire feu
                > lieu spacieux

(s.v. Avarus) > avoir de richesse
               > avaricieux

b) Additions

(s.v. Asciola) > petite dolouere hachete
               > petite dolouere ou hachette

c) Corrections

(s.v. Anas) > eaue ou canete (A8 and all editions to V)
             > cane ou canete

4.3.3. Garbin

Garbin copied V closely and corrected a few typographical errors, but retained many others.
Neither of his editions contributes anything new in the letter ‘A’.

4.3.4. Huss

Huss followed G2 without correcting the typographical faults which had been passed on from V.
He made some additions and changes.

a) Additions

(s.v. Appono) > mettre adiouster
               > mettre ou adiouster

(s.v. Armiger) > escuyer ou qui porte armes
                 > escuyer ou qui porte les armes

b) Substitutions

(s.v. Archa) > arche ou huche a mettre pain
              > arche ou coffre
Huss did not reprint his dictionary, and the other editions which subsequently appeared in Lyons descended through another filiation. It is unfortunate that the revised French forms which he introduced were not picked up in later editions of the CA.

**4.3.5. Unknown [printer of Casus Longi], Lyons**

The unknown author of the edition we call **UL1** combined **C1** and **G2** to produce his dictionary. As a result, some of the forms rejected by **V** are restored.

*a) Restorations*

- **(s.v. Ab)**
  - preposition deservant a l'ablatif **(C1)**
  - preposition servante a l'ablatif **(G2)**

The change to *preposition* has the effect of changing a Latin form into a French one.

- **(s.v. Abdicatius)**
  - refusé **(C1)**
  - privé **(G2)**

- **(s.v. Abdico)**
  - refuser **(C1)**
  - priver **(G2)**

- **(s.v. Ablacto)**
  - sevrer de lait **(C1)**
  - sevrer **(G2)**

- **(s.v. Abnegatio)**
  - abnegation denoyement **(C1)**
  - denegacion denyement **(G2)**

- **(s.v. Alienigena)**
  - né en estrange pais **(C1)**
  - en estrange pais **(G2)**

*b) Substitutions*

- **(s.v. Antiphona)**
  - anthienne
  - *antiphone*

*c) Corrections*

- **(s.v. Abrado)**
  - raire fort **(A8)**
  - raise fort **(C1 and all editions to UL1)**

Faulty Latin forms are sometimes corrected.

Agroto <sic> as avi atum *demener ou degetter* **(A8 and all editions: demener ou was omitted from V)**

- Agito tas tavi tatum *degetter*
4.3.6. Schultis

Schultis adopted UL as his source and printed it carefully. Among the very few changes which he made are:

a) Reordering

(s.v. Anclia) > roue ou engin de puis pour traire l'eau
(s.v. Anclia) > roue ou engin pour traire l'eau de puis

b) Correction

(s.v. Asie) > asie regio quedam (A8)
(s.v. Asie) > aise regio quedam (C1 and all editions to S)
(s.v. Asie) > asie regio quedam

4.3.7. Havard

Havard copied S but made a lot of typographical errors. He shortened a number of articles by omitting part of the French definition, and also omitted some articles. Havard contributed nothing of interest in the letter 'A'.

4.3.8. Morin

Morin adopted C1 as his principal source, with the result that his French glosses follow those in that edition. Elimination of the preposition la (which was introduced in C2) from the first article (A premiere lettre de a b c) is the marker for editions belonging to Series 2. New material is largely, although not exclusively, drawn from the VFC (see 4.1.2.).

a) Substitutions

(s.v. Abiectio) > abiection despit ou ordunance
(s.v. Abiectio) > abiection despit ou desordonnance
(s.v. Aliquandiu) > avecques longuement
(s.v. Aliquandiu) > aucun peu de temps
(s.v. Aluta) > alene ou corduan
(s.v. Aluta) > cordoven cuir (VFC)
(s.v. Ambra) > ambre species quedam medicinalis
(s.v. Ambra) > species quedam valde cara. ambre. galice (VFC)
(s.v. Ambulatrum) > idem (refers to allee in previous article)
(s.v. Ambulacrum) > per c non per t. locus ad spaciandum. gallerie (VFC)
(s.v. Amplus) > large de nef ou ample
(s.v. Amplus) > large grant
(s.v. Apto) > apparilier ou affietier enformer ou essayer
(s.v. Apto) > appareilier ordener faire convenable. aptum facere (VFC)
b) Additions to existing articles

(s.v. Ambio) >

environner ou couvoiter
environner ou couvoiter honneur (VFC)

(s.v. Amentum) >

la courroie ou le lacet qui est au milieu du iavelot ou du glaive
la courroie ou lacet qui est au milieu du dart ou du glaive pour mieulx darder
(VFC)

c) New articles

(s.v. Amatorius) d’amour (VFC)

(s.v. Anguillaris) d’anguille. ut cibus anguillaris (VFC)

(s.v. A[n]guillarium) le lieu ou les anguilles sont (VFC)

(s.v. Attamen) toutesfois

d) Correction

(s.v. Appricus) >

declinable
id est delectabilis. delectable.

4.3.9. Unknown, Paris

The compiler of the first Paris edition of Series 2 (UP) printed Morin’s text with only a few typographical errors. He also eliminated some French glosses from articles which contained more than one equivalent. We have only observed one change in the letter ‘A’.

a) Substitutions

(s.v. Amentum) >

troupeau de grosses bestes beuf et vaches
troupeau de grosses bestes beuf ou vaches

4.3.10 Morand

Morand adopted the edition we call UP for his dictionary.

There are a large quantity of typographical errors but few changes in the microstructure.

a) Substitutions

(s.v. Amicabilissime) >

tresamiablement
tresagreablement

(s.v. Aurifocina) >

la forge ou on fait l’or
la forge ou l’en fait l’or
b) **Additions**

(s.v. Acies) > oste ou pointe ou tranchant

> oste ou qui a pointe ou tranchant

Morand’s second edition adds more typographical errors, and a few changes:

a) **Substitutions**

(s.v. Aquilo) > ung vent de bise de coste galeme

> ung vent de bise du coste galeme

(s.v. Atramentum) > encre ou autrement qui est noir

> encre: ou autre chose qui est noir <sic>

This last substitution is the same as one made by Vérard (see 4.3.2.). However, we do not see any evidence that Morand used Vérard’s edition and assume rather that the change reflects contemporary use.

b) **Additions**

(s.v. Atrium) > atre a faire feu

> atre a faire du feu

4.3.11. **Le Noir**

Typographical faults are very common in Le Noir’s edition, which is based on M1. He makes a few changes in the letter ‘A’:

a) **Substitutions**

(s.v. Appello) > appliquer arriver a port

> appliquer arriver au port

(s.v. Averto) > descombrer oster

> debouter ou oster

b) **Correction**

(s.v. Auriga) > chartier (A8 and all printed editions)

> charretier

4.3.12. **de la Barre**

De la Barre used both M2 and T2 as his sources. He corrects some errors but also creates others. He contributes nothing original in the letter ‘A’ and makes only one change:

a) **Addition**

(s.v. Aquilo) > ung vent de bise du coste galeme

> ung vent de bise du coste de galeme
4.3.13. Le Bourgeois

LB is a copy of MM, with a number of orthographical variants, some typographical errors, and the occasional omission of a French gloss from articles where there were previously several equivalents. Le Bourgeois adds nothing of interest to letter ‘A’.

4.3.14. Hostingue

Hostingue’s edition is the finest of all the editions of the CA. Unfortunately, he copies some of the faulty readings from M2, but the text is virtually without typographical errors. There is one change in the letter ‘A’.

a) Addition

(s.v. Aborior) \[ \text{avorter naistre} \] > \[ \text{avorter a naistre} \]

4.3.15. Gaultier

GA is another good edition. It is a copy of HO, with very few typographical faults, apart from two faulty readings, and running headlines which are switched at the top of two pages. A ante u over column a and A ante u over column b are switched on folio A.iii for A ante d over column a and A ante g over column b.

GA does not make any contribution in the letter ‘A’.

4.3.16. Conclusion

Results from the examination of only one letter are not conclusive but they support an assumption that there is little original material in the CA. Most of the changes relate to the addition of grammatical words, such as articles and conjunctions, to the glosses.

Huss’s use of trencheplume (see 4.3.4.) is an earlier attestation than that given by Godefroy (8, 12: Franchières, Fauc. II, 87, 1561). Further examination of the CA might provide additional examples.

4.4. Summary

The hastily conceived and often rudely printed dictionary generally referred to as the Catholicon abbreviatum occupied a place in the market for Latin-to-French lexica just at the time that the European printing industry was in its first explosion of growth. By the second decade of the sixteenth century, printing was well established in all major cities in France. Due to humanist
influence and the interest in classical Latin and Greek, there was no longer a demand for texts containing medieval Latin. The lacuna left by the disappearance of the CA was largely filled by the Latin-French and French-Latin dictionaries created in the 1530s by Robert Estienne (see 7.0.).
5.0. **Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus**

The *Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus* is a pre-Renaissance Latin-French dictionary, printed in Rouen by an atelier which first belonged to Guillaume Le Talleur and later to Martin Morin (see 4.2.11.). All known copies of the first edition lack a title page. The incipit reads:

\[\text{Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus ex summa ianuensis vulgariter catholicon dicta et huguicione ac papia presertim excerptus circa scripturam sacram quamprimum atque grammaticaliter insistens: feliciter incipit.}\]

The colophon does not mention the printer’s name or location, nor does it bear a date:

\[\text{Vocabularius familiaris ex summa ianuensis (vulgariter catholicon dicta) ac papia hug. necnon aliis autoribus quamplurimus excerptus et diligenter emendatus: finit feliciter.}\]

The first edition is assumed to be the work of Le Talleur, and to be dated c.1490.

The *VFC* is a large dictionary. The first edition comprises 672 pages, two columns per page, fifty lines per column, and contains 439,000 words. It was typeset in two stages (probably by two different workers): letters ‘A’ to ‘H’, and letters ‘I’ to ‘Z’. There are 1-3/4 blank columns between the two parts of the text. Verdier (1916: 120f.) praises the handsome font, the correctness of the typography, and even the superior quality of the paper in the *VFC*, calling it "Le Talleur’s most remarkable work".

The second edition of the *VFC* bears the title:

\[\text{CATHOLICON Alias Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus. lampridem Rothomagi Impressus.}\]

followed by Morin’s plaque, and below that the name and location of the bookseller:

\[\text{Venales reperiuntur in domo Johannis Alexandri librarri generalis Alme universitatis Andeg. In vico vulgo nomine A La chaussee saint pierre.}\]

The incipit is the same as that in the first edition, as is the colophon apart from the addition of a date:

\[\text{Vocabularius familiaris ex summa ianuensis (vulgariter catholicon dicta) ac papia hug. necnon aliis autoribus quamplurimus excerptus et diligenter emendatus: finit feliciter. Anno. M. CCCCC. xviii. kalendas augusti.}\]
The way in which the date is printed has given rise to much speculation about the year of printing: is it 1500? or is it 1518? We incline to the earlier date (despite the error concerning the calends of August) for two reasons: 1) the variation in the type between century and year – we believe the typesetter would probably not have switched from upper to lower case in the middle of the date; and 2) the length of time between editions – we feel it is unlikely that Morin would have printed a second edition of the VFC after a lapse of more than a quarter of a century.

The second edition contains 316 pages, two columns per page and fifty-two lines per column. The font is different from that in the first edition, and the hand-lettered initials have been replaced by large woodcut initials. The division into two parts is not repeated. The second edition is a careful copy of the first, and there are few changes of substance.

Morin often completes paradigms of inflections by adding endings such as .onis, .tis, .a, .um, etc. He occasionally adds material in Latin or French to existing articles:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[...]} & \text{et Illum castrum troianum (s.v. Ille .lis)} \\
\text{[...]} & \text{(Depravatio .onis) empirement (s.v. Depravo)} \\
\text{Diabolus} & \text{cum i latino et unico i scritur quamquam a verbo cum duplici l scripto dirivetur videlicet a diaballo quod est criminor unde diabolus grece criminator dicitur Et componitur diaballo ex dia prepositione que pro dicit et ballo iacio Hec Tortelius inde Diabolicus .ca .cum de dyable diabolique}
\end{align*}
\]

or inserts a new article:

Suxi preteritum de sugo.

Morin omits a large number of connectors, such as .i., et, vel, dicitur, inde, and so on. Most, although not all, of the omissions relating to definitions are items which also occur elsewhere in the text. Some examples are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[...]} & \text{Lamentositas .tatis planté de plours (s.v. Lamentamen)} \\
\text{Sempiternaliter} & \text{adverbium sempiterniter} \\
\text{[...]} & \text{Superflius .a .um .i. superabundans} \\
\text{Tabellula} & \text{.le parva tabula diminutivum}
\end{align*}
\]

5.1. **Sources of the Vocabularius famillaris et compendiosus**

In the incipit and the colophon, Le Talleur cites his sources in a conventional fashion reminiscent of that of Le Ver (see n. 47 supra): Balbi, Papias, Hugutio and other authorities. Just as with the DLV, there is no doubt that these works (in particular, the Catholicon) are the
origin of a large portion of the VFC. However, we do not believe that Le Talleur drew his material directly from them.

It is possible that he copied much of it from the DLV. We have discussed the relationship among the GGL, DLV and VFC (see p. 60f. supra). Research in progress\(^8^1\) may determine the precise filiation. We do not attempt to propose a solution here. Rather, we present some of the similarities and some of the differences between the DLV and the VFC.

**5.1.1. Dictionarius of Firmin Le Ver and Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus**

The primary distinction between the VFC and the DLV lies in the organization of the macrostructure. As we have seen in 2.5.6., Le Ver had a three-step plan which he followed almost without exception:

1. lemmata are organized alphabetically
2. sub-lemmata are arranged hierarchically following their lemmata
3. the two levels are distinguished visually:
   a) from the rest of the text – both lemmata and sub-lemmata are set flush against the left margin, and
   b) from each other – lemmata begin with a large coloured initial, usually alternating red and blue, sometimes just red, and sub-lemmata begin with a regular initial in the same brown ink as the rest of the text.

In the VFC the visual distinction between lemmata and sub-lemmata is lost in the printing. Le Talleur did not have at his disposal the technical means to recreate this effect.

Another feature of the DLV which Le Talleur abandoned is the system of grammatical indicators set against the right-hand column margin.

More importantly, the derivational relationship between lemma and sub-lemmata and the hierarchical relationship among the derivatives breaks down. At times the lemma is moved in order to take up an alphabetical position. (In principle, the VFC is ordered alphabetically, although this system is not always followed.) Very often a long article in DLV is divided into shorter ones, and the derivational sequence is interrupted. We see both of these choices in the following example.

\(^8^1\) By Professor B.S. Merrilees and Mr. W. Edwards, with the collaboration of Dr. J. Monfrin.
The fourteen items from DLV are divided into eight in VFC. The lemma, Cibus, is moved to its appropriate alphabetical location (although alphabetical order is not strictly observed), and the derivational sequence is entirely lost, particularly since the derivatives (most of which are now lemmata) are interrupted by two other lemmata not belonging to the word family.

The key point to be kept in mind, however, is that despite their dispersion in VFC, the basic articles (lemmata + treatment in Latin and/or in French) are often very similar in both dictionaries. There are a large number in which both the Latin and French content are virtually identical:

A est une preposition qui sert a l’ablatif i. de, ut: a domino factum est istud... (DLV)
A est une preposition qui sert a l’ablatif ut: a domino factum est istud... (VFC)

ABESUS .besa .sum - i. circumquaque comestus et corrosus .i. de toutes pars mengiés et rongiés et componitur cum am, quod est circum, et esus (DLV)
Abesus .a .um, - circumquaque comestus et corrosus de toutes pars mengié ou rongié et componitur ex am, quod est circum, et esus - productur ‘e’ (VFC)
or are very close:

**DECETERO** - adverbium - *en avant* amodo, denuo, rursum, deinde, iterum, dehinc, deinceps (*DLV*)

**Decetero** - adverbium - *doresenavant* i. denuo, amodo, deinde, iterum, rursum, deinceps, dehinc (*VFC*)

**Edulus** .la .lum - .i. *glout, grant mengeur* i. estor vel estrix, vorator vel voratrix, comestor, qui multum comedit - ab edo, es dicitur (s.v. EDUS) (*DLV*)

**Edulus** .la .lum - .i. estor, vorator, qui multum comedit *grant mengeur* et dicitur ab edo, es (*VFC*)

The *VFC* is also distinct from the *DLV* by reason of its smaller size. It is roughly four-fifths the size of the *DLV*. Moreover, a substantial quantity of its lemmata do not occur in *DLV* (20 percent. of the lemmata in the letter ‘A’). They must have been added by Le Talleur. Finally, the amount of French in *VFC* is less (12.3 percent. of the total text against 15.6 percent. in *DLV*).

### 5.1.2. *Vocabularius breviloquus*

The total number of lemmata in the letter ‘A’ in *VFC* is 2,890, in contrast with 3,629 in *DLV*. 261 (or eleven percent) of *VFC*’s lemmata in the letter ‘A’ do not occur in *DLV*, and approximately 325 of those in *DLV* are not found in *VFC*.

A major portion of the 261 lemmata not found in *DLV* were probably drawn from a large Latin dictionary, *the Vocabularius breviloquus* (*VB*). The German humanist and reformer Johannes Reuchlin compiled the *VB* during a stay in Switzerland, at the request of the Amerbach brothers, printers of Basle. It was first printed in 1475 and was reprinted many times, by them and by French and German printers. The principal source of *VB* is the fourteenth-century manuscript Latin-German *Vocabularius brevilogus*, which is itself based on the *Catholic*on, although Reuchlin also drew on other authorities, including Papias’ *Elementarium*.

Research presently in progress\(^2\) shows that many of the lemmata added to *VFC* over those in *DLV* occur in the *Catholic*on, *Elementarium* and *VB*:

---

\(^2\) We are indebted to our colleague, Mr. William Edwards, for sharing the unpublished results of his current research.
(a) Lemma occur in VB, Catholicon and Elementarium

- **Abarim** - mons in quo obiit Moyses
- **Abrotonium** - nomen mulieris impositum causa adulationis secundum Hucucionem et est grecum secundum Papiam et interpretatur amplexibus apta

(b) In VB and Catholicon, but not in Elementarium

- **Acerre** - arum - nomen civitatis
- **Achile** - proprium loci in quo latitavit David

(c) In VB and Elementarium, but not in Catholicon

- **Achantis** - grece - avis est carduellus latine
- **Acharon** - civitas Palestrine que post ea dicta est Cesarea

Twenty percent of the additions (53 lemmata) are not found in DLV, VB, Catholicon or Papias. For example:

- **Abgregatio** -onis - I. separatio
- **Adapto** -as -avi -aptatum - componitur ex ad et apto - as - appareiller, ordener. faire advenant - inde Adaptus -ta -tum ordené, appareillé

Many of these 53 lemmata belong to an etymological family already present in the dictionary. We take these instances as evidence of Le Talleur’s lexicographical spirit.

- ...et **Abnutio** -onis refusement
- ...**Adinventus** -ta -tum trouvé
- ...inde **Afflictivus** -a -um qui tormente et **Afflicative**, adverbium tormenteement

5.2. Conclusion

The *Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus* is a comprehensive, well-organized and handsomely printed dictionary but it is, to all intents and purposes, a medieval dictionary. It had outlived its era at the time of its second printing, on the threshold of the sixteenth century.

The *VFC* was destined to be replaced within a very short time by Latin and bilingual dictionaries such as those of Calepino and Estienne.
6.0. **Vocabularius Nebrisensis/Epithoma Vocabulorum**

The extensive writings of the Spanish grammarian and humanist, Aelio Antonio de Nebrija, include a Latin-Spanish dictionary,\(^{83}\) printed at Salamanca in 1492. The *Lexico o dicionario latino-español* was not the first bilingual dictionary printed in Spain (in 1490 Alfonso Fernández de Palencia published the *Universal Vocabulario en latin y en Romance*, which is directly based on Papias), but it is a highly original work. In his preface to the facsimile edition of the *Lexicon* (Barcelona, 1979) Germán Colón demonstrates that, although Nebrija's sources are not yet precisely determined, his dictionary is not slavishly copied from earlier compilations.\(^{84}\)

Nebrija’s influence was felt in Spanish lexicography until the eighteenth century, and his lexicographical heritage extended throughout Europe for at least two centuries, although it was not generally acknowledged (Lépinette 1992: 228).\(^{85}\) One of the earliest adaptations of the *Lexicon* is a Latin-Catalan/Catalan-Latin dictionary entitled *Vocabularius Aelij Antonij Nebrissensis*, in which Nebrija’s Spanish terms are replaced by Catalan terms. This work, apparently based on the 1506 (Seville) edition of the *Lexicon*, was translated and edited by Gabriel Busa, a monk from the Augustinian monastery in Barcelona, and first printed in 1507.

Busa respected the integrity of Nebrija’s work: he did not add entries to the nomenclature and he systematically substituted a Catalan term for a Spanish term in the microstructure. The only modification is the occasional appearance of a Catalan term for a Latin lemma which either is not translated in the *Lexicon* or has a Latin equivalent (id. 1992: 230).

6.1. **Sources of the Vocabularius nebrisensis/Epithoma vocabulorum (VN/EV)**

Beaulieux (1904: 374, 388) notes the existence of a series of Latin-French dictionaries under the names of "Antonius Nebrisensis (Aelius)" and "Guilelmus Monachus de Villadei". These

---

\(^{83}\) Nebrija’s dictionary has somewhat the character of an encyclopaedia, due to the fact that it contains a very large number of proper nouns and their descriptions.


\(^{85}\) Also see Wooldridge 1989b.
Dictionaries are the result of an adaptation by an unknown French translator of Busa's Latin-Catalan adaptation of Nebrija's *Lexicon*.

**6.1.1. Vocabularius Aelij Antonij Nebrissensis**

As we have noted above, the Latin macrostructure of Nebrija's *Lexicon* (Latin-Spanish) and Busa's *Vocabularius* (Latin-Catalan) is identical. Busa did not eliminate entries from or add entries to Nebrija's work; he restricted his efforts to translating the Spanish terms in Catalan. Exhibit 33 (based on data in Lépinette 1992: 237) illustrates similarities in French and Catalan glosses which tend to confirm that Catalan rather than Spanish influenced the choice of French equivalents by the unknown author of the VN.

**Exhibit 33: Comparison of glosses in Lexicon 1492, Busa 1507 and VN 1511**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lemmata</th>
<th>Lexicon 1492</th>
<th>Busa 1507</th>
<th>VN 1511</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asoratum</td>
<td>pavimento de azulejos</td>
<td>pavimento de raioletes pintadas</td>
<td>pavement painture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyosciamos</td>
<td>Veleño erba</td>
<td>erba mandragora</td>
<td>herba mandragore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurodes</td>
<td>acelga silvestre</td>
<td>Bleda silvestre</td>
<td>blete silvestre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicto. is</td>
<td>Gañir el can [...]</td>
<td>glapir lo ca [...]</td>
<td>glapir [...] iaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nymbus, vi-treus</td>
<td>redoma de vidro</td>
<td>ampolla de vidre</td>
<td>ampoule de voire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notesco</td>
<td>anochecer</td>
<td>vesprir</td>
<td>envesprir [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nape</td>
<td>nombre de perro en ovidio</td>
<td>nom de gos en lo ovodi</td>
<td>nom de gos en ovide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a) Morphological similarities**

**b) Addition of details**

**c) Omission of details**

**d) Aberrant translations (calques)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acras</th>
<th>el guadapero, arbol silvestre</th>
<th>arbre silvestre</th>
<th>arbre salvaige</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdomen</td>
<td>por la ijada gruessa del pescado</td>
<td>llada grassa del peix</td>
<td>isle ou croit la poi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acapnus</td>
<td>por eosa sin homo</td>
<td>cosa sin fum</td>
<td>chose sans fon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamolisis</td>
<td>siervo de pitagoras filosofo</td>
<td>catiu de pitagoras filosof</td>
<td>filz de pitagoras: crestien</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lépinette (1992: 238) notes that the lemmata in d) above are absent from the *Catholicon*, and surmises that when the author of *VN* did not know the French translation for a Catalan term, and the lemma was not included in a text to which he could refer, he often did not eliminate the term from his own nomenclature but substituted a calque of the Catalan form. (It seems certain that his understanding of Catalan was limited.)

From a comparison of 587 entries in four samples, Lépinette (1992: 240) calculates that additions to the macrostructure of the *VN* which do not appear in Busa or Nebrija amount to roughly ten percent of *VN*’s macrostructure. A large number are drawn from the *Catholicon*, Papias and the *Vocabularius breviloquus* (id. 1992: Annexe, 255). Many of the additions are linked to religion, which is not surprising, since the author intended his work primarily for use by preachers (see title on p. 166 *infra*). This tendency is particularly noticeable in articles which retain Busa’s traductive structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Busa 1507</em></th>
<th><em>VN 1511</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria <em>la cuitat de Egyptte et altres</em></td>
<td><em>Alexandria Une cite deegpte dont est saincte</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acheldemach <em>ager sanguis interpretatur</em></td>
<td><em>Acheldemach le champ qui fut achete des deniers dont fut vendu dieu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precuro <em>corre davant</em></td>
<td><em>Precuro courir devant iohannes precurrit citius Petro ut habetur in evangelio il alla devant saint Pirre</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.1.2. *Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus*

Lépinette (1992: 248) admits that there are evidently other sources which she has not discovered. We believe that one of these other sources is the *Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus* (*VFC*), the Latin-French dictionary discussed in 5.0. Appendix 6 sets out the lemmata beginning with ‘Z’ in *VFC*, Busa 1507 and *VN* 1517. The most striking aspects are the expansion in the macrostructure of *VN* and the correspondence in lemmata between *VFC* and *VN*.

It seems that the compiler of *VN* took large sections alternately from Busa and from *VFC* (in much the same way as the compiler of *MPST* took material alternately from Papias and the *Catholicon*), and combined them in second-letter alphabetical order. Exhibit 34 shows that articles beginning with ‘Z’ which are drawn from *VFC* tend to fall into three categories:
### Exhibit 34: Comparison of glosses in *Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus*, Busa 1507 and VN 1517

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFC</th>
<th>Busa 1507</th>
<th>VN 1517</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a) Articles are entirely new.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zabema, Zabeteria, Zabara vel Zabarca est locus ubi ponuntur vestes vel libri vel quodlibet allud comme huche, aumaire ou cofre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Zabema e. Zabeteria, Zabara vel Zabrica pour le lieu a mettre livres, robes ou autre choses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zabulus vel Zabulon i. contrarius vel transgressor, ipse enim est diabolus unde Zabulinus .na .num de diable et Zabuligena .ne filz de diable, de contraire ou de transgresseur i. zabulo genitus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Zabulus vel Zabulon i. contrarius vel transgressor et ponitur pro diablo. unde Zabulinus a. um. de diable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **b) All articles belonging to a particular family from both texts are included.** | | |
| - | Zeta. e. edifici era axicom ximinea | Zeta e. e. un certain edifice |
| Zeta. te maison ou chambre conclaivis, secissus et inventur in passione sancti Thome zetas hiemales et zetas estivales - secundum Papiam zetas hiemales dicimus domus quas calidas facit subducta flamma, gallice estuves et zetas estivales dicimus esse domus quas frigidas facit subducta aqua chambr maison a refroidier | Zetecula. e. aquell edifici petit | Zeta etiam la derniere lettre de a.b.c.z. |

| **c) Articles from VFC are substituted for those of the same family in Busa.** | | |
| Zelotipus .pa .pum envieux, sous-peconneux ou jaloux comme de sa femme ou femme de son mari | Zelotipus i. per lo gelos | Zelotipus a. um. envieux suspiconneux ou jaloux: comme l'homme de femme vel econsverso |
| Zelotypia .tipe jalousie, envie, suspision et dicuntur a zelus .li | Zelotypia. e. per la gelosa | Zelotypia e. jalousie: envie: suspicion |
| Zelotypo .pas .i. invidere vel suspiconem habere et potest poni transitive ut: iste zelotipat uxorem suam .i. habet suspicionem de ea | Zelotypo .as. avi. per allo mateix | Zelotypo as. envier: suspicionner, potest enim poni transitive ut iste zelotipat uxorem suam il a suspicion de sa femme |
| Zelor .aris .atus sum vel fui .ari - amare aimer .i. zalere - Zelatus .ta .um invidit vel amavit | Zelosus a. um. amoureux: ou plain d'envie ou jaloux | Zelor aris. aymer: zeler: ou envier |
| Zelo .as .tum aimer ou avoir envie amare vel invidere, ut in Psalm: zelavi super iniquos | Zelotes tis. idem jaloux | Zelo as. aymer ou avoir envie zelavi super iniquos extra |
| Zelosus .sa .sum - zelo plenus comparatur amoureux ou plain d'envie ou jalous propre quod et zelotes dicitur - Zelotes .tis idem, emulator jalous | Zelosus a. um. amoureux: ou plain d'envie ou jaloux | Zelosus tis. idem jaloux |
| Zelo .as .tum aimer ou avoir envie amare vel invidere, ut in Psalm: zelavi super iniquos | Zelotes tis. idem jaloux | Zelosus tis. idem jaloux |
| Zelosus .sa .sum - zelo plenus comparatur amoureux ou plain d'envie ou jalous propre quod et zelotes dicitur - Zelotes .tis idem, emulator jalous | Zelosus a. um. amoureux: ou plain d'envie ou jaloux | Zelosus tis. idem jaloux |
We have considered the possibility that the source of the articles in letter-section 'Z' might be an edition from Series 2 of the *Catholicon abbreviatum*, because of the close similarity of this section in *VFC* and Series 2 of the *CA* (see 4.1.2.). However, we have concluded that this explanation is unlikely since there is at least one instance in which the article in the *VN* corresponds to that in the *VFC* but not to that in the *CA*:

**VFC**

| Zeb interpretatur lupus unde | Zebe hostia lupi quam scilicet suffocavit |

**CA 1492**

| Zeb. interpretatur lupus |

**VN 1517**

| Zeb interpretatur lupus iou Zebe es. le sacrifice du lou ou de la beste quam scilicet suffocavit |

### 6.1.3. *Catholicon abbreviatum*

Lépinette (1992: 244) notes that the French translations in the *VN/EV* do not seem to be drawn from Latin-French lexica. She bases her conclusion (with which we agree) on comparison with *Aalma*, MP (the part published in Nobel 1986), and four editions of the *CA*.

There is one area, however, where it is possible that the *CA* made a modest contribution. Guillaume Le Moine, adapter of the series entitled *Epithoma vocabulorum* which was printed at Caen c.1529 by the firm of Michael Angier, concludes his title with a statement that he has added information about the gender of nouns and verbs (see p. 167 *infra*). Le Moine’s method is to use a system of abbreviations set against the right-hand column margin. These are the same signs used in the *CA* and they are located in the same place (both the abbreviations and the position are inherited by the *CA* from *Aalma*).

A likely direct connection between the two dictionaries lies in the fact that Michael Angier printed an edition of the *CA* for Laurent Hostenue c.1511–1512 (see 4.2.19.). It is not unreasonable to suppose that Guillaume Le Moine had seen a copy of Angier’s edition.

---

86 Lindemann (1994: 251f) compares the last thirteen entries of *VN 1511* with Nebrija 1492, *CA 1492 (MM)* and Nebrija 1506, without apparently regarding the *CA* as a possible source for some of them.
### 6.1.4. Dictionarium of Ambrogio Calepino

The title of the *Epitoma vocabulorum (EV)* also contains a list of sources (see p. 167 *infra*) which Le Moine claims to have used to augment and correct his base text (the VN). Calepino’s name is at the top of the list and is referred to again in the dedication (see p. 168 *infra*). A brief comparison of VN and EV indicates that the quantity of additions to the nomenclature of the latter is not large, and it seems unlikely that Le Moine actually drew on very many of the authorities he names. However, there is a possibility that he did take some material from the *Dictionarium* of Ambrogio Calepino.

The Augustinian Ambrosius Calepinus, or Ambrogio Calepino (1440–1510) spent some thirty years writing his encyclopaedic *Dictionarium* (Labarre 1975: 7). It was first published at Reggio nell’Emilia in 1502, and more than two hundred editions of it were printed up to 1799. The *Dictionarium*’s long life may be attributed to its later polyglot character. A large number of Latin versions printed in the early part of the sixteenth century already contained Greek equivalents for many Latin words; then, beginning in the 1540s, new languages were added, with some editions containing as many as eight languages. Depending on the country of publication, all modern European languages, as well as Greek and Hebrew, appeared in the *Dictionarium* at one time or another (*id.* 1975: 7).

The following exhibit compares some lemmata added by Le Moine to his *Epitoma vocabulorum*, with the same or similar words in Calepino:

**Exhibit 35: Comparison of Selected Lemmata in Calepino’s Dictionarium and Epitoma vocabulorum 1529 (VN/EV8)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dictionarium</th>
<th>VN/EV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malacia ae. mollicia cum maris fluctus omnino quiescunt &amp; languent...</td>
<td>Malacia e.: molesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammotreptus quod significet Aug. in interpretatione psal. declarat. Si eum inquit quaeris imitari &amp; ex illo pendere adhuc lacte vis nutrire &amp; fies mammotreptus quales dicuntur pueri qui diu sugunt quod non decet...</td>
<td>Mammotreptus: qui tette encor. m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatarius cui dantur mandata peragenda.</td>
<td>Mandatorius. a. um: a qui on mande. o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansuetari. qui feras mansuefaciunt.</td>
<td>Mansuetarius a. um.: aprivoise. o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastigophorus flagelliser servus abo aliis saepius casus: vel caedi dignus.</td>
<td>Mastigophorus a. um.: batais.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastas [...] sed proprie animalium. latine mamma.</td>
<td>Mastas: mamelle. gre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastuprari est manu tractando virilia run veneream peragere...</td>
<td>Mastuprari as: faire villenie de sa main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matta storea &amp; teges: quam fit canabbi lino iunco palma sirpo aut sparto.</td>
<td>Matta e: natte idem quod storea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazonomum pe. cor. graeca dictio qua lanx significatur ad ferenda obsonia in mensam.</td>
<td>Mazonomum: plat ou escuelle. n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2. Filiation of the *Vocabularius nebrissensis*/*Epithoma vocabulorum*

Lindemann (1985: 66f., 1994: 253) identifies eleven editions of the VN/EV:

- **VN1**: *Vocabularius Nebrissensis*, Lyon, 1511
- **VN2**: *Vocabularius Nebrissensis*, Paris, 1516
- **VN3**: *Vocabularius nebrissensis*, Lyon, 1517
- **VN4**: *Vocabularius Nebrissensis*, Paris, 1523
- **VN5**: *Vocabularius nebrissensis*, Lyon, 1524
- **VN6**: *Vocabularius Nebrissensis*, Paris, 1528
- **VN/EV7**: *Epithoma vocabulorum* (Guillaume Le Moine), Caen, s.d. (vers 1529)
- **VN/EV8**: *Epithoma vocabulorum* (Guillaume Le Moine), Caen, 1529
- **VN/EV9**: *Epithoma vocabulorum* (Guillaume Le Moine), Caen, s.d. (c.1529)
- **VN10**: *Vocabularius Nebrissensis*, Paris, 1538
- **VN11**: *Vocabularius nebrissensis*, Lyon, 1541

Beaulieux (1904: 374) considers the edition by Regnault Chaudière of Paris (VN2) to be the oldest of the VN and gives it a date of 1500. However, Lindemann (1985: 67; 1994: 251) demonstrates that the Regnault Chaudière edition should be dated 1516, and states that the 1511 edition of Simon Vincent of Lyon (VN1) is the oldest and the tête de série.

The following research is based on Lépinette's examination of VN1 and VN10, on Lindemann's examination (we are not certain of the editions), and on our direct examination of VN3, and VN/EV8.

The title of VN1 reads:

\[ \text{Vocabularius Nebrissensis.} \]
\[ \text{Aelii Antonii Nebrissensis grammatici Lexicon, i.e., Dictionarium nuperrime ex Hispaniense in gallicum traductum eloquium: cum quamplurimis additionibus a papa et hugone excerptis. Predicatibus eloquentiam seu verbi copiam optantibus necnon ceteris tironibus terminorum explanationem scire volentibus summe pernecessarium. Quod si comparaveris cadidissi me lector te fraudatum esse non iudicabis.} \]

The reverse of the title page is occupied by a verse consisting of eight distichs, entitled *Ars ipsa ad lectores*. The following two folios are taken up on both sides by a long, pious exhortation to youth, which begins: *Ciusdam picardi dullendiensis ad iuvenes exhortatoria monitio*. (We assume the possibility that the unnamed "Picard of Doullens" is the translator of the first edition of the VN.) The incipit of the dictionary reads: *Aelii Anthonii nebrissensis grammatici lexicon id est dictionarium nuperrime ex hispaniense in gallicum traductum eloquium.*
The title of VN3 is set in a narrow border of religious figures, and above the printer's plaque (which also has a religious theme). There is a minor change in the title, wherein the last sentence, which began Quod si comparaveris..., now reads:

Habes insuper studiose lector compluram ut legendo cognoscere poteris accurate castigata.

The printer/bookseller is identified on the title page below his plaque:

¶ Venundantur Lugdunia Philippo guarin prope sanctum Antonium et Valentie prope sanctum apollinarem.

The verse Ars ipsa and the Picard's exhortation are in the same form and in the same place in VN3 as in VN1. Column b of the last page of VN3 concludes:

Deo gratias

¶ Finit vocabularius Aelii Anthonii Nebrissensis nuperimme cum multis additionibus. Impressus Lugduni anno Millesimo quingentesimo decimoquinto die vero mensis Octobris decimoquinto.

According to Lindemann (1994: 601f.), another sentence is added to the title of VN6:

Permuitas dictiones hoc in vocabulario fuisse nuperimme additas candidus lector facile cognoscet: immutatas item significaciones aliquot videbit: ut et copiosior: et catigatio in manus hominum libellus hic exiret.

The three editions produced at Caen by Michael and Gerard Angier for Guillaume Le Moine under the title Epithoma vocabulorum, present some variations from other editions of the VN and may be considered a separate branch of the series. The title page of VN/EV7 is entirely different from that of the Lyons series. Le Moine, who occupied a chair in the Faculty of Arts at the University of Caen from 1514 and is accorded by Delisle (1894: 14) "a modest place among the first French humanists" eliminates the religious motifs from the title page and replaces the title (which was addressed to preachers) with the following:

Epithoma vocabulorum
decrptum ex
Calepino Hemoia barbaro
Anthonio nebrissensi Erasmo roterodamo
Perotto Angelo policiano
Laurentio vallensi Anthonio codro
Theodoro gaza Januensi
Philippo beroaldo Cornucopia
Baptista pio Marco varrone
Et plusculis alius quod tandem auctum est et correctum a Guilemno monacho de villadei appositis item tum nominum tum verborum generibus cum antea dessent.
The title of VN/EV7 is followed by a verse consisting of eight distichs written by Magistri Jacobi le Roulx, Gonfrevillensis curati and addressed: Liber ad discipulos. The printer's name and address are at the bottom of the page:

¶ Venundantur Cadomi in edibus Michaelis angier iuxta conventum fratrum minorum.

Le Moine also removed the verse Ars ipsa and the exhortation to youth which appear in the earlier editions of the VN. In their place, on folio A.i.v is a dedication to Joannes Faber of Rouen, in which Guillaume Le Moine repeats his claim that his dictionary draws on several works, especially Calepino and Nebrija. The only existing copy of VN/EV7 is incomplete and lacks a colophon.

The title page of VN/EV8 begins with the title Epithoma vocabulorum and the same list of sources as does VN/EV7. The verse written by Master Jacob le Roulx is replaced by one from Dr. David Jore, which begins ¶ David lorius Condetanus Subviriacus Franciscum mousseum motanum salutat. The page concludes with the same identification of Michael Angier as does VN/EV7. The dedication to Joannes Faber on folio A.i.v is replaced by a letter which begins:

¶ David lorius Condetanus subviriacus Guilelmm Mon- nachum Villadeum preter humanas litteras Theologica disciplina preditum. Salute impertitur.

The one-page letter ends Anno a christo nato M.D.xxix. septimo idus februarias, thus providing the only date among the three editions published at Caen. Column b on the last page of VN/EV8 ends:

¶ DEO GRATIAS.

¶ Epithomatis vocabulorum ex calepino et nebrissensi: et alliis plusculis excerpti aucti et correcti per Guilelmm mon- nachum de viladei.

¶ FINIS

The preliminary pages of VN10 differ slightly from those in earlier editions of VN. The title reads:

Vocabularius Nebrissensis. Aelii Antoni Nebrissensis Grammatici luculentissimi de lingua latina bene meriti Lexi- con id est Dictionarium nunc denique post omnium editiones diligentissime Impressum catigatumque accuratis-
At the end of the text, a colophon reads:

Escutum parisiis in officina Calcographica honesti viri
Joannis Savetier. Anno publice salutis MCCCCXXXVIII <sic>

The verse *Ars ipsa ad lectorem* appears as usual on folio a.ii, followed by other distichs which are not found in previous editions of *VN*, but which appeared in the 1507 edition of Busa’s Latin-Catalan/Catalan-Latin dictionary. The names of the authors, Martí Ivarra and Joan Garganter, included in Busa, are omitted from *VN10*. Folio a.iii of this edition presents an exact reproduction of Gabriel Busa’s declaration to his Provincial which opened his 1507 edition. Beginning on folio a.iii is the pious exhortation to youth which appeared in earlier editions of *VN*, without change except for omission of the reference to the “Picard of Doullens”. Lépinette (1992: 236) concludes from the inclusion of material from Busa (1507) that the author of *VN10* had access to a copy of Busa’s dictionary.

6.3. Conclusion

Lépinette (1992) and Lindemann (1985 and 1994: ch. 3.) have thoroughly described the internal and external (i.e. in relation to other contemporary Latin-French dictionaries) characteristics of the macrostructure and the microstructure of the *VN/EV*. We do not believe it is useful to recapitulate their findings here. However, in Chapter 8.0. we discuss the *VN/EV*’s consultability in comparison with the other printed bilingual dictionaries in our corpus.

Busa preserved the integrity of Nebrija’s dictionary when he compiled his Latin-Catalan adaptation. It is clear, however, that the compiler of the *VN* did not understand the originality of Nebrija’s work and, moreover, had a different purpose in mind. As Lépinette (1992: 251) accurately observes, "The culture implicit in the *VN* and that underlying Nebrija-Busa belong to the same period but they come from two different intellectual worlds: medieval vs. humanist. The distance between them is clearly shown in the changes effected in the work of the Spanish humanist by the French compiler."

---

Robert Estienne (1503–1559) was the son of a Parisian printer, Henri Estienne, and (following his father’s death in 1520), the stepson of another printer, Simon de Collines. After finishing his studies, Robert worked for his stepfather until about 1526, when he established himself as an independent printer in premises formerly occupied by his father in the Clos Bruneau, rue St-Jean de Beauvais (Brandon 1904: 3f.). He exercised his trade there until his move to Geneva in 1550, where he continued to print until his death.

As a printer, Robert Estienne’s program was a practical one. Over a period of more than thirty years it covered a wide range of Latin and Greek classics, several editions of the Bible in Latin as well as an edition in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek, grammars and other pedagogical works in both Latin and French, and several dictionaries, addressed to different audiences.

As an author and editor, we can say with Starnes (1963: 10) that “his was an historical and critical method like that of such humanist scholars as Colet and Erasmus”.

7.1. Early Lexicographical Works

Artz (1966: 84) tells us:

“The greatest undertaking of Spanish Renaissance Humanism was a polyglot text of the Bible in parallel columns of the original languages and a Latin translation. This was the favorite enterprise of Cardinal Ximenes; it was completed in 1522 after Ximenes’ death. This work was one of the great monuments of scholarship and printing skill in the first half of the sixteenth century. In the Old Testament the Latin Vulgate was printed between the Hebrew text and the Greek Septuagint.”

This Bible, usually called the Complutensian Polyglot Bible, comprises six volumes, of which Volume VI is a glossary of Hebrew, Chaldean, Greek and Latin words (Starnes 1963: 16). Robert Estienne based his first lexicographical work on the glossary in the Complutensian Bible. It is a glossary of proper names in the Scriptures and an index of the Old Testament,

---

89 Brandon (1904: 6) believes it more likely that Robert Estienne was born in 1498.
90 Archbishop of Toledo, Primate of Spain, and founder of a University at Alcalá.
92 Complutum was the former name of Alcalá.
entitled *Hebraea, Chaldaea, Graeca et Latina nomina*, which was a companion volume to his first edition of the Bible, printed in 1528. The 1532 edition includes an enlarged glossary and an index of both Old and New Testaments. Such a glossary and index are found in all of Estienne’s subsequent editions of the Latin Bible (*id.* 1963: 10f.).

In 1537, Estienne published the glossary of proper names and the index to the Scriptures as a separate work with the title:

```
Hebraea, Chaldaea, Graeca et Latina nomina virorum, mulierum, populatorum, idolorum, urbium, fluviorum, montium, caeterorumque locorum quae in Bibliis leguntur, restituta, cum Latina interpretatione.
Locorum descriptio ex Cosmographis.
Index praeterea rerum et sententiarum quae in iisdem Bibliis continentur.
Parisis
Ex officina Roberti Stephani.
M. D. XXXVII.
```

Estienne acknowledges his debt to the Complutensian Bible at the beginning of this independent edition of the glossary: *Deinde, interpretationem, quae in Bibliis Compluti impressis erat, in omnibus fere se curi sumus* (*id.* 1963: 17). Armstrong (1956: 90) remarks that this glossary "is virtually a dictionary".

Further evidence of Estienne’s feeling that proper names needed separate treatment comes from his revision of a dictionary of proper nouns compiled by Herman Torrentius (first printed in 1498). Estienne printed the *Dictionarium poeticum quod vulgo inscribatu Elucidarius Carminum* in 1530 and again in 1535. This text was the basis for his own work entitled *Elucidarius poeticus, sive Dictionarium nominum proprium*, published in 1541, "but his compilation deals more completely and systematically with the proper names found in ancient literature, with details and references, and incorporates general geographical information of a kind not to be found in the older book at all" (*id.* 1956: 90).

Estienne’s first large, original lexicographical work appeared in 1531: his *Dictionarium, seu Latinae linguae Thesaurus*, usually called *Thesaurus*.

### 7.2. *Dictionarium, seu Latinae linguae Thesaurus*

Brandon (1904: 27f.) defines three stages in the development of Latin lexicography from the invention of printing until Estienne produced his large lexicographical works.
The first stage is represented by John Balbi’s *Catholicon*. It was the first dictionary to be printed (see p. 111 *supra*) and it dominated the field in the last half of the fifteenth century. The nomenclature of the *Catholicon* contains ancient and medieval words, and the microstructure is a mixture of encyclopaedic articles and shorter ones. Balbi’s citations are drawn mainly from earlier lexica including Papias and Hugutio, from the Vulgate and the Church Fathers, as well as from grammarians and commentators. From the humanist viewpoint, the *Catholicon* "lacks a solid base: that is, a classical vocabulary supported by citations from authors of good Latinity" (*id.* 1904: 28). We would also include in the first stage the Latin dictionary called *Vocabularius breviloquus*, compiled by Johannes Reuchlin from a manuscript dictionary based on the *Catholicon* (see 5.1.2.), and first published in 1475.

The *Comuccopiae sive linguae latinae commentarii* of Nicholas Perotto, published in 1489 (nine years after Perotto’s death), represents the second stage in printed Latin dictionaries. Perotto carefully selected Latin words and studied them thoroughly in order to comment on their meaning and their classical usage. The consultability of the *Comuccopiae* is aided by an appendix in which the words commented on are listed in alphabetical order with a reference to the page on which they are treated (*id.* 1904: 28). The second stage should probably also include the *Commentarii linguae latinae* based chiefly on Ciceronian usage, written by Étienne Dolet. Although Dolet was a contemporary of Robert Estienne (the *Commentarii* were published in two volumes in 1536–1538), his method was entirely different, as Christie (1964: 244f.) explains:

"The work of Robert Estienne was a dictionary [...], in which the alphabetical order was followed, and in which each word was explained by itself and without regard to its relationship to others. Dolet, on the contrary, arranged his words according to their connection with each other, or rather with the ideas which they expressed. The commentary upon one word is followed by a commentary upon the words of a like character, and then upon those which are contrary or dissimilar."

The third stage in dictionary development, according to Brandon, is found in the *Dictionarium* of Ambrogio Calepino (see 6.1.4.). Calepino’s principal source appears to have been a thematic dictionary written by Franciscus Grapaldus, entitled *Lexicon de partibus aedium*, and first printed in Parma in 1494 (Collison 1982: 64, Green 1996: 50). Each of the
twenty-four chapters of the *Lexicon* begins with a description of the apparatus, instruments, furnishings, etc. of a particular part of a house (such as *Apotheca* or *Gynaecium*), but moves on to a general discussion of the subject (Green 1996:50f.), thus furnishing additional vocabulary and definitions.

It is almost certain that Calepino also used the *Catholicon* as a source. A number of its lemmata are found in the nomenclature of the *Dictionarium*: see Appendix 7 for a comparison of lemmata beginning *Mag-* in the two dictionaries. However, the structure of the articles is different in several respects, as we see from Exhibit 36:

**Exhibit 36: Article Abominor in the Catholicon and the Dictionarium of Ambrogio Calepino**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catholicon</th>
<th>Dictionarium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abominor</td>
<td>Abominor penultima correpta ex ab et ominor: de quo infra. Est autem abominari execrari fastidire et quasi pro malo omne habere. Pii. Abominamur recedente aliquo ab epulis simul verri solum: aut bibente conviva mensam vel repositorium tolli in auspiciatissimum iudecatur...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abominaris abominatus sum componitur ex ab et ominor omaris quod est auguror. et est abominari abhorrere aliquid cum excucracione repellere, execrari. detestari. vel malum omne imprecari. Unde hic abominium nii. execracio. et hec abominarum. liber ubi abominacionescribesbantur et correpta mi abominor. et est verbum deponens. Ro. ii Qui abominaris ydola sacrilegium facis.</td>
<td>Josse Bade et Jean Petit, Paris, 1516/1517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mainz 1460: reprint Gregg: Westmead 1971

In this example, Calepino retains phonetic and derivational information but omits grammatical details, and replaces the etymological definition with an internal reference. Linde-mann (1994: 118) points out another important difference between the two dictionaries, that is, the function of citations. She explains that in the *Catholicon* Balbi frequently uses citations to support the encyclopaedic commentary. By contrast, Calepino uses citations from classical authors to prove the purity of the Latin form.

Brandon (1904: 29) remarks that it appears Calepino did not draw his citations directly from the authors but rather took them from grammarians and commentators, which diminishes the scientific value of the work. Nevertheless, the *Dictionarium* represents a step forward from the *Catholicon*, through the elimination of much medieval Latin vocabulary, the number of citations, and the absence of encyclopaedic articles (although Calepino retains some proper nouns).
Calepino's dictionary was an immediate success and enjoyed a lasting reputation (see 6.1.4.). However, repeated printings and emendations soon made it a difficult work to consult, and about 1528\textsuperscript{93} Estienne was asked to produce an improved edition of Calepino's popular work. He approached several scholars whom he considered suited to the task but, such was the state of the work,\textsuperscript{94} no-one would agree to undertake it. Finally, Estienne decided to write an original work based on a fresh survey of Latin literature (Armstrong 1956: 85), exemplified by the best writers and glossed by the most authoritative commentators (Wooldridge 1989a: 177). The result of three years' intensive labour by Estienne was the appearance in 1531 of a new Latin dictionary, comprising 964 folios and containing a quantity of French interpretations, with the title:


Despite the fact that Estienne considered Calepino's work to be unsatisfactory in many ways, it is clear from the comparison in Exhibit 37 that in this case, at any rate, he used the Dictionarium as his basic source: eliminating, adding, correcting and reordering material according to his own plan, verifying or substituting citations, and adding French forms.

Exhibit 37: Article **Macer** in the *Dictionarium* of Ambrogio Calepino and the *Thesaurus* 1531 of Robert Estienne
Varro. Tum propter laborem asperantur: & macescunt.

Macio as. macrum facio. Cuius compositum est emacio: quod est valde macio. Col. lib. v. At certe in ordinariis vitibus utique obtinendum est ne pluribus flagellis emacientur nisi si futuria propaginibus propiciemus.


Josse Bade et Jean Petit, Paris. 1516/1517

Macritudo macritudinis, foem. gen. Idem. Plautus in Capt. 4.32. Ossa, atque pellis sum misera macritudine.

Macies maciei, foem. gen. Maigreté. Apuleius. Unde ista tam subita macies, & tantus pallor:

Maces maces, macui, macere, Estre maigre. Plaut. in Aulul. 16.28. Qui ossa. atque pellis totus est, ita cura macet.


Macreo macres, macrui, macere, Estre maigre.


Macerare, Mollificare, ut fit cum quippiam tam diu in aqua tenetur donec tenerescat. Mettre attendir en leave, Mettre destremer. Terent. in Adelphis. 3.3.27. Salsamenta haec Stephanieo fac ut macerentur probé. Columella lib. i. Piscinas duas, alteram quae anseribus, pecoribusque serviet: alteram in qua lupinum ulmi vimina, & virgas, atque alia, quae sunt usibus nostris apta, maceremus.


Maceratus macerata maceratum, Qui est amoll, attendi. Plaut. in Poenulo. 8.21. Macerato hoc pingues fiunt auro in Barbara boves.


Macro macras macpare, Faire mol. Unde EMACRARE. Vide loco suo.
Brandon (1904: 36) writes: "Estienne proposed three improvements in the science of lexicography: that is, purging of the vocabulary, verification of generally accepted interpretations, and more extensive use of classical citations with precise references". Estienne explains his methods in compiling the Thesaurus in a second Preface,95 and we discuss them in Chapter 8.

We should stress that the Thesaurus of 1531 (T1531) is not a bilingual dictionary. Brandon (1904: 48) affirms that Estienne had Latin and only Latin in mind. He intended T1531, which is addressed studiosis lectoribus, to be used both by students and by scholars knowledgeable in Latin (id. 1904: 50). However, he later recognized the need to separate his dictionaries into monolingual Latin and bilingual Latin-French works. In the second edition of the Thesaurus (T1536), he eliminated the expression Cum Gallica ferè interpretatione and replaced it with a list of the Latin writers cited in the text:

Dictionarium seu Latinae Linguae Thesaurus, non singulas modo dictiones continens, sed integras quoque Latine et loquendi, et scribendi formulas Catone, Varrone, Caesare, Cicerone, Livio, Columella, Plinio avunculo, Plinio secundo, Plauto, Terentio, Virgilio, Martiale. Cum Latina tum grammaticorum, tum vari generis scriptorum interpreta-
tione. Parisiis. Ex officina Roberti Stephani, 1536.

Estienne moderated the importance of French in this edition because he had in mind a project to publish a Latin-French dictionary.96 However, the absolute volume of French scarcely changed in T1536, due to the large quantity of new entries, of which a number include a French interpretation (Brandon 1904: 58, Wooldridge 1977: 21f.).

French was suppressed entirely in the 1543 edition of the Thesaurus, a huge work of more than 3,000 folios in three volumes, and the last edition published by Estienne.

Dictionarium, seu Latinae linguæ Thesaurus. Non singulas modo dictiones continens, sed integras quoque Latine et loquendi, ex scribendi formulae ex optimis quibusque authori-
bis, ea quidem nunc accessione, ut nihil propemodum observatu dignum sit apud Oratores, Historicos, Poetas, omnis denique generis scriptores, quod hic non promptum paratumque habeat. Editio secunda. Parisiis. Ex officina Roberti Stephani typographi regii, 1543.

95 See Brandon 1904: 36.
96 Preface to Thesaurus 1536: "[...] Tantum illa quae et in promptu et sine circumloquutione occurrerunt, non parem multa consulto praeter mittentes, adicimus: quae latius multo, ac fusius suo quoque loco, adhibitis prius in consilium viris doctis, in Latino-Gallico nostro dictionario, a nobis summo studio parique diligentia explicabuntur..."
In the title, Estienne calls this his second edition, but he refers to it as the third edition in the preface.

Wooldridge (1977: 21, n.8) remarks that the Thesaurus subsequently had a "glorious monolingual career". Posthumous editions appeared in Lyons in 1573, in London in 1734 and in Basle in 1740 (Brandon 1904: 59, n.2).

7.3. *Dictionarium Latino-gallicum*

Beginning with T1536, the Thesaurus was intended for the use of scholars. The elementary and practical part of the work was continued in another dictionary intended for students, which appeared in 1538, entitled the *Dictionarium Latino-gallicum* (DLG):


The elements for creating such a dictionary were already in place: a good Latin vocabulary, arranged in alphabetical order, with a substantial number of French translations. However, Brandon (1904: 62f.) stresses that the DLG is not simply an abridgement of T1536, for Estienne devoted considerable effort to refining and adding French material. Although it contains a greater quantity of French, the DLG is a much smaller text (757 pages): rare and outdated Latin entries are omitted, as are the names of writers and authorities.

Exhibit 38 illustrates the successive changes made by Estienne in the article *Macer* in the transition from T1531 to T1536 to DLG:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesaurus 1531</th>
<th>Thesaurus 1536</th>
<th>DLG 1538</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Macero
Macresco
Macreo
Macesco
Macritudo
Macies
Macmr
Macilentus
Macerare,
cibi macrescat pecus. Varro, Qui earum
refertur. Facere. à quo Emacio. Vide loco
morbus
Sas. Dabimusque
Columella
SUO.
Arva segetibus eius (scilicet
Macrum
Plaut. in Capt. 4.32, Ego qui tuo
macescere:
Esto maigre.
Sas.
Columella
156, Qui ossa, atque pellis sum
misera macritudine.
Macilentus, adiect. Idem. Festus, Macilenti, macie attenuati. Plaut. in
lib. 2. cap. 9.3.
Macellus, adiect. diminut. pro
Macilento. Lucilius lib. 6. Si
nisti, magnus homo est, nasu-
tus, macellus. Nonius.
Macilento
Sed quo facie est
Rhod. estiam illa
arvae segetibus eis (scilicet
hordei) macescoere. Varro, Tum
propter laborem aspersantur &
macescunt.
Macio
Macies,
Macrum
facere. À quo Emacio. Vide loco
suo.
Macero
Macreses, macui,
macescere: Devenir maigre.
Plaut. in Capt. 4.32. Ego qui tuo
moerore maceror, macesco,
consenesco, & tabesco miser.
Columella libro secundo, Constat
arva segetibus eis (scilicet
hordei) macescoere. Varro, Tum
propter laborem aspersantur &
macescunt.
Macesco, macescis, macui,
macescere: Devenir maigre.
Plaut. in Capt. 4.32. Ego qui tuo
moerore maceror, macesco,
consenesco, & tabesco miser.
Columella libro secundo, Constat
arva segetibus eis (scilicet
hordei) macescoere. Varro, Tum
propter laborem aspersantur &
macescunt.
Macerare,
Mollificare, ut fit cum
quipiam tam diu in aqua
tenetur donec tenerescat.
Mette attendrir en leau,
Mette destremper. Terent. in
Adelphis. 3. 3. 27. Salsamenta
haec Stephanio fac ut mace-
rentur probé. Columella lib. i,
Piscinas duas, alteram quae
graeco deduci putat. Graeci enim
μορφα longum dicunt. Quae
autem tenuia sunt, longiora
videntur.
Macrum solum, Cic. pro lege
Agra. 69.
Macer libellus, Mart. lib. 2. 6.
Macrior vitis. Colum. lib. 4. cap.
24. 8.
Pinguissima vel macerrima
humus. Colum. lib. 2. cap. 9.3.
Macerare, Fort
Macerate, participium.
Macresco, macrescis, macresce-
re. Devenir maigre.
Macero, maceres, macerare,
Faire maigre, Amaigrir.
Macerare, Fort mouylier, &
laver ou tremper.
Maceratus, participium.
Macresco, macrescis,
macescere, Se tremper &
amollir.
Robert Estienne, Paris, 1538
anseribus, pecoribusque serviat: alteram in qua lupunum ulmi vimina, & virgas, atque alia, quae sunt usibus nostris apta, maceramus.

**Macerare se.** Se affliger, & contrister tellement que lon devienne maigre. Plaut. in trinummo, 5.2. Multas res simul in meo corde vorso, multum in cogitando dolorem indipiscor, egomet me concoquo, & macero, & defatigo. Idem in Milite, 10.22. At hoc me facinus miserum macerat. ldem in Capt. 4.30. Qui tuo merore maceror. Terent. in And. 4.2.2. Tu modo anime min te macerare. Ibidem. 5.3.15. Sed quid ego: cur me excrucion: cur me macero: ldem in Eunu. 1.2.107, Rus ibo: ibo hoc macerabo biduum.

**Maceratus** macerata maceratum, Qui est amolli. attendri. Plaut. in Poenuo, 8.21. Macerato hoc pingues fiunt auro in Barbaria boves.


Robert Estienne, Paris, 1531
tigo. Idem Milite, 10.22.
- at hoc me facinus miserum macerat,
Meúmque cor, corpúisque cru-
ciat. Idem Capt. 4.30, Qui tuo
moerore maceror. Terent. And.
4.2.2, Tu modo anime me noli
te macerare. Ibidem. 5.3.15.
Sed qui ego: cur me excrucio?
cur me macero? Idem Eunuch.
1.2.107, Rus ibo: ibi hoc me
macerabo biduum.

**Maceratus**, particip. Mollis &
tener factus. Plaut. Poemul.
8.21, Macerato hoc pingues
fiunt auro in Barbaria boves.

**Maceresco**, macerescis,
macerescere, Maceratum fiere,
Antiquum. Cato de re rustica.
Frumento curgulio ne noceat,
neu mures tangant, lutum de
amurca facito: palearum paulum
addito, finito macerescant.

**Macro**, macras, macrare, unde
**EMACRARE**. Vide suo loco.

Robert Estienne, Paris, 1536

The *DLG* was reprinted almost without change in 1543 and 1544. It was printed again in 1546, when greater care was given to the use of French, so as to capture accurately the meaning of the Latin. In addition, the mention of sources was restored, giving the *DLG* a more erudite aspect.

Dictionarium Latino-gallicum multo locupletius. Thesauro nostro recens excuso ita ex adverso respondens, ut extra paua quaeadam aut absoleta, aut minus usitata vocula,
in hoc eadem sina omnia, eodem ordine, sermone patrio
explicata: adjectis authorum appellotionibus quas in
superiore Latino-gallico praetermisimus.
Lutetiae. Ex officina Roberti Stephani typographi regii, 1546.

Wooldridge (1977: 21) explains that this latter change was caused by the introduction in 1542 of a second series of Latin-French dictionaries, the *Dictionariolum puerorum*, based on an abridgement of the *DLG*.

The *DLG* was reprinted twice more in Paris: by Robert’s brother, Charles Estienne, in 1552, and by his brother-in-law, Jacques du Puys, in 1561.

**7.4. Dictionaire Francoislatin**

We have no indication that Estienne planned to produce a French-Latin dictionary at the time he first printed the *DLG* in 1538. However, whether through his own inspiration or through the sug-
gestion of others, he soon set to work on reversing the DLG to create the first printed dictionary in which French is the language of entry, the *Dictionaire Francoislatin*.

The *DFL* of 1539 is a small dictionary, 527 pages printed two columns per page. It contains very little new material over that in the DLG; rather, it is a question of rearrangement according to a plan similar to that used by Estienne in his earlier dictionaries (Brandon 1904: 66). Exhibit 39 illustrates the treatment in the *DFL* of the French originating in the article *Macer* in the *DLG*. We discuss Estienne’s method in Chapter 8.

*Exhibit 39: Article Macer in Dictionarium Latino-gallicum 1538 and corresponding articles in Dictionaire Francoislatin 1539*

**DLG 1538**


Macrum solum.
Macer libellus.
Macior vitis.
Pinguissima & macerrima humus, contraria.


Macilentae maleae.


De sua sollicitudine macié que narret.

*Maceo*, maces, macui, macere, *estre maigre.*

*Macesco*, macescis, macui, macescere, *Devenir maigre.*


*Macreo*, macres, macrui, sive

*Macresco*, macescis, macrescere, *Devenir maigre.*

*Macero*, maceras, macerare, *Faire maigre, Amaigrir.*

† *Macerare se*, S’amaigrir, & macerer son corps de cure et chagrin qu’on prend.


Macerare brassicam in aquam.

† *Macerare*, Fort mouillir, & laver ou tremper.

*Maceratus*, participium.


**DFL 1539**

*Amaigrire.*

*Amaigrire*, Emaciare, Macerare.

*Amollir.*

*Amollir*, [...] Amollir & attendrir en leaue, Macerare.


*Maire*, Gracilis, Macer, Obesus.

*Fort maigre*, Macilentus

*Devenir maigre*, Macescere, Macrescere, Emaciari.

Estre maigre, Macere.

Faire maigre, Macerare.

*Maigreté*, Macor sive Macor, Gracilitas.

*Maigreur*, Macor.


*Mouillir*, [...] Fort mouillir et laver et tremper, Macerare.

*Tremper*. *Trémépé*. *Trempe ment.*

*Tremper*, [...] Se tremper et amollir, Macerescare.

Robert Estienne, Paris, 1539

---

97 Wooldridge (1977: 23, n. 16 and n. 17) advises that of 49 bilingual items on the first page of the letter ‘T’ of DLG 1538, 43 are found in DFL 1539; and of 67 bilingual items on the first page of the letter ‘T’ of DFL 1539, 63 come from DLG 1538.
Estienne's purpose in compiling the DFL is set out in the preface: to assist French youth in their study of Latin literature. Encouraging the use of proper Latin was still the focus of Estienne's efforts. Although the form was in place for a dictionary in which French would have equal status with Latin, it would only be in the second edition of the DFL, printed in 1549, that the conception would join the form (id. 1977: 25).

7.5. Conclusion

Robert Estienne was a remarkable combination of scholar, author, editor, printer and businessman. He is most often honoured for producing correct editions of the Bible and making them available to a large number of readers. Among his many other accomplishments, he also made outstanding contributions to the field of lexicography. Wooldridge (1977: 19) tells us:

"En l’espace de neuf ans, Robert Estienne créa trois dictionnaires qui firent date dans les lexicographies latine et française : le Latinae linguae Thesaurus, le Dictionarium latinogallicum (DLG) et le Dictionaire francoislatin (DFL)."

He continues (1977: 23):

"Si le Thesaurus d’Estienne a marqué le commencement de la lexicographie latine moderne, son Dictionaire Francoislatin contenant les motz & manieres de parler Francois, tournez en Latin de 1539 [...] n’en fait pas moins pour la française."

---

98 Preface to DFL 1539: "Pour ce que la profession de nost’art nous enhorte a faire tousjours quelque chose qui soit utile en general a tous ceux qui entendent au faict des lettres: ou pour le moins duisant aux apprentiz pour lesquelz il fault d’autant plus soigner, qu’ilz ont greigneur besoing de secours, que ceulx qui ont acquiz quelque ruze, et peuvent d’eux mesmes, sans l’aide d’autruy, passer par les destroictz de la langue Latine: A ceste cause apres avoir mis en lumiere le grand Thresor d’icelle langue, lequel peut servir a toutes gens de quelque hault scavor qu’ilz soyent garniz: nous avons mis cueur & entente au soulagement de la ieunesse Francoise, qui est sur son commencement & bachelage de litterature. Si leur avons faict deux livres: L’ung commenceant par les motz Latins deschiffrez en Francois: qui fut publie des l’annee precedente. L’autre est cestuy cy qui va prenant les motz de la langue Francoise, les mettant apres en Latin tout au plus pres qu’il s’est peu faire."
8.0. TYPOLOGICAL SUMMARY

The eighty years from the first printed edition of the Catholicon to the appearance of the Dictionaire Francoislatin is a brief period in the history of Western lexicography, but in that short space of time fundamental changes occurred in both the form and the content of dictionaries. We examine some of those changes in this chapter.

8.1. Consultability

The degree of consultability varies widely among early printed dictionaries, just as it does among manuscript ones. Much of the variation is related to progress in the new technology of printing, which we discuss in 8.1.2. In 8.1.1. we look at certain aspects of the nomenclature, in much the same way as we discussed pre-print lexica in 3.1.1.

8.1.1. Classes represented in the macrostructure

8.1.1.1. Grammatical words

Looking first at Latin monolingual dictionaries, we observe that most of the common prepositions and conjunctions are included in the Vocabularius breviloquus, in the section which Reuchlin calls Indeclinabilia. Pronouns are included under Nomina. Conjunctions, prepositions and pronouns are well-represented in Calepino’s Dictionarium, where each part of speech is identified and then illustrated by several examples of the use of the word.

The first of the bilingual dictionaries, the Catholicon abbreviatum, is the printed version of Aalma, and grammatical words are present in its nomenclature in the same proportion as in the manuscripts (see p. 73 supra); that is, most prepositions are included, fewer conjunctions, and still fewer pronouns. The Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus contains all of the common prepositions and conjunctions, and most of the pronouns, in just the same way as its close relative, the Dictionarius of Firmin Le Ver.

The articles containing grammatical words in Vocabularius nebrissensis are similar to those in CA: identification of the part of speech in Latin or French, followed by a short French definition:

Ast. coniunctio mais. (VN3)
At coniunction adversative mays. (VN3)
Identification of parts of speech is still inconsistent throughout our corpus. For example, An, which is called a conjunction in the manuscript dictionaries in which it occurs, is identified in VN/EV as *adverbe interrogatif*. Also in Estienne’s *Dictionarium Latino-gallicum* the entry for An begins: *adverbia est interrogativum*.

All common grammatical words are found in Estienne’s *Thesaurus* and *DLG*. The part of speech is identified, followed by examples, some of them with French translations. The examples are set one under the other, rather than one after the other as in Calepino.

Since the *DFL* of 1539 does not contain grammatical and similar information, grammatical words are not identified. Prepositions include: Du, En, Pour, etc. and conjunctions include: Et, Car, Mais, and so on. Definite articles do not appear in the nomenclature of the *DFL* although they are included in some entries, for example, L’esté, *Le siege de l’homme*. Brandon (1904: 67) explains that the article is not prefixed to the noun to identify the gender, but rather because these nouns were most commonly encountered with one article or another. The indefinite article, *Un*, on the other hand, does have entry status.

A large number of pronouns occur as entries in *DFL* 1539, including: *Ce, Ceci, Celuy, Ceste, Cestuy, Dont, Je, Luy, Mien, Mon, Moy, Nostre, Nous, Que, Quel,Quelque, Sien, Soy, Toy, Toymesme, Vostre, Vous*, etc.

**8.1.1.2. Affixes**

The *Thesaurus* and *DLG* contain the six prefixes which *in compositione solum reperiuntur* (*DLG*), that is, *am, con, di, dis, re* and *se*, as well as the enclitic suffixes *met, ne, ve*. Each is followed by examples of use, supported by citations.

In both the Latin and the Latin-French dictionaries in our corpus, free-standing Latin prepositions such as *ante, circum* and *extra*, are used in composition as prefixes:

*Anteactus*, participium sine verbo, ex ante & actus (*DLG*)

**8.1.1.3. Compounds**

Many compounds have entry status in alphabetical order in the *CA* and the *VN/EV*, but they are rarely identified as such:
In the VFC, compounds are often identified by the connectors *componitur* and *dictio composita*:

**Necdum** adverbium .i. nundum, non adhuc, non statim. et est una dictio composita.

Compounds are equally numerous in Calepino, but are seldom identified. An exception is:

**Mediusfidius** compositum est...

Compounds often occur in the microstructure of all of the dictionaries, both with and without identification:

- **Vulnero** .ras. a.p.i. sauciare. vulnus facere Et componitur **Convulnero** .ras ... *(VB)*
- **Heredito** .tas [...] componuntur **Coheredo** .das et **Coheredito** .tas, **Exheredo** .das et **Exheredito** .tas *(VFC)*
- **Servo** as. [...] **Conservo. Observo. Preservo. Reservo.** (Calepino).
- **Macio** as. macrum facio. Cuius compositum est **Emacio**... *(Calepino)*

The use of connectors such as *componitur* was declining with Calepino, and virtually disappeared with Robert Estienne. Although Estienne’s dictionaries in our corpus contain a large quantity of compounds both as entries and as sub-entries, their articles (and micro-articles) do not include connectors. For example:

- **ALIUSMODI**, adverbium, *Dune autre faceon, ou maniere*. Caesar, Uno enim excepto, quem aliusmodi, atque omnis natura finxit, suos quisque habebat charos. *(T1531)*
- **Macio** macias maciare, Macrum facere. à quo **EMACIO**. Vide loco suo. *(T1531)*

In the case of the last example, we can be sure that the compound does occur in the nomenclature.

### 8.1.1.4. Derivatives

Derivatives in the alphabetical dictionaries, the *CA, VFC, VN/EV* and Calepino, usually have separate entry status although, as we have seen, traces of earlier family relationships often persist in the ordering. Occasionally in the *CA and VN/EV*, and more frequently in *VFC*, derivatives occur within articles as sub-lemmata, and are commonly introduced by *inde* or *unde*.

- **Matureo** es ui. *mature. devenir meur*. Inde maturesco. *(MM)*
- **Lotrix** .cis [...] unde **Lavatus** .ta .tum et **Lavatio** .onis *(VFC)*
Connectors used to express derivation are much the same as those found in manuscript dictionaries: *dicitur, descendit, fit, ab, ex*, etc.

- *Abies* ei. est quedam pes metrificandi. et dicitur de abeo abis: quia cito abit. (UL1)
- *Equester* ab eques fit: ... (Calepino)
- *Obdo* is. ex ob & do. (Calepino)

Etymologies occur occasionally in Estienne’s dictionaries:

- *ACCIDO*, accidis, accidi, accisum, accidere, Ex ad & caedo caedis ... (T1531)

### 8.1.1.5. Proper nouns

Proper nouns, identifying both places and people, are found only occasionally in VFC, but somewhat more often in CA, usually with their derivatives, as in the following example from UL1:

- *Affrica* affrice. proprium nomen regionis. *affrique* f
- *Affricanus* affricana affricanum. *celuy qui est d’affrique* o

Proper nouns are present in large numbers in VN/EV, because they are frequent in its source document, the *Lexicon* of Nebrija. Many of them originate in a language other than Latin: Greek, Syrian, Hebrew, etc., although the original language is seldom identified:

- *Attis*: *la fille de Crannus qui denomma de son nom Athenes*. (VN3)
- *Azana*: *une region de Ethiopie*. (VN3)

Estienne included proper nouns in **T1531** and **T1536**:

- *Cronciades*. Unus ex praestantioribus Herculis filiis, ex Magara Creantis Thebanorum regis filia. (T1536)

However, he omitted them from DLG and DFL, because by the time those works appeared he had separately printed lexica containing proper nouns, i.e. *Dictionarium poeticum* and *Hebraea, Chaldaea, Graeca et Latina nomina* (see p. 171 supra). An exception is *Alpes*, which occurs as an entry in DFL.

### 8.1.1.6. Marked words

Markers such as we discussed in 3.1.1.6. are found, in varying quantities, in the texts in our corpus which were printed before Estienne. They occur much less frequently in his work.

#### 8.1.1.6.1. Temporal markers

In VFC and Calepino, the temporal markers are *secundum usum modernum, secundum antiquos, non est in usu*: 
Acerbo .as, quod non est in usu sed componitur Exacerbo .bas ... (VFC)
Lotrix .cis lavendiere et scias quod lavo .as facit lotum secundum usum modernum; invenitur etiam lautum et lavatum unde Lavatus .ta .turn et Lavatio .onis secundum antiquos (VFC)
\*Lat as. latum facio: quamvis non sit in usu ... (Calepino)

The CA and VN/EV do not include temporal markers in their articles.

**8.1.1.6.2. Spatio-linguistic markers**

The nomenclature of most of the dictionaries in our corpus contains a large quantity of lemmata of foreign origin. The connectors interpretatur and dicitur are often used and the languages of entry and exit may or may not be identified:

- **Macroblus** bii. est proprium nomen hominis. Et interpretatur longissima vita  m (MM)
- **Adonay** est nomen dei: et est indeclinabile. et interpretatur dominus  m (UL1)
- **Brunda** grece, latine cornu dicitur vel caput cervi (VFC)
- **Mithos** interpretatur fabula. (VN3)
- **\*Abba** per geminum bb: Syra dictio est: Latine dicitur pater... (Calepino)
- **Opththalmos** Graece, Latine dicitur oculus (DLG)

Calepino and Estienne’s Thesaurus contain a significant quantity of Greek text, which is as much a tribute to the skill of the type-founders as it is to the erudition of the authors.

French forms are marked occasionally in CA, VFC and VN/EV:

- **Ablacto** .as .avi .atum sever gallice ... (VFC)
- **Modius** etiam vel modiolus est lignum grossum in rota: galice moyeu de roe. (VN3)

In the Thesaurus and DLG, similar markers are also found:

- **Une sorte de poisson qu’on appelle calemar, qui ha deux petis os comme ung cousteau & une plume, & ha le suc noir comme encre: ceulx de marseille s’appellent Taute** (s.v. Loligo) (DFL)
- **Une iatte une sibyle de pressoir, ou semblable. Lugdunenses dicunt, Une conche** (s.v. Concha) (T1531)
- **Gallico proverbio dicitur, Avoir deux cordes tendues en son arc** (s.v. Utor) (T1531)

**8.1.1.6.3. Socio-professional markers**

As we have explained in 3.1.1.6.3., technical words were not specifically marked in dictionaries of this period. The following terms may be considered ‘technical’:

- **Lamier.** Le lamier d’une muraille, [...] d’une maison (DFL)
- **Poultre.** Une piece de bois en edifice qu’on dict proprement ung tref ou poultre... (DFL)

**8.1.1.6.4. Stylistic markers**

Stylistic markers used in our corpus refer to vulgar or popular equivalents for Latin words. They may involve Latin terms:
or French terms:

Loquendus [...] unde hoc Colloquium .quii .1. concilium vel concio vel quod vulgo dicitur parlement. (VFC)
Aquariolus, huius aquarioli m.g. pen. corr. Festus, Aquarioli dicebantur mulierum impudicarum sordidii asseclae. Hos praeposita litera gallorum vulgus Macquereaux appellat. (DLG)

8.1.2. Presentation of entries

8.1.2.1. Arrangement of lemmata

Alphabetical order had become the generally accepted arrangement in lexicography by the fifteenth century, although early printed dictionaries rarely followed it absolutely, and there continued to be some lexica ordered by other than alphabetical arrangement.

8.1.2.1.1. Thematic arrangement

Among early printed thematically-arranged dictionaries is the Lexicon de partibus aedium of Franciscus Grapaldus (see p. 172 supra), each of whose chapters describes the furnishings of a different part of a house. A popular small dictionary whose articles are grouped by subject, is the Vocabularium latinis gallicis et theutonicis verbis scriptum. Each entry is in Latin, followed by an equivalent in French and in German. Texts such as the Commentarii of Perotto and Dolet were also arranged by subject; however, their purpose was not so much to define a word as to illustrate its use.

8.1.2.1.2. Simple alphabetical arrangement

The Catholicon abbreviatum is an alphabetically-ordered dictionary, as are the Aalma manuscripts from which it is derived. However, its consultability is seriously compromised by the errors committed by Caillaut in copying from his source. They appear, to a greater or lesser extent, in most letter-sections and they were faithfully reproduced in every edition.

To use words beginning Caa- to Cath- at the beginning of the letter 'C' as an example, the lemmata run in the order illustrated below. Lemmata are in fair alphabetical order from Caath to Caducus, but the next word is Cassis, when it should be Cadulus. The next group runs from Cassis to Cathedralicus, which is immediately followed by Carmentis, and so on.
We have numbered each group according to the order in which it should appear, and one can see that it would be possible to cut apart the text between the errors and reassemble the pieces in the correct order. In speculating on the reason for these mistakes, we wonder whether the folios of the source manuscript (which may have been loose and were probably not numbered) were out of order when Caillaut made his copy.

Orthographical variants also affect the consultability of the CA in terms of its nomenclature, but only to a limited extent, because there are fewer variations in Latin spelling than in French. As may be expected, those which occur usually involve double consonants, medial ‘h’, etc.

The compiler of the monolingual Latin Vocabularius breviloquus, Johannes Reuchlin, explains in a fashion reminiscent of Papias and Balbi that he follows absolute alphabetical order, and then adds a note to excuse any inadvertent errors.\footnote{"[...] Ut autem istud quod a lectore in libro isto quaeritur facilius inveniatur, posui vocabula secundum ordinem alphabeti. Et est ordo alphabeti non solum in primis et secundis litteris vocabulorum hic positorum sed etiam in tertii et quartis et caeteris litteris sequentibus usque ad finem eorum, Verbi gratia Aaron stat ante Abachuc ex eo quia licet ambae in hac littera a incipient, tamen secunda littera in Aaron praecedit} Reuchlin makes good on his

| Caath          | 1 |
| Caducus       | 9 |
| Cassis        | 8 |
| Cathedraticus | 7 |
| Carmentis     | 6 |
| Cassidile     | 5 |
| Captivus      | 4 |
| Carmen        | 3 |
| Capella       | 2 |
| Caprinus      | 1 |
| Caniculans    | 1 |
| Capdo         | 1 |
| Campanile     | 1 |
| Canicula      | 1 |
| Caligo, caligas | 1 |
| Camparino     | 1 |
| Cadulus       | 1 |
| Caligo .gas .gavi .atum | 1 |
intention, following virtually perfect alphabetical order in each of the three sections of the dictionary: *Nomina, Verba* and *Indeclinabilia*.

The *VFC* is intended to be ordered alphabetically, and Le Talleur followed this arrangement fairly closely, although as we have noted on p. 156f. *supra*, there are occasional lapses.

The ordering principle of the VN/EV is alphabetical but it is not followed absolutely, as this extract from *VN3* shows:

Fraus dis.
Fraudulens tis.
Fraudulentia e.
Fraudulentuer
Fraudo as.
Fraudatio onis.
Frausus a. um.
Fraudator oris.

Of course, this arrangement is inherited from Nebrija, through Busa. Signs remain of an earlier word-family arrangement.

Calepino’s *Dictionarium* is alphabetical only to the third letter, an arrangement which seriously impairs its consultability. Appendix 7 gives a short example of Calepino’s ordering of words beginning *Mag*.

8.1.2.1.3. *Alphabetical-derivational arrangement*

Beginning with the *Thesaurus* of 1531, Estienne set in place a triple organization system, which may be seen in Exhibit 37 on p. 174 *supra*. (The similarity to Le Ver’s ordering system, see p. 90f. *supra*, is striking.)

Wooldridge (1977: 97) describes the three classifications:

“Les entrées sont d’abord regroupées étymologiquement par familles dérivationelles dont une forme de base est mise en vedette, les dérivés de celle-ci étant présentés en sous-vedettes. Les vedettes sont à leur tour classées par ordre alphabétique. Chaque vedette ou sous-vedette est l’objet d’un traitement d’équivalence, d’illustration ou d’explication, l’unité et son traitement constituant un article (ou micro-article). Les trois systèmes sont déterminés et distingués par la typographie.”

---

secundam litteram in Abachuc. Etiam acentum stat ante acidum, quia icet in ipsis primae duae litterae concordant, tamen tertia littera in acetum praeceedit tertiiam in acidum et quarta littera in actor praeceedit quartam in actrix et sic de aliis. Et icet talis ordinatio seu ordo in aliquibus vocabulis non praecise observatur vel forte hoc es propter aliquam convenientiam simul positorum vel forte ex inadvertentia. Ad meliorem autem intellectum et memoriam firmiorem, applicavi quibusdam vocabulis versus ex diversis autoribus collectos ...” Incipit, Basle 1475.
Estienne carries his triple system through the succeeding dictionaries in our corpus, although there are some changes in typography from one dictionary to another. We discuss the typography, which plays an essential role in Estienne’s dictionaries, in 8.1.2.2.3.

**8.1.2.2. Visual aspects**

Beaulieux (1910: 53) writes:

> “Si nous comparons les plus anciens incunables avec les manuscrits contemporains, nous constatons qu’ils ne présentent aucune différence : illustration, disposition, caractères, abréviations, tout cela est identique. Cent ans après, le divorce est absolu. Le livre imprimé s’est complètement transformé, ou plutôt définitivement formé...”

The dictionaries which we have examined in Part B of our study fully confirm Beaulieux’s observations.

**8.1.2.2.1. Page layout**

The text of Caillaut’s first edition of the Catholicon abbreviatum is laid out so as to occupy the page from margin to margin (see Plate 2, p. 122 supra). With a few exceptions, Latin lemmata begin at the left margin. The exceptions are those cases in which one article succeeds another on the same line – presumably due to an error on the part of the writer. French definitions are located roughly in the middle of the page, and grammatical abbreviations are flush right. Thus, in a large proportion of the articles, there is blank space between the end of the lemma and the beginning of the definition, and again between the end of the definition and the grammatical indicator. (Very often, although by no means consistently, Latin definitions directly follow their lemmata without intervening blank space. We conjecture that Caillaut may have intended to highlight French forms through physical separation from the Latin lemma.)

Caillaut continued to set out the text of his dictionary one column per page in both of his later editions (C2 and C3). However, in the third edition, he abandoned the practice of leaving blank space between the end of the lemma and the definition, except on the first two pages. Beginning on the third page, definitions immediately follow headwords.

An important and lasting change in page layout occurred in V (Vérard 1485), where the text is set out in two columns per page, a format followed by every succeeding printer. The only exceptions are found in Series 2, where the Prologus and the Epigramma (and the Epistola
exhortatoria in GA) occupy the entire page, as does the colophon in LB, B, HO, and GA. The switch to two-column layout was likely prompted by reasons of economy. Its immediate effect was to shorten the content of the articles, usually the French definitions.

All copies of the Vocabularius breviloquus, Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus, Vocabularius nebrissensis and Dictionarium of Calepino which we have examined are laid out in the common format of two columns per page, with the exception of preliminary dedicatory and exhortatory material. Estienne did not follow common practice in his first edition of the Thesaurus, which fills the page from margin to margin. In T1536, the DLG and the DFL, he adopted the more usual layout of two columns per page, except for the Prefaces which occupy the whole page.

The amount of space between columns, and the width of the margins, varies in every dictionary and from one edition to another of the same dictionary. The former was at the discretion of the printer, while the latter was more likely to be the result of a choice made during binding.

8.1.2.2.2. Text division

Printed initials at the beginning of letter-sections were not commonly used in the CA, the first edition of the VFC, or the VN/EV. Wood-cuts are found from time to time, often in the first initial letter of the book. In early texts a large block was left open at the head of a letter-section, usually with the appropriate letter printed in the middle of it in lower-case. After printing, each initial in each copy was to be hand-lettered, in coloured ink, by a rubricator. In many copies which we have examined, this last step was not carried out (see Plate 2, p. 122 supra). The second edition of VFC has woodcut initials at the beginning of each letter section.

Text division at the end of letter-sections was common in manuscripts. It occurs in A8, and in all the editions of the CA, as Et hec de littera -. Morin added Sequitur de - in MM and it is included in some subsequent editions. In the 1478 edition of the VB, in the Indeclinabilia, each short letter-section is introduced De A, etc., while in the longer Nomina and Verba, second-letter changes are introduced A ante B, etc. The same method of indicating second-
letter changes is used in the VN/EV and Bade's 1516/1517 edition of the Dictionarium of Calepino. Second-letter changes are not noted in either edition of VFC.

Estienne did not use ornamental initials to introduce letter-sections in T1531. Changes in first and second letters are marked by upper-case letters within the column before the change. The DLG, however, has large, ornate initials at the beginning of each letter.

Column headings are not found in our corpus until the end of the fifteenth century. They occur in the second edition (1500) of VFC. Nicholas de la Barre introduced them into the CA in 1510, and they occur in all later editions. The VN/EV, first printed in 1511, also contains column headings. In these early dictionaries, column headings consist of two letters centered over the column, identifying the first two letters of the major part of lemmata in the column: Mo, Mu, etc. In T1531 column headings range between two and four letters, in order to identify all of the letter changes in the column, e.g. A B S U A B S Y A B U. In Estienne’s later dictionaries which are laid out two columns per page, column headings are reduced to two or three characters.

The paraph (¶) or ‘pied-de-mouche’ was first used in the Catholicon abbreviatum by Martin Havard, to introduce text-divisions and also his colophon. Later printers sometimes use it at the head of text-divisions. In 1497 Michel Le Noir uses the symbol to introduce some of the entries in the letter Z; however, he does not use it consistently – neither in the letter Z nor elsewhere in the text. In VFC 1500 the paraph introduces the colophon. It appears in VN/EV to introduce letter-sections: ¶A ante b, and so on. In DLG, Estienne uses this mark to introduce different meanings of the lemma or sub-lemma.

8.1.2.2.3. Typography
All editions of the CA, the VN/EV, the VB and the VFC are printed in gothic type, which was used in France in the fifteenth century for books on theology, jurisprudence, medicine, and pedagogical texts in general. These were conservative texts, intended for a learned audience, and gothic type looked more like a manuscript.

The edition of Calepino’s Dictionarium printed by Josse Bade in 1516/1517, and all of Estienne’s dictionaries, are printed in roman type. According to Armstrong (1986: 54), “[T]he
rejection of gothic types for academic printing went back to the first Paris press; after the
career of Henry Estienne (d.1520) and the parallel career of Badius, no Paris printer would
have thought of setting up an educational treatise or a classical Latin text in anything but
roman or italic."

After 1532, Robert Estienne used both roman and italic type in his dictionaries.

Armstrong (1986: 49) explains:

"Estienne [...] used italic up to 1543 as a modern printer does, to distinguish a
particular phrase or passage in a page of roman type. A recognizable development in
this direction can be traced in his work, especially in his characteristic use of italic to
distinguish vernacular words in his bilingual dictionaries and grammars, and similar
works. The French words in La Maniere de tourner les verbes are in 1530 printed in
roman like the Latin, as are the French equivalents provided in the first edition of the
Thesaurus in 1531, but in the 1532 edition of La Maniere, the Latin is printed in
roman and the French in italic, which forthwith was adopted as the rule of the
house."

Estienne also alternated the size of type to distinguish certain items in the text. In

**T1531** lemmata are printed in upper-case roman; in subsequent dictionaries, they are printed
in lower-case roman in a larger font size than the body of the text. In **T1536**, proper nouns are
printed in a small upper-case roman font and their entire entries are deeply indented. In all
dictionaries, small upper-case roman is used to highlight the lemma in internal references.

Estienne’s system for setting out macro-articles included wide use of indented text; that
is, the first line (including the lemma) was set flush to the left margin, and the second and
succeeding lines were indented. The first line of each sub-lemma began at the first indent, and
second and succeeding lines were indented yet again. In Exhibit 38 (p. 177 *supra*) we attempt
to illustrate the way in which Estienne used typography to improve the consultability of his
dictionaries (although we do not reproduce his fonts).

The use of indentation varies widely in early printed dictionaries. All text in the first
edition of the *Catholicon*, printed in 1460, is set flush to the left margin (‘carré’), but in an
edition printed in Venice in 1483, each lemma is against the margin, and succeeding lines are
indented. Similar indentation appears in the 1478 edition of the *Vocabularius breviloquus*
printed at Eltville. On the other hand, both editions of the *VFC* are printed ‘carré’, as are all
editions of the CA except H1, printed by Mathias Husz (see p. 127 supra). The copies which we
have examined of the VN/EV are also set flush to the left margin.

8.1.2.2.4. Abbreviations

The desire to imitate manuscripts led type-founders to try to duplicate all of the many
abbreviations used by scribes, and such abbreviations abound in printed texts of the fifteenth
and early sixteenth century (Febvre/Martin 1971: 81). Added to the gothic type, such symbols
detract significantly from the consultability of early dictionaries for the modern reader. For
example, the edition of the CA which we have named ULI, makes extensive use of characters
imitating scribal abbreviations. Although it is carefully typeset, this dictionary is not easy to
consult today. Presumably, however, it did not present such difficulties to fifteenth-century
users who were familiar with the manuscript tradition.

There are fewer abbreviations in Estienne’s dictionaries than in the earlier works in our
corpus. Those remaining include ‘&’, ‘&c.’, ‘~’ over a vowel to indicate omission of a following
nasal consonant, ‘’ for ‘-us’ ending, ‘q’ for ‘-que’ ending, and others. Use of the ampersand
and tilde persists in the twentieth century.

8.1.3. Structure of the article

While the organization of the macrostructure is fairly well established as either simple
alphabetical or alphabetical-derivational, the microstructure of the dictionaries in our corpus is
still fluid in terms of both organization and content.

8.1.3.1. Citations and examples

Reuchlin’s Vocabularius breviloquus, which is based on medieval compilations, often refers to
Papias, John Balbi, Hugutio, as well as the Bible. He also often cites authors such as Sidonius,
Horace, Virgil, and so on.

Citations and references to authorities are found only rarely in the CA. One of the few
eamples is:

Manipulus ii. gerbe de ble ou compagnie de deux cens hommes damnes. ou ce que
le prestre met au bras quant il chante. Et dicitur de manus et plico. vel de manus et
pilum. ut patet in grecismo. (C1)
In the lengthy article treating the lemma *zelus*, there is a citation from the Psalms, from ‘*Helyas*’ and two from ‘*beatus Bernardus*’. The same article in the *VB* contains the references to the Bible and Peter Helias, but does not have Saint Bernard.

References in the *VN/EV* are not numerous, and many of them are biblical. For example:

[...] Item *maceria* est membrana secundinarum qua involuuntur pueri in utero que dividitur in partu. unde *genesis*. xviii. quare divisa est propter te *maceria mea*. *la portiere de la matris*. (VN3)

We have not found examples using a lemma in the *CA* but have found them occasionally in the *VN/EV*. The following example is given first in Latin, and then translated into French, a practice followed by Estienne, beginning with T1531.


Although the *VFC* is based mainly on Balbi, Papias (largely filtered through Le Ver and with much of Le Ver’s French) and the *Vocabularius breviloquus* (see 5.1.), Le Talleur does not often cite his authorities.

Calepino is entirely different, of course. His work abounds in citations, drawn mainly from classical authors. Brandon (1904: 39) notes that Estienne did not inaugurate the trend to using citations of good Latinity; however, he accelerated it. Estienne adopted some of Calepino’s citations in T1531, as we see in Exhibit 37 (on p. 174 supra), and he added many others. Terence, Plautus and Pliny were among his favorite sources, as well as Cicero, Columella, Varro, Festus and others. His concern was always to select those which best explain the lemma or sub-lemma in question. As we noted on p. 177 supra, Estienne omitted the names of sources from the first edition of the *DLG*, and from the *DFL*.

### 8.1.3.2. Grammatical and similar information

Johannes Reuchlin divided his dictionary into three parts: *Nomina*, *Verba* and *Indeclinabilia*, which simplifies identification at the first level. Parts of speech are usually identified – *nomen*, *adverbium*, *participium*, *prepositio*, etc. – and often qualified as well – *adverbium quantitatis*, *coniunctio affirmativa*, and so on. Reuchlin uses a system of abbreviations to provide
grammatical information about nouns and verbs. The initials (which are not those which we are accustomed to see in the Aalma and its successors) follow the lemma, e.g. Utor, uteris, usus sum. d.t.i. or Vulgo .gas. a.p.i.

The system of abbreviations located against the right-hand text margin which is found in Aalma and DLV, is also found in all editions of the CA. In the Prologue to Series 2 of the CA, particular attention is drawn to this method (see p. 133 supra). The system of marginal abbreviations is not found in VFC. Indicators for gender often (although by no means always) follow the lemma: Amadrias.dis feminini generis... Parts of speech are identified in VFC and frequently qualified as well: Amplissimum, adverbium suppellativi gradus.

As we have noted earlier (see p. 164 supra), Guillaume Le Moine adopted the marginal abbreviation system in his editions of the VN/EV. The editions which we have examined identify parts of speech such as adverbs, prepositions, and conjunctions. However, they rarely provide the genitive form of nouns, and often omit the inflected forms of the verb.

In the Thesaurus and the DLG, Estienne identifies some parts of speech, e.g. adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions, participles, etc. and specifies the gender of nouns. He provides fully inflected forms of adjectives and of verbs\(^{100}\) and thus does not need to add other identification. All of this grammatical information is omitted from the DFL of 1539 (see Exhibit 39 on p. 181 supra), because this text was meant to be a key to DLG 1538. Individual owners often bound the two dictionaries together.

Phonetic and orthographic information is rare in the CA, as it was in Aalma. As far as we have found, it is not included in the VN/EV. In VFC it is included occasionally, as it was in DLV:

Ambaxiatrix.icis embaxaderesse secundum aliquos ista scibuntur per 'ss'.

The striking feature in this example is that the orthographic information relates to the French gloss.

At times, Calepino and Estienne include phonetic information:

Andronitis, pen.prod. ... (DLG)
Eripio.is. pe.cor. ... (Calepino)

\(^{100}\) "[...] in verbis autem coniugatio aut ex secunda persona, aut ex infinitivo." Second Preface, Thesaurus 1531.
8.1.3.3. Internal references

We have not found internal references in the VN/EV, and only rarely in the CA. Le Talleur’s markers indicating the location of an internal reference include: Vide in (lemma); Vide in suo loco; In suo loco dicitur, etc.

In Bade’s 1516/1517 edition of Calepino, the markers are Vide in (lemma), Vide loco suo. Both expressions are used by Estienne in the Thesaurus and the DLG. The DFL does not contain internal reference markers.

8.1.3.4. Techniques of definition

Definitional techniques used in the CA, VFC and VN/EV differ very little from those in the manuscript lexica which we reviewed in 3.1.3.2.5. Lemmata and sub-lemmata are glossed by synonyms, syntagms, short definitions, and so on.

We do not feel it is particularly helpful to present more examples of these methods, and look instead at Estienne’s approach. In the Thesaurus and DLG simple equivalents occur at times, with or without a supporting citation:

- **Balaustium**, balaustis, m.g. La fleur de pomme de coing. Vide Plinium lib.xxiii. cap.vi. (T1531)
- **Monoculus**, monoculi, m.g. Qui na quen oeil. (T1531)

More commonly, Estienne’s method involves some form of the following:

Latin lemma or sub-lemma + French definition + Latin citation which illustrates the definition.

- **Alludo** alludis, allusi, allusum. Se iouer a quelcon. Terentius. Forte habui scortum, cepi ad id alludere. Je me commenceay iouer a elle.

Alludere, cest aussi dire paroles qui signifient autre chose quelles ne monstrent. Virg. Nec plura alludens, ea vox audita laborum, Prima tuit finem.

A series, often lengthy, of Latin locutions follows most lemmata and sub-lemmata in the Thesaurus and DLG, to illustrate the uses of the Latin word. Many of these locutions are translated into French. According to Brandon (1904: 68), Estienne’s method of compiling the DFL seems to have been to take French interpretations from the DLG, then establish Latin interpretations from the same text, and then range under the French interpretation the locutions and examples which were already in the DLG as translations.
One of the obvious results of this procedure is that, in addition to a considerable number of single equivalents, a large quantity of French locutions appear as sub-lemmata in the DFL.

\begin{itemize}
  \item Ung arbitre esleu par les parties [...] Arbiter ...
  \item Prendre ung arbitre [...] Arbitrum capere ...
  \item Quand l’arbitre donne sa sentence, Arbitrari.
  \item Chose qui est soubiecte a l’arbitrage de l’arbitre, Arbitrarium
  \item La sentence de l’arbitre, Arbitrium.
  \item Franc arbitre, Arbitrium liberum.
\end{itemize}

Although it was later modified, this style of classification persisted in the line of French-Latin dictionaries which succeeded the DFL of 1539.

8.2. Rôle and Status of French

The role of the French language in early printed dictionaries is unchanged from its rôle in bilingual manuscript lexica: to assist in the study and acquisition of Latin. One of the main objectives of the humanist movement was the purification of the Latin language, and we see ample evidence of this purpose in sixteenth-century manuals, commentaries and dictionaries.

Brandon (1904: 68, n.1) reminds us that the principal if not the exclusive objective of the first edition of the Dictionaire Françoislatin was the advancement of the study of Latin. He adds (1904: 69) that we must always keep in mind that Estienne regarded his lexicographical work as a unit. The different lexica are only the different manifestations of a single effort whose point of departure is the Latin language.

Almost imperceptibly, the status of French in dictionaries begins to change during the period covered in this study. The change manifests itself first in the search for greater precision in French translations for Latin terms. Lépinette (1992: 252) notes that the result of this research effort may be observed on two levels. On the lexicographical level, it led to establishment of a system of interlingual equivalencies consisting of two terms, which led toward progressive normalization of the articles of bilingual dictionaries. Kibbee (1986: 143) also remarks that the use of synonyms to gloss entries in the DFL is a first step toward definitions.
On the linguistic level (that of French), the search for adequate translations for Latin entries led to the enrichment of French, thanks to gradual precision in the meanings and uses of the lemmata.

Further evidence of the change in the status of French is related to the increased use of French in Estienne’s dictionaries. Although Estienne’s purpose is to facilitate access to Latin, it is clear from his abundant translations that he considers French adequate to express all nuances of Latin.

In speaking of the character of Estienne’s French, Brandon (1904: 54) points out that it is important to distinguish the translation of words and the translation of locutions. In the translation of words, we see little difference between early printed bilingual dictionaries and the DLG, as illustrated in the following Exhibit.101

Exhibit 40: Article Macer in Catholicon abbreviatum, Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus and Dictionarium Latinogallicum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CA c.1482</th>
<th>VFC c.1490</th>
<th>DLG 1538</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maceo</strong> [... estre maigre</td>
<td><strong>Maceo</strong> [... estre maigre, amaigrir</td>
<td><strong>Maceo</strong> [... Estre maigre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macer</strong> [... maigre</td>
<td><strong>Macer</strong> [... maigre</td>
<td><strong>Macer</strong> [... Maigre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macero</strong> [... briser, depecier. debiiter. amaigrir</td>
<td><strong>Macero</strong> [... briser, froisser, dilanier</td>
<td><strong>Macero</strong> [... Faire maigre, Amaigrir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macilentus</strong> [... maigre</td>
<td><strong>Macilentus</strong> [... maigre, plain de maigresse</td>
<td><strong>Macilentus</strong> [... Fort maigre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macor</strong> [... maigreur</td>
<td><strong>Macor</strong> [... maigresse</td>
<td><strong>Macor</strong> [... sive macor Maigrete, ou Maigreur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The quantity of French in locutions, Brandon explains, is much greater, and it stems entirely from the author. Estienne translated Latin locutions into the vigorous French of the sixteenth century.

8.3. Conclusion

The printed dictionaries in our corpus fit into two of the three categories described by Brandon (see p. 171f. supra): i.e. the Catholicon, Perotti’s Cornucopiae, and Calepino’s Dictionarium. The first stage includes the Vocabularius breviloquus, Catholicon abbreviatum, and Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus, which are printed versions based on earlier

---

101 Articles in the VFC and DLG are, of course, much longer, but we have selected only the lemmata which correspond to those in the CA, in order to illustrate the similarity of French glosses.
manuscripts, as is the *Catholicon*. The glossary format and lack of citations cause the *Vocabularius nebrissensis/Epithoma vocabulorum* to be included in this first group, even though it is not based on traditional medieval compilations.

Our corpus does not include any lexica falling into the second group. Calepino’s *Dictionarium* represents the third group. Calepino attempts to purify the Latin by eliminating some lemmata and by citing classical sources rather than earlier lexica such as Papias and Hugutio. However, Estienne’s criticism of the *Dictionarium* (see n. 94 *supra*) goes straight to the heart of the matter: its low degree of consultability. Alphabetical order is followed only to the third letter, while examples and citations follow one another in long strings.

With the *Thesaurus* of 1531, Estienne created a truly new dictionary: macro-articles consisting of a root lemma, followed by members of the word family, set out one below the other; strict alphabetical arrangement for lemmata; each lemma and sub-lemma followed by examples, citations and/or French definitions; and the whole distinguished by typographical techniques. The process, in particular the typography, would be slightly altered in later dictionaries, but the basic framework was in place.

The *Dictionaire Francoislatin* of 1539 followed the same principles, although much of the text – grammatical information, authors’ names, and citations – was omitted. A first attempt at creating a French-Latin dictionary, it was the foundation-stone of a long line of bilingual dictionaries, leading in time to the first monolingual French dictionary.\footnote{See Wooldridge 1977: 45 for diagrams illustrating the succession of Estienne’s dictionaries.}
9.0. CONCLUSION

We have followed Latin lexicography through seventeen centuries of progress, hesitation, trial and error, from Varro’s *De lingua latina* to Estienne’s *Thesaurus*, and we have also observed three centuries of development in Latin-French lexica. From this survey we are able to identify some important trends.

9.1. Methods

- Elevation in the status of lexicography vis-à-vis grammar, from subordinate to equal, while still retaining essential ties.
- Expansion in the composition of the macrostructure of lexica, from difficult or foreign words through progressive compilations to the large collections of Balbi, Nestor, Calepino and Estienne.
- Reduction in the size of the nomenclature, first through abridgement, to produce Latin schoolbooks and Latin-vernacular lexica, and later through elimination of outdated and bizarre lemmata, firstly to retain recognizably medieval forms, later to return Latin to its classical purity.
- Related to this later purge is the recognition that an encyclopaedia and a dictionary are two distinct works (Brandon 1904: 29).
- Change in the arrangement of the macrostructure from local order in collections of interlinear and marginal glosses, through increasingly sophisticated alphabetical order, to a combination of alphabetical and derivational arrangement.
- Visual support for both manuscript and printed texts, through marginal notations, page layout, text division, and size and style of characters.
- Increasing uniformity of article structure, that is, the type, quantity and location of information, both definitional and linguistic.
- Change in definitional procedures, from equivalents to paraphrases and definitions. This is the first stage in the recognition that the role of a definition is not merely to translate a word but rather to explain it (Quemada 1972: 100).
Change in the nature and function of citations. In medieval lexica, citations tend to be drawn from previous compilations (e.g. Isidore, Papias, Hugutio), from Latin grammarians both ancient and contemporary, and from the Vulgate. By the beginning of the sixteenth century, citations are more numerous and they are usually drawn from classical Latin works. Their function is changing from illustrating the meanings of Latin words to teaching their use through good examples (id. 1972: 100).

The nomenclature of bilingual dictionaries is based on that of Latin lexica, and their metalanguage, whether in Latin or in French, usually relates to Latin forms.

The original purpose of bilingual dictionaries – translating, teaching, learning Latin – is still virtually unchanged in the first half of the sixteenth century.

9.2. Sources and transmission

We find that there are only a limited number of sources in medieval Latin lexicography. Chiefly, these are the Vulgate Bible, Latin grammarians, and Latin glossaries. Concerning the latter, Laistner (1931: 177) notes that there are only a few early glossaries which must be regarded as basic.

We also see that the close interdependence among Latin lexica makes it impossible to trace their transmission except in the broadest terms. For example, when the author of a dictionary in the Catholicon line of descent cites Hugutio or Papias, we cannot know whether he drew his material directly from those sources or by way of the Catholicon. As Buridant (1986: 27) accurately observes:

"La lexicographie médiévale, comme la science médiévale dans son ensemble, vit de compilation, qu’il s’agisse de sommes lexicographiques latines ou bilingues".

Relationships among medieval and pre-Renaissance Latin-French dictionaries are somewhat easier to trace than those of Latin lexica because of their smaller numbers. However, as we have seen, their sources represent a wide range of Latin dictionaries, and there are some surprising borrowings among the bilingual texts.
9.3. Early Printed Latin-French Dictionaries

The first printed dictionaries (whether Latin or bilingual) closely resembled their manuscript predecessors, in both content and form. Even a new compilation, such as Nebrija’s Latin-Spanish *Lexicon* and its Latin-Catalan and Latin-French adaptations, is very much like other contemporary bilingual dictionaries.

Estienne’s *Thesaurus* represents a new stage in Latin lexicography because Estienne is the first lexicographer to break entirely free of the medieval tradition. Kibbee (1986: 140) affirms:

“Estienne has as a primary goal cleaning up the Latin dictionaries of his medieval predecessors, ridding them of the medieval barbarisms by substituting classical sources for medieval sources, and expunging medieval usages for which no classical examples can be found.”

Equally important, of course, is the fact that Estienne evidently valued French as a means of access to the Latin language, and regarded the vernacular as an integral part of his lexical works.

Brandon (1904: 26) claims that Estienne was unaware of medieval manuscript lexica, although he knew the printed Latin dictionaries from 1460 to 1530. We feel it is rather unlikely that Estienne, as a student in the first two decades of the sixteenth century, would not have had some exposure to manuscript dictionaries. In any case, he must have retained some impressions, both positive and negative, from earlier compilations, whether manuscript or printed. His early experience with dictionaries, even before Calepino’s *Dictionarium*, probably contributed to his resolve to create a new work.

There is no evidence that Estienne knew or used other bilingual dictionaries. What is clear, however, is the supremacy of Latin in all of them, including Estienne’s. Wooldridge (1977: 23) tells us that “although the essential form of the French dictionary is established” in the *DFL* of 1539, “the intention will only be born later”, in the second edition of 1549. Brandon (1904: 73) affirms that the seed of a true French language dictionary may be seen in the second edition.
9.4. **Future Opportunities**

Our work in this study identifies some areas which we were not able to explore fully, and which seem to us to present opportunities for future research. These relate to:

1. **French lexicography.**

   There are untapped resources of Middle French in the *Aalma* series of manuscripts, in all editions of the *Catholicon abbreviatum*, and in all editions of the *Vocabularius nebrissensis*/Epithoma vocabulorum*. A database of the text in these dictionaries would complement the work of the REFLEX\textsuperscript{103} Group in the Department of French Language and Literature at the University of Toronto. One of their databases contains the entire text of the *Dictionarius* of Firmin Le Ver, the *Glossarium gallico-latinum* and the *Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus*, and another the works of Robert Estienne (beginning with the *Thesaurus* of 1531), and his successors up to the *Thresor* of Nicot (1606).

2. **Latin lexicography.**

   We do not believe that a database has been created of the monolingual Latin editions of Ambrogio Calepino’s *Dictionarium*. Such a database, which might also include the Latin text from the three groups of bilingual lexica mentioned in 1. above, would provide an excellent record of late medieval and pre-Renaissance Latin language.

\textsuperscript{103} *Research in Early French LEXicography.*
APPENDIX 1

Comparison of French terms in
the Glossarum gallo-latinum (ms. Paris, BN lat. 7684),
the Dictionarius of Firmin Le Ver (Merrilees 1994a),
and the Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus (Guillaume Le Talleur, Rouen, c.1490)

This brief analysis compares articles selected from GGL with corresponding articles in DLV and VFC. In other words, we do not compare DLV and VFC with each other. Our findings, which are based on examination of the letters 'A' to 'H' in the three dictionaries, are divided into three broad categories: French terms in GGL occur in both of the other dictionaries; French terms in GGL occur in either DLV or VFC; French terms in GGL do not appear in DLV or VFC.

The comparison focuses on French terms; however, it will be clear that there are many similarities in the Latin definitions and metalanguage. This is more noticeable in DLV and VFC, because the Latin content of GGL is much less than that of the other two texts.

1. French terms in all texts are identical or very similar.

While there is variation from one letter to another, an average of 76% of the articles examined fall into this category. The following examples illustrate the high degree of similarity among the texts.

a) The same single French term occurs in all three texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GGL</th>
<th>DLV</th>
<th>VFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abominable</td>
<td>Abominabilis et hoc .bile - abominables</td>
<td>Abominabilis et hoc .le - abominable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abominabilis .le</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainité</td>
<td>Certitudo .dinis - certainétês</td>
<td>Certitudo .dinis - certainétê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certitudo .dinis</td>
<td>Certus componitur Quamcertus .a</td>
<td>Certus componitur Quamcertus .i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certus componitur quamcertus .i. valore certus, incertus .i. non certus unde incertitudo .i. non certitudo</td>
<td>valore certus .- Incertus .i. non certus .- unde Incertitudo .i. non certitudo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiableté</td>
<td>Amicabilitas .tatis - amiabletês</td>
<td>Amicabilitas .tis - amiabletê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amicabilitas .tatis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) One French term in GGL matches one of the French glosses in the other texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GGL</th>
<th>DLV</th>
<th>VFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bride</td>
<td>HABENA .bene - renne, bride, frein de cheval .i. lorum retinaculum freni et dictur ab *habeo, habes quia per eam habemus .i. retinemus equos.</td>
<td>Habena .ne - resne, bride, frein de cheval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>habena, habene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Two or more French terms in GGL match two or more in the other texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GGL</th>
<th>DLV</th>
<th>VFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apostat apostata .te pervers, renoié</td>
<td>APOSTATA, apostate - penultima corripta . . . .</td>
<td>Apostata ,e - apostat, pervers, renoié</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barat, fraude, deception fraus, fraudia, decepcion, fallacia</td>
<td>Fraus, fraudis - fraude, deception, barat ,i. dolus, deceptio, fallacia, versutia</td>
<td>Fraus ,dis - fraude, deception, barat ,i. dolus, deceptio, fallacia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destoumer declino .as .atum decliner</td>
<td>DECLINO .natum - decliner ou destoumer</td>
<td>Declino ,as - decliner, destoumer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. French terms in GGL differ from those in one or the other text.

An average of 8% of the French terms in GGL match those in DLV but do not match those in VFC, and an average of 9% match those in VFC but do not match those in DLV.

a) A French term in GGL appears in the corresponding article in either DLV or VFC but not in both.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GGL</th>
<th>DLV</th>
<th>VFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apostasie apostasia .sie</td>
<td>Apostasia ,sie - penultima pro- ducta apostasie, renoiemens ,i. renunciato, retro ad bonum morem itio</td>
<td>Apostasia ,e - renoyement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buye conca .ce</td>
<td>Conca ,ce - eciam dicitur quoddam vas terreum ,i. buye, cruche, quene a yauue ydra</td>
<td>Conca - cruche ou canne a eauue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergerie caula .le, parc ou l’estable des brebiz ,i. ovile et est grecum</td>
<td>CAULA, caule - ,i. ovile, muni- mentum ovium ,i. parc ou stable de brebis - grecum est</td>
<td>Caula ,le - berquerie, oville, parc ou stable de brebis et est grecum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincenelle cinifes. fis petite mouche qui point</td>
<td>CINIFES, cinifis - ,i. tahons, scilicet culicum genus aculeis per molestum et dicitur a cinos vel parva musca,scilicet cinzala ,i. chincheles</td>
<td>Cinnifes. fis vel Cinifes - petite mouche qui point, cincinelle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) The form of French gloss in GGL matches that in the corresponding article in one of the other texts but not in both.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GGL</th>
<th>DLV</th>
<th>VFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentier .rīi</td>
<td>Argentarius .rīi - .i. qui custodit argento .i. argentier</td>
<td>Argentarius .rīi - .i. qui garde l’argent ou œuvre d’argent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autorizer .zas .tum</td>
<td>Autorizo .zas .zatum - autorisier .i. affirmare, autenticum facere</td>
<td>Autorizo .as - faire ferme et autentique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cil .lii de oeil</td>
<td>CILIUM, cili - .le paupiere qui œuvre l’œil</td>
<td>Cilium .lii - cil d’œul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chose transitoire</td>
<td>Functorium .rīi - qui tost passe</td>
<td>Functorium .iī - chose transitoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjuration .ti</td>
<td>Adiuramentum .ti - conjurentemens</td>
<td>Adiuramentum .ti - adjurement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


c) An article in either DLV or VFC lacks any French gloss.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GGL</th>
<th>DLV</th>
<th>VFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitaine sus cent ce&lt;n&gt;turio .onis</td>
<td>Centurio .ronis - .i. qui preest centum viris vel centum militibus</td>
<td>Centurio .onnis - capitaine sur cent hommes qui centum preest viris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloué .a .um</td>
<td>CLAVATUS .ta .tum - .i. clavis confinis et dicitur a *clavus - .i. cloés vel clavo veste vel instrumento ornatus et preparatus</td>
<td>Clavatus .a .um -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compunction .onis</td>
<td>Compunctio .tionis - .i. peccatorum suorum cum merore recordatio; compunctio cordis est, dolor cordis</td>
<td>Compunctio .onnis - compunction, doulour de ses pechés .i. peccatorum suorum commemoratio, recordatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deable demonis</td>
<td>DEMON, demonis - diables .i. diabolus et interpretatur peritus vel sciens</td>
<td>Demon .onnis -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble joint .a .um</td>
<td>Collateratus .ta .tum - ensemble joint</td>
<td>Collateratus .ta .tum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleume .matis</td>
<td>FLEGMA, flegmatibus .rīi - unus de iii&quot; principalibus humoribus humani corporis ......</td>
<td>Flegma .atis - fleume: humeur unus de quattuor humoribus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. French terms in GGL differ from those in corresponding articles in DLV and VFC.

This is an interesting category because it raises the question of the source of some of the French terms in GGL. An average of 7% of the French terms examined fall into this category.
**a) One or more French terms in GGL are lacking from both DLV and VFC.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GGL</th>
<th>DLV</th>
<th>VFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Celeemem*  
clam - adverbium qualitatis - .i.  
latenter idem, occulte *occultemente*  

| *Chatepelouse, chenille*  
eruca .ce  

| *Debouter, repeller, fouller*  
excitio, excitis .ssi .ssum  

---

**b) Corresponding articles in DLV and VFC lack any French glosses.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GGL</th>
<th>DLV</th>
<th>VFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Aclinouer*  
acclinatorium .rii  

| *Administrour*  
administratorius .a .um  

---

In the following examples, French glosses are translations of the Latin definitions:

- *Chappon qui mene les poussins*  
comme une geline  
gallus, gallinacius  

- *Faculté, possibilité*  
facultas, facultatis  

---

**c) The form of French terms in GGL differs from those in DLV and VFC.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GGL</th>
<th>DLV</th>
<th>VFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Beneure*  
beatitas .tis - felicité  

| *Chal de piez ou de mains*  
callus .lii  

| *Dedicacion*  
dedicacio .onis  

| *Fourel a mettre saiettes*  
faretra, faretre  

---
Often, *GGL* substitutes an equivalent for a paraphrase. The process involves nouns, verbs and participles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ameresse</th>
<th>Amatrix .tricis - <em>femme qui aymme</em></th>
<th>Amatrix .cis - <em>femme qui ayme</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>amatrix .tricis, scilicet que amat</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevaucheresse</td>
<td>Equitissa .sse - <em>femme qui che-vauche</em></td>
<td>Equitissa .sse - <em>femme chevauchant</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>equitissa .sse</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apostater</td>
<td>Apostato .tas .tare - <em>estre apo- stat, estre renoiès</em></td>
<td>Apostato .as - <em>estre apostat</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>apostato .tas</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branchir, avoir branches</td>
<td>FRONDEO .des .dui .dere - <em>havoir branches, estre branchus</em></td>
<td>FRONDEO .des .dui - <em>avoire branches</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>frondo .des .dui</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestié</td>
<td>Cristatus .ta .tum - <em>qui ha grant creste, etc. ou heammés</em></td>
<td>Cristatus .ta .tum - <em>qui a grant creste</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cristatus .a .um</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2

**Parallel French glosses in *Aalma* (A1) and in the *Dictionarius* of Firmin Le Ver (Merrilees 1994a)**

1. **Single term in both dictionaries.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Aalma</th>
<th>DLV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dubitatio</td>
<td>doubtance</td>
<td>doubtanche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eupreopia</td>
<td>biautez</td>
<td>biautés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galerus</td>
<td>chapel de cuir</td>
<td>chapiau de cuir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassa</td>
<td>nasse a prendre poisson</td>
<td>nasse a prendre poissons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanus</td>
<td>la mer grant</td>
<td>la grant mer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reboo</td>
<td>resonner</td>
<td>resoner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Single term in *Aalma* augmented in *DLV* by terms from other sources or LeVer's own vocabulary.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Aalma</th>
<th>DLV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corda</td>
<td>corde</td>
<td>corde, come de harpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munifex</td>
<td>larges</td>
<td>larges, qui donne volentier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturaliter</td>
<td>naturelment</td>
<td>naturelment, par nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebulo</td>
<td>lecher</td>
<td>lecheres, friant, glouton, menteur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officina</td>
<td>lieu ou l’en fait office</td>
<td>officine, lieu ou on fait office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primevus</td>
<td>de primier aage</td>
<td>de premier aage, anchien</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Two or more terms in both dictionaries.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Aalma</th>
<th>DLV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperor</td>
<td>ensemble ouvrer ou aider</td>
<td>ensemble ouvrer, aidier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ether</td>
<td>li aers ou la plus haute partie de l’aer</td>
<td>l’air, le plus haut air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foculo</td>
<td>nourrir ou faire feu</td>
<td>nourrir ou faire feu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munifico</td>
<td>faire don ou honneur par don</td>
<td>donner, honnourer par don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plectrum</td>
<td>gouvernail de nest &lt;sic&gt; ou langue ou archet de vielle</td>
<td>gouvernial de nef ou la langue ou l’arquet de vieile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplanto</td>
<td>supplanter. Decevoir</td>
<td>supplanter, dechevoir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Two terms in *Aalma* augmented in *DLV.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Aalma</th>
<th>DLV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calidus</td>
<td>cauteilleux ou malicieux</td>
<td>cauteleus, malicieux, sages, soubtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depono</td>
<td>deposer ou mettre jus</td>
<td>mettre jus, demetters, desposer, laissier, abaissier, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnarus</td>
<td>sages, expers en science</td>
<td>sages, soubstis, expers in science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margineus</td>
<td>de rivage ou de marge</td>
<td>de rivage, de rive de mer ou de marge de livre ou de ourle de vestement ou de bort de quelque chose que soit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picta</td>
<td>cote ou peinture</td>
<td>robe, cote ou peinture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutor</td>
<td>suerres ou couseur</td>
<td>sueur, coudeur, cordouennier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **More terms in Aalma than in DLV.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Aalma</th>
<th>DLV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ducatus</td>
<td>duchez, Menemens ou conduis</td>
<td>duchiét</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obturo</td>
<td>clorre, boucher, Estouper</td>
<td>estouper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oestrum</td>
<td>une mouche, Thaon. ou sapience ou esperit de poete</td>
<td>tahon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppedium</td>
<td>aide, subside, Suffrage ou scabelle</td>
<td>ayde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Parallels in the structure of the French definitions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Aalma</th>
<th>DLV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefactorius</td>
<td>guerredonneur ou qui fait bien pour</td>
<td>guerredonneur, qui fait bien pour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bien</td>
<td>bien que on li a fait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallicantus</td>
<td>chant de coq ou heure de la nuit que</td>
<td>chant de coq ou l'eure de nuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l'en dit coqs chantant</td>
<td>que on dit cocs chantants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omentum</td>
<td>la pel en quoy sont enclos les boyaulz</td>
<td>la panche, le piau en quoy sunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggrunda</td>
<td>ce qui est entre le toit et la paroit.</td>
<td>soubs goutiere, che qui est entre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sougoutiere</td>
<td>paroit et toit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following extracts are especially striking, in that Latin definitions are absent from **DLV**, and the French definitions are identical (Merrilees/Edwards 1994: xvf.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aalma</th>
<th>DLV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ab preposicion qui sert a lablatif</td>
<td>AB est une preposition qui sert a l'ablatis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad preposicion servent a accusatif</td>
<td>AD - preposition qui sert a l'acusatis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De une preposicion qui sert a lablatiz</td>
<td>DE - preposition qui sert a l'ablatis case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3

Occurrence of Selected Grammatical Terms
in Six Medieval Lexica

- A dash (–) indicates that the term is not included in the macrostructure of that dictionary.
- At times, a grammatical term is present in the macrotext of a particular dictionary but is not identified as belonging to a specific category. Such occurrences are marked "unidentified" in the following exhibits.
- Since grammatical words can have more than one function and identification of the part of speech is not always consistent throughout the corpus, we have shown the category (or categories) assigned to a term by each dictionary.
1. **Selected conjunctions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conj.</th>
<th>Papias</th>
<th>Catholicon</th>
<th>Comp.</th>
<th>Aalma</th>
<th>MPST</th>
<th>DLV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ac</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acsi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>unidentified (s.v. 'ac si')</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>s.v. 'am'</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ast</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj. &amp; adv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj. &amp; adv.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atque</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atquin</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1. uninvent.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attamen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>s.v. 'tamen'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj. &amp; adv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aut</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autem</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ena</td>
<td>conj. (graeca)</td>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>conj. (graeca)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enim</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enimvero</td>
<td>s.v. 'enim'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equidem</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>s.v. 'quidem'</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>adv. &amp; conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etenim</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etiam</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>s.v. 'etsi'</td>
<td>unident.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>im&lt;m&gt;o</td>
<td>adv. &amp; conj.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adv. &amp; conj.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>adv. &amp; conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ita</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adv. &amp; conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itaque</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>s.v. 'ita'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>licet</td>
<td>adv. &amp; conj.</td>
<td>conj. (s.v. 'liceo')</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>adv. &amp; conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nam</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>namque</td>
<td>s.v. 'nam'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>s.v. 'nam'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. Selected prepositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prep.</th>
<th>Papias</th>
<th>Catholicon</th>
<th>Comp.</th>
<th>Aalma</th>
<th>MPST</th>
<th>DLV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ob</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>adv. &amp; prep.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>adv. &amp; prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>para</td>
<td>prep. &amp; adv.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>prep. (greca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>penes</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per</td>
<td>prep. &amp; adv.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pone</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr&lt;a&gt;e</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr&lt;a&gt;eter</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>unident.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prope</td>
<td>unident.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>propter</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>adv. &amp; conj.</td>
<td>adv. &amp; conj.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>adv. &amp; conj.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pros</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>unident.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep. (solum per comp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secundum</td>
<td>unident.</td>
<td>unident.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secus</td>
<td>unident.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>prep. &amp; adv.</td>
<td>prep. &amp; adv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sine</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prev.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>super</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adv. &amp; prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supra</td>
<td>s.v. ‘super’</td>
<td>s.v. ‘super’</td>
<td>s.v. ‘super’</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>s.v. ‘super’</td>
<td>prep. &amp; adv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>unident.</td>
<td>prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>versus</td>
<td>adv. &amp; prep.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>adv. &amp; prep.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>prep.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 4

**Comparison of Lemmata in the Letter 'Z' in Catholicum abbreviatum c.1482, Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus and Catholicon abbreviatum 1492**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CA c.1482</th>
<th>VFC</th>
<th>CA 1492</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zabulom</td>
<td>zaberna ne. zaberta, zabarra vel zabarca</td>
<td>zaberna/ne. zaberta/rie. zabarra vel zabarca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zabulon</td>
<td>zabulon</td>
<td>zabulon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zabuligena ne.</td>
<td>zabolus vel zabolon, inde zabuligna na num et zaboligena ne.</td>
<td>zabolus vel zabolon. unde zaboligna/a/ um et zaboligena/ ne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zacharias nie.</td>
<td>zacharias</td>
<td>zacharias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zacheus</td>
<td>zacheus</td>
<td>zacheus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zalata te.</td>
<td>zair</td>
<td>zair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zama</td>
<td>zama</td>
<td>zama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zeb</td>
<td>zembr</td>
<td>zembr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zebedeus</td>
<td>zebedeus</td>
<td>zebedeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zelotes tis. vel zelesus a um.</td>
<td>zelotipia &lt;sic&gt; pie.</td>
<td>zelotipus a um.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zelotipus a um.</td>
<td>zelotipus a um.</td>
<td>zelotipus/a/um.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zelus li.</td>
<td>zelus li.</td>
<td>zelus/li.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zephrus ri.</td>
<td>zephirus</td>
<td>zephirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zeta</td>
<td>zeta</td>
<td>zeta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zeuma tis.</td>
<td>zeuma tis.</td>
<td>zeuma/tis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zerebavel, vel ierabel</td>
<td>zerebavel vel ierabel</td>
<td>zerebavel vel ierabel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zima</td>
<td>zima</td>
<td>zima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zimos</td>
<td>zimos</td>
<td>zimos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zinziber</td>
<td>zinziber</td>
<td>zinziber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zizianium nii. [...] Et pluraliter ziza-</td>
<td>zizianium nii. [...] Et pluraliter ziza-</td>
<td>zizianium nii. [...] Et pluraliter ziza-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zodiacus a um.</td>
<td>zodiacus ci.</td>
<td>zodiacus/a/um.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zedeeara &lt;sic&gt; re.</td>
<td>zedeeara &lt;sic&gt; re.</td>
<td>zedeeara &lt;sic&gt; re.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zodiacus ci.</td>
<td>zodiacus ci.</td>
<td>zodiacus ci.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zona ne.</td>
<td>zona ne.</td>
<td>zona/ne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zanifragium &lt;sic&gt; gii.</td>
<td>zanifragium &lt;sic&gt; gii.</td>
<td>zanifragium &lt;sic&gt;/gii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zerobabel &lt;sic&gt;</td>
<td>zerobabel</td>
<td>zerobabel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zoticus a um.</td>
<td>zoticus ci.</td>
<td>zoticus/a/um.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zoizinus a um.</td>
<td>zoizinus ci.</td>
<td>zoizinus/a/um.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zucara re.</td>
<td>zucara re.</td>
<td>zucara re.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zios vel zius</td>
<td>zios vel zius</td>
<td>zios vel zius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5

Title Pages from Existing Copies of the *Catholicon abbreviatum*¹⁰⁴

**Series 1**

Caillaut c.1482

Huss 1489/1490

Unknown [printer of Guido, *Casus longi*] c.1490

Schultis c.1495

Havard 1499/1500

**Series 2**

Morin 1492

Le Bourgeois 1497/1498

Morand 1497/1498

Le Noir 1497

Tréperel 1499

Morand c.1500

Tréperel c.1500

de la Barre 1510

Gaultier 1519

¹⁰⁴ This list is necessarily incomplete. Some editions are missing; some existing copies lack title pages; and some existing copies are unavailable for reproduction.
Plate 5: Title page of Catholicum abbreviatum, Antoine Caillaut, Paris, c.1482
Latholicon parvum.

Plate 6: Title page of *Catholicon parvum*, Matthias Huss, Lyons, 1489/1490
Plate 7: Title page of *Catholicum parvum*, Unknown, printer of *Casus longi*, Lyons, c.1490
Plate 8: Title page of *Catholicum parvum*, Engelhard Schultis, Lyons, c.1495
Plate 9: Title page of *Catholicum parvum*, Martin Havard, Lyons, 1499/1500
Plate 10: Title page of Catholicon abbreviatum, Martin Morin, Rouen, 1492
Plate 11: Title page of *Catholicon abbreviatum*, Jean Le Bourgeois, Rouen, 1497/1498
Plate 12: Title page of *Catholicum parvum*, Jean Morand, Paris 1497/1498
Plate 13: Title page of *Catholiccon abbreviatum*, Michel Le Noir, Paris, 1497
Plate 14: Title page of *Catholicon abbreviatom* <sic>, Jean Tréperel, Paris, 1499
Plate 15: Title page of *Catholicicon abbreviatum*, Jean Morand, Paris, c.1500
Plate 17: Title page of Vocabularius breviloquus, Nicolas de la Barre, Paris, 1510
Plate 18: Title page of *Vocabularius Srevilloquus <sic>*, Raulin Gaultier, Rouen, 1519
APPENDIX 6

Comparison of Lemmata in the Letter 'Z' in
Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus, Busa 1507
and Vocabularius nebrissensis 1517

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFC</th>
<th>Busa 1507</th>
<th>VN 1517</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zaberna ne. zabiteria, zabarra vel zabarca</td>
<td>zabulon</td>
<td>zabulon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zabulon</td>
<td>zacharias</td>
<td>zacharias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zabulus vel zabulon, inde zabulinas na num et zabuligena ne.</td>
<td>zacynthius</td>
<td>zacynthius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zacharias</td>
<td>zama</td>
<td>zama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zacheus</td>
<td>zamia</td>
<td>zamia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zair</td>
<td>zamolysis</td>
<td>zamolysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zalata</td>
<td>zance</td>
<td>zance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zama</td>
<td>zanclae</td>
<td>zanclae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zambri</td>
<td>zanclaeus</td>
<td>zanclaeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zeb inde</td>
<td>zaran</td>
<td>zaran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zebe</td>
<td>zea</td>
<td>zea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zebedeus</td>
<td>zeta</td>
<td>zeta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zebub</td>
<td>zeta</td>
<td>zeta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zelatus est</td>
<td>zelatipus a um</td>
<td>zelotipus a um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zelotipia tipie</td>
<td>zelotypus</td>
<td>zelotypus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zelatipas pas</td>
<td>zelotypa</td>
<td>zelotypa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zelar aris atus sum vel fui ari</td>
<td>zelotypia</td>
<td>zelotypia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zelatus ata atum</td>
<td>zelus</td>
<td>zelus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zelo as vi tum</td>
<td>zelor</td>
<td>zelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zelosus sa sum</td>
<td>zelo</td>
<td>zelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zelotes tis</td>
<td>zeno</td>
<td>zeno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zelus li lo</td>
<td>zenulus</td>
<td>zenulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zephyrus</td>
<td>zephyrius</td>
<td>zephyrius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zeta te</td>
<td>zephyria</td>
<td>zephyria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zeuma matis</td>
<td>zephyritis</td>
<td>zephyritis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zimos vel zima unde</td>
<td>zethus</td>
<td>zethus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>azima</td>
<td>zethus</td>
<td>zethus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zinzala le</td>
<td>zeugma</td>
<td>zeugma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zinzalarium rii</td>
<td>zeugma</td>
<td>zeugma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zinziber eris</td>
<td>zeugma</td>
<td>zeugma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zio vel zaius</td>
<td>zeusis</td>
<td>zeusis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zizania hoc zizinium nii et hec</td>
<td>zeus</td>
<td>zeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zizania nie</td>
<td>zeuro</td>
<td>zeuro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zizanium nii</td>
<td>zinthulo</td>
<td>zinthulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zizania nie</td>
<td>zinthus</td>
<td>zinthus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zizania orum</td>
<td>zyma</td>
<td>zyma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zodiacus ci</td>
<td>zizania</td>
<td>zizania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zona ne</td>
<td>ziziphus</td>
<td>ziziphus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zonarius nia rium</td>
<td>ziziphum</td>
<td>ziziphum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zonella le</td>
<td>zodiacus</td>
<td>zodiacus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zonula le</td>
<td>zoius</td>
<td>zoius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zonifragium gigi</td>
<td>zona</td>
<td>zona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zorobabel</td>
<td>zona</td>
<td>zona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zoticus a um</td>
<td>zonula</td>
<td>zonula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zozinus ma mum</td>
<td>zopyrus</td>
<td>zopyrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zucara re</td>
<td>zopissa</td>
<td>zopissa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zuthus</td>
<td>zuthus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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zinzalarium ii. 
zinziber eris. 
zio vel zius 
zodiacus zodiaci 
zolus i. 
zona e. 
zonula e. 
zonarius ii. 
zophirus 
zopissa e. 
zothus ti. 
zorobabel 
zonifragium ii. 
zoticus ca. cum. 
zozimus a. um. 
zucara e.
## APPENDIX 7

Comparison of Lemmata beginning *Mag.* in the *Catholic* and the *Dictionarium* of Ambrogio Calepino

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catholicon</th>
<th>Dictionarium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magalia</td>
<td>Magar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magale .lis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magal</td>
<td>Magidae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalenus</td>
<td>Magia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magdalenus na num</td>
<td>* Magicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magdalena ne</td>
<td>Maginor aris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mage</td>
<td>Magirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magis</td>
<td>Magis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magis pluris</td>
<td>Magistri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magister</td>
<td>magister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magistra .tre</td>
<td>magistellus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magisterculis li</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magistercula le</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magister .ra .rum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magisterium .rii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magistralis .le</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magistratus .tus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magistermilitum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistratus in magister est.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnas</td>
<td>Magnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnamentum</td>
<td>magna num &amp; magnum secundum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnamentum .i</td>
<td>Magnalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnalis</td>
<td>Magnificus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnalis .le</td>
<td>Magnifico as.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnamentum in magnamentum exponitur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnanimus</td>
<td>Magnas atis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnanimus .a .um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnanimis .me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnanimiter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnanimitas .tatis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnas</td>
<td>Magna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnas [.tis]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnatus .ta .tum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnatus .ta .tum in magnas est</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnes</td>
<td>Magog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnes .etis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnifico</td>
<td>Magus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnifico .cas .cavi .care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnificus .ca .cum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnifice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnificens .tis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnificenter .tius .sime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnificencia .cie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnificus in magnifico .cas vide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magniloquus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magniloquus .a .um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magniloquium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnopere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus .na .num</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maguder maguderis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magicus .ca .cum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.  Lexicography


Barham 1843 = Francis Barham, The Life and Times of John Reuchlin or Capnion, the Father of the German Reformation, London: Darton, 1843


Bray 1986 = Laurent Bray, César-Pierre Richelet (1626–1698), Biographie et oeuvre lexicographique, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1986


CGL = Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum a Gustavo Loewe inchoatum, auspiciis Academiae Litterarum Saxoniae compositum recensuit edidit Georgius Goetz, 7 vol., Leipzig 1888–1923

Chassant 1877 = A.A.L. Chassant, Petit vocabulaire latin-français du XIIIe siècle, extrait d’un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque d’Évreux, Paris 1857, reprint 1877


Daly 1966 = Lloyd W. Daly, "Guillelmus Brito and his works", *The University of Pennsylvania Library Chronicle* 32, 1966, 1–17


Daly/Daly 1975 = Lloyd W. Daly and Bernardine A. Daly (eds.), *Summa Britonis sive Guillelmi Britonis Expositiones Vocabulorum Biblie*, 2 vol., Padua, 1975


Delisle 1894 = Léopold Delisle, "Alexandre de Villedieu et Guillaume Le Moine, de Villedieu", *Bibliothèque de l’École des Chartes* 55, 1894, 488–504


Delisle 1869 = Léopold Delisle, "Note sur un manuscrit de Tours renfermant des gloses françaises du XIIe siècle", *Bibliothèque de l’École des Chartes* 70, 1869, 320–333


Escallier 1851 = E... A... E..., *Remarques sur le patois suivies du vocabulaire latin-français de Guillaume Briton (XIVe siècle)*, Douai, 1851


Hauréau 1885 = Barthélemy Hauréau, "Additions et corrections" in Histoire littéraire de la France, Tome XXIX, Paris, 1885


Hunt, T. 1979c = Tony Hunt, "Vernacular glosses in medieval manuscripts", Cultura neo-latina 39, 1979, 9–37


Keil = Heinrich Keil, Grammatici latini, 8 vol. 1855–1870, reprint Hildesheim: Olms 1961

Kibbee 1985 = Douglas A. Kibbee, "Progress in bilingual lexicography during the Renaissance", 
*Dictionaries 7*, 1985, 21–31


Labhardt 1936 = André Labhardt, *Contributions à la critique et l’explication des gloses de Reichenau*, Neuchâtel, 1936


Lindsay 1903 = Wallace Martin Lindsay (ed.), *Nonii Marcelli de compendiosa doctrina libros XX onionsianis copiis usus edidit Wallace M. Lindsay*, 3 vol., Leipzig 1903; reprint Hildesheim: Georg Olms 1964


Lindsay 1917 = Wallace Martin Lindsay, "The Abstrusa Glossary and the Liber Glossarum", *The Classical Quarterly* 11, 1917, 119–131

Littré 1852 = Émile Littré, "Glossaires" in *Histoire de la langue française*, Tome XXII, 1852, 1–38

Loewe 1876 = Gustav Loewe, *Prodromus Corporis glossariorum latinorum, Quaestiones de glossariorum latinorum fontibus et usu*, Leipzig, 1876

Mai 1836 = Angelo Mai (ed.), *Classicorum auctorum. Tome VIII, Thesaurus novus latinitatis*, Rome 1836

Manitius = Max Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 3 vol., Munich, 1911–1931


Merrilees 1993a = Brian Merrilees, "Transmission and transformation: shaping the medieval dictionary". Paper presented to the Society for Textual Scholarship, New York, April 1993

Merrilees 1993b = Brian Merrilees, "Translation and definition in the medieval bilingual dictionary". Paper presented to the 28th International Congress on Medieval Studies, Kalamazoo, Michigan, May 1993


Mountford 1925 = J.F. Mountford, Quotations from Classical Authors in Medieval Latin Glossaries, New York, 1925


Powitz 1988 = Gerhardt Powitz, "Das Catholicon in buch- und textegesichtlicher Sicht", in Wolfenbütteler Notizen zur Buchgeschichte XIII, 2, 1988, 125–137


Quemada 1972 = Bernard Quemada, "Du glossaire au dictionnaire", Cahiers de Lexicologie XX, I, 1972, 97–128

Riessner 1965 = Claus Riessner, Die 'Magnae Derivationes' des Uguccione da Pisa und ihre Bedeutung für die romanische Philologie, Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1965


Robustelli Della Cuna 1972 = Fabrizia Robustelli Della Cuna, "Osbern da Gloucester: vocaboli volgari", Quadrivium 13/2, 1972, 43–65

Roques 1936a = Mario Roques, "Recueil général des lexiques français du Moyen Âge", Romania 62, 1936, 248–155


Scheler 1865a = August Scheler (ed.) "Glossaire roman-latin du XVe siècle (Ms. de la Bibliothèque de Lille", *Annales de l’Académie d’archéologie de Belgique* XXI/1 (2e série) 1865, 81–133


Scheler 1867 = August Scheler (ed.), "Trois traités de lexicographie latine du XIIe et du XIIIe siècle. III. Adea Parvipontani, De utensilibus ad domum regendam pertinentibus", *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Literatur* VIII, 1867, 75–91

Scheler 1886 = August Scheler (ed.), "Le Catholicon de Lille, Glossaire latin-français" in *Mémoires couronnés et autres mémoires publiés par l’Académie royale des sciences, des lettres et des beaux-arts de Belgique* XXXVII, 1886, 3–153


Weijers 1989 = Olga Weijers, "Lexicography in the Middle Ages", *Viatior* 20, 1989 139–153


Wright 1857 = Thomas Wright (ed.), *A Volume of Vocabularies illustrating the Condition and Manners of our Forefathers*, Liverpool 1857; 2nd edition, London 1873


2. Language


3. **Books and Printing**


Daly 1967 = Lloyd W. Daly, *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Brussels: Latomus, 1967


4. Bibliographies and Catalogues


BE = Catalogo general de Incunables en Bibliotecas Españolas, Madrid 1989


BI = Indice generale degli Incunaboli delle Biblioteche d’Italia, Rome 1972


BNC = Catalogue général des livres imprimés de la Bibliothèque nationale, Auteurs, Paris 1897–


Brunet 1865 = Gustave Brunet, La France littéraire au XVe siècle, ou Catalogue raisonné des ouvrages en tout genre imprimés en langue française jusqu’à l’an 1500, Paris, 1865; Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1967

BSA = Bayerische Staatsbibliothek alphabetischer Katalog, 1501–1840

BSI = Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Inkunabelkatalog


Cat. Bignon = Catalogue de la bibliothèque de feu M. Jérôme Bignon, Paris: Chimot, Libraire, 1848

Cat. Yemeniz = Catalogue de la bibliothèque de M.N. Yemeniz, Paris: Bachelin-Deflorenne, 1867


Haebler 1903 = Conrad Haebler, Bibliografía Ibérica del Siglo XV, The Hague-Leipzig, 1903

Hain = Ludwig Hain, Repertorium bibliographicum ad annum 1500, 4 vol., Stuttgart-Paris, 1826–1838; reprint Milan: Görlich, 1953


Picot = Emile Picot, Catalogue des livres composant la bibliothèque de feu M. le baron Rothschild, 5 vol., Paris, 1884–1920

Proctor = Robert Proctor, An Index to the Early Printed Books in the British Museum from the Invention of Printing to the Year MD, 3 vol., London: Kegan Paul, 1898–1903


Renouard 1965 = Philippe Renouard, Répertoire des imprimeurs parisiens, libraires, fondeurs de caractères, et correcteurs d'imprimerie depuis l'introduction de l'imprimerie à Paris (1470) jusqu'à la fin du seizième siècle, Paris: Minard, 1965


5. Other


Faguet 1898 = Émile Faguet, Seizième siècle. Études littéraires. Paris: Boivin, 1898

Laistner 1931 = M.L.W. Laistner, Thought and Letters in Western Europe, A.D. 500 to 900, London: Methuen, 1931

Nettleship 1885 = Henry Nettleship, Lectures and Essays on Subjects connected with Latin Literature and Scholarship, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1885


6. *Lexicographical Instruments*


B LIST OF AUTHORS AND WORKS

Following is a list of works discussed in our study, arranged alphabetically by author, or by title if they are anonymous. Each item includes a short description, references to the publications in Part A above in which they are mentioned, and details (where known) of manuscripts and editions.

1. Pre-Print Works

Aalma. late 13th-early 14th c., group of Latin-French alphabetical glossaries, based on the Catholicon of John Balbi of Genoa, and source of the printed Latin-French Catholicon abbreviatum.
Ed. ms. Lille BM 388, Scheler 1865a; ms. Paris BN 13032, Roques 1938.
Mss. Paris BN lat. 13032; Paris BN lat. 17881, Paris BN lat. 14748; Paris BN lat. 7679; Exeter 3517; Salins BM 44; Lille BM 388 (now n° 147); Metz BM 510; Saint-Omer BM 644; Troyes BM 1459; Angers BM 417 – fragments of letters D, E, F; Épinal BM 224; Paris AN M897; Metz BM 1182; Paris, BN nouv.acq.fr. 24398, ff. 14–25 – fragment of M, complete N and O, fragment of P.

Abavus, 8th–9th c., Latin alphabetical glossary (or group of glossaries).
Ed. CGL IV, 301–403, and 589–599; GL II, 29–121.

Abavus, late 13th-early 14th c., group of Latin-French alphabetical glossaries. Some mss. based on Papias, others on Balbi.
Ed. 5 mss. Roques 1936b.
Mss. Douai BM 62, Evreux BM 23, Vatican lat. 2748, Paris BN lat. 7692, Conches BM 1, Trier SB 1125.

Abolita and Abstrusa, beg. of 8th and beg. of 7th c., Latin alphabetical glossaries.
Lit. Laistner 1931, 177; Lindsay 1917; Weijers 1989, 140.
Ed. CGL IV, 3–198 (Abstrusa); GL III, 1–90 (Abstrusa), 93–183 (Abolita).

Adam of Petit Pont, De utensilibus ad domum regendam pertinentibus, c.1150, Latin thematic glossary describing people and objects encountered on a visit to the author’s estate in England. Some mss. contain English and French glosses.
15 mss.

Alexander Nequam, De nominibus utensiliwm, 12th c., Latin thematic glossary of everyday objects and occupations. Some mss. contain English and French glosses.
Ed. Scheler 1866; Wright 1857, 96–119; extracts Hunt, T. 1991 I.
30+ mss.
Alexander of Villedieu, *Doctrinale*, c.1199, Latin grammar in 3 parts; one of several new grammars which began to replace Donatus and Priscian. Many mss. contain French glosses.
400+ mss.

Aristophanes, *Lexeis*, 3rd c. B.C., systematically-arranged dictionary using a derivational approach to show the original meaning of every word.

Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, 2nd c., a compilation of earlier scholarship on Latin language and literature, and on law and philosophy. 100+ chapters concern Latin lexicography, 10 chapters deal with etymology, and 30+ chapters discuss Latin grammar.

*Auricept*, 7th c. Irish grammar and glossary, the oldest treatise of any language of Western Europe.

Based on the *Summa Britonis* and the *Graecismus*.
Ed. in progress, Grondeux.
Ms. Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine H236.

*Catholicon anglicum*, English-Latin lexicon, based on the *Catholicon*, *Brito*, *Hugutio* and others. Close similarities with the *Synonyma* of John of Garland.

*Catholicon latin-français*, alphabetical Latin-French dictionary, based mainly on the *Catholicon* of John Balbi.
Ed. in progress, Merrilees/Edwards/Nobel.
Ms. Montpellier Faculté de Médecine H110 (c.1370–1380); Stockholm KB N78 (mid-15th c.),

*Corpus, Erfurt, Leiden and Epinal Glossaries*, 8th–9th c., Latin alphabetical glossaries with some Anglo-Saxon glosses.

Dionysius Thrax, *Ars grammatica*, 2nd c. BC, earliest extant grammar, which greatly influenced later Greek and Roman grammarians and lexicographers.

*Donatus*, *Ars minor* and *Ars maior*, 4th c., basic Latin grammars used throughout the Middle Ages.
Ed. Mainz 1452 and many other early editions; Holtz 1981.


Ed. CGL III 1892

Eberhard of Bethune, *Graecismus*, c. 1210, Latin grammar in fifteen books of hexameters, includes all aspects of grammar and glossography.


Ed. J. Wrobel, Breslau 1887.

Erotian, *Collection of Technical Terms in Hippocrates*, 1st c., compilation of medical terms.

Lit. Daly 1967, 34; Sandys 1921 1, 329.


Firmin Le Ver, *Dictionarius*, 1420–1440, large Latin-French dictionary based on the *Catholicon* of John Balbi and on other sources including Papias, Hugutio and Donatus. Combines absolute alphabetical order with the derivational system. Closely related to the manuscripts *Glossarium gallico-latinum* and the printed *Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus*.


Ms. Paris BN nouv.acq.fr. 1120.


Lit. Daly 1967, 34; Sandys 1921 1, 329.

*Glossae Eucheri*ii, 5th c., Latin glossary of terms extracted from the *Formulae spiritualis intelligentiae* of Saint Eucherius.


*Glossarium Ansileubi* – see *Liber glossarium*.

*Glossarium gallico-latinum*, 15th c., French-Latin glossary, alphabetical to first letter. Closely related to the *Dictionarius* of Firmin Le Ver and to the *Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus* of Guillaume Le Talleur.


Ed. in progress, Merrilees/Edwards.

Ms. Paris BN lat. 7684.

*Glossarium Salomonis*, two versions, end of 8th c. and 10th c., large alphabetical Latin glossary; in some mss. attributed to Salomo III, abbot of St. Gall and Bishop of Constance. Largely based on the *Liber glossarum*.

Lit. Collison 1982, 43; Hessels 1019, 127; Lindemann 1994, 94; McGeachy 1938

Ed. Augsberg c.1475, with German glosses.


Ed. Daly/Daly 1975.

130 mss.

Hesychius, *Lexicon*, 5th c., very large Greek lexicon, alphabetically ordered.

Ed. Latte, Copenhagen 1953.

1 ms. (15th century).

Hrabanus Maurus, *De rerum naturis* or *De universo*, vast encyclopaedia based on Isidore of Seville’s *Opus de universo*. Includes an alphabetically-arranged etymological glossary.
Lit. Collison 1982, 40; Laistner 1931, 176; Sandys 1921 1, 483.

Ed. Strasbourg 1467.

210+ mss.

Hugutio of Pisa, *Magnae derivationes*, c.1200, vast Latin dictionary, organized on the derivational system. Alphabetical to first letter only. Most mss. are furnished with a table to improve consultability. One of the chief sources of medieval lexicographical production.

Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae sive Origines*, early 7th c., encyclopaedia in twenty books. Book I, *De grammatica* (a treatise on grammar) and Book X, *De vocabulis* (a glossary explaining the origin and meaning of certain substantives and adjectives) were very influential in medieval grammar and lexicography.

Ed. Lindsay 1911.

Isidore of Seville, *De differentia verborum*, early 7th c., list of synonyms in first-letter alphabetical order, and *De differentiis rerum*, a list of terms of a theological and spiritual nature.
Lit. Brehaut 1912, 26; Lindemann 1994, 96.

John Balbi of Genoa, *Catholicon*, 1286, Latin grammatical work in five parts, of which book V is a large lexicon, based on Papias, Hugutio and others, and organized on the basis of alphabetical order and derivation. The most influential dictionary of the Middle Ages, and the source of many abridgments and adaptations, both Latin and Latin-vernacular.

Ed. Mainz 1460 (reprint Gregg: Westmead 1971), and 25+ later editions to 1521.

200+ mss.
John Marchesinus, *Mammotrectus, or Expositiones vocabulorum Biblie*, beg. 14th c., a theological manual containing etymological explanations of difficult words in the Bible and in the liturgical Hours. In text order, accompanied by an alphabetical table. Based mainly on William Brito.
Ed. Venice 1476; Paris 1521.


John of Garland, *Dictionarius*, c.1220, thematic Latin glossary, arranged according to an assortment of everyday topics. Most mss. contain vernacular glosses.
Ed. Géraud 1837; Scheler 1865b; Wright 1867; Hunt 1991.

5 mss.

Ed. Valencia 1475.
Ms. Madrid BN 1801; Paris BN lat. 7678.

Julius Caesar, *De analogia*, 1st c. B.C.
Lit. Nettleship 1895, 147f.; Sandys 1921 I, 180, 194.

Julius Pollux, *Onomasticon*, 2nd c., Attic glossary covering law and administration, music and dancing, medicine, the stage and numismatics.
Lit. Collison 1982, 34; Daly 1967, 28; Matoré 1968, 42; Sandys 1921 I, 327.
Ed. Venice 1502.

*Liber glossarum*, late 8th c., important Latin alphabetical glossary, based largely on the *Etymologiae* of Isidore. Main source for the Reichenau Glossary, the *Glossarium Salomonis*, and Papias. Also called *Glossarium Ansileubi*.
Ed. GL l.

Marcus Terentius Varro, *De lingua latina*, 1st c. BC, first treatise on the Latin language, of which only 6 of the original 25 books remain. Varro’s etymological model for the study of language greatly influenced medieval grammar.
Marcus Terentius Varro, *Disciplinarum libri novem*, 1st c. B.C., first Latin work on the liberal arts.
Lit. Sandys 1921 I, 178.

Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Synonyma*, 1st c. B.C., collection of Latin synonyms, much used by later grammarians and lexicographers
Lit. Nettleship 1895, 147f.; Sandys 1921 I, 180, 194.

Nigidius Figulus, *Commentarii grammatici*, 1st c. B.C. Early Latin grammar, dealing especially with orthography, synonyms and etymology.
Lit. Nettleship 1895, 147f.; Sandys 1921 I, 194.

Nonius Marcellus, *De compendiosa doctrina*, 4th c., encyclopaedic Latin work consisting of three parts: lexicographical, grammatical and antiquarian. Based largely on Varro, Probus and Pliny.
Lit. Collison 1982, 35; Daly 1967, 58f; Lindemann 1994, 91; Nettleship 1885, 228f.; Sandys 1921 I, 220.
Ed. Lindsay 1903.

Ed. ms. Vatican Reg. lat. 1392, Mai 1836.
21 complete mss. and 6 fragments.

Papias, *Elementarium doctrinae erudimentum*, c.1050, first important Latin dictionary, based largely on the *Liber glossarum*, alphabetical to the third letter. Close to a glossary structure, but contains some examples of the derivational system, and some encyclopaedic articles. Very influential in later Latin lexicography.
Ed. Milan 1476; Venice 1485, 1491, 1496 (the latter edition was reprinted at Turin in 1966); de Angelis 1977, 3 volumes, letter A.
110 mss.

Paulus Diaconus (Paul the Deacon), 8th c., a commentary on Donatus, and an epitome of Festus’s abridgement of the *De verborum significatione* of Verrius Flaccus.

Peter Helias, *Summa super Priscianum*, c.1150, a commentary on Priscian’s *Institutiones grammaticae*.
Peter of Riga, *Aurora*, 12th c., vast poem on the Old Testament; grammatical rules developed in verse.
Lit. Della Casa 1981, 44.

Photius, *Lexicon*, 9th c., Greek lexicon including material from earlier glossaries, alphabetical to the second letter.
1 ms. Codex Galeanus, Trinity College, Cambridge.
Ed. Naber, Leyden 1864.

Photius, *Etymologicum genuinum* and *Etymologicum parvum*, 9th c., two lexica based on the etymological principle, which greatly influenced later Byzantine lexicography. Alphabetical to the third letter.
Lit. Collison 1982, 36; Daly 1967, 67; Sandys 1921 I, 400, 414f.

Pierre Bersuire, *Reductorfurn*, *repertorium et dictionarium morale utriusque testamenti*, beg. 14th c., a manual for the clergy, of which Part 3 is an alphabetically-arranged glossary of more than 3,000 words from the Bible, with moral expositions.
Ed. for ex. Nuremberg 1489.
Many mss.

Lit. Della Casa 1981, 37; GGL II, 60f.; Hessels 1910, 126; Littré 1852, 2f.; Nettleship 1884: 244.
Ed. Rome 1836; GGL V.

Plato, *Cratylus*, 5th c. B.C., a Dialogue in which three speakers uphold different positions on the origin of language.
Lit. Amsler 1989, 32; Sandys 1921 I, 92.

Pliny the Elder, *Dubius sermo*, 1st c., grammatical treatise based chiefly on Varro, Verrius Flaccus and the *De analogia* of Julius Caesar. Source for a number of later grammarians.
Lit. Nettleship 1895: 161, 163; Sandys 1921 I, 204f.

Pliny the Elder, *Historia naturalis*, 1st c., monumental wordbook on natural history, largely copied from Greek sources.
Lit. Daly 1967, 38; Sandys 1921 I, 204.

Priscian, *Institutiones grammaticae*, c.510, comprehensive Latin grammar consisting of 18 books. Together with Donatus, the grammatical authority of the Middle Ages.
1,000+ mss.

*Promptorium parvulorum*, 1440, English-Latin alphabetical dictionary, consisting of 2 parts – *Nominae* and *Verba*. Composed by an English Dominican and based mainly on the *Catholicum*.
Ed. Pynson 1499; Wynkyn de Worde; Julian Notary; Mayhew, 1908.
Reichenau Glossary, 10th c., Latin glossary in 2 parts – a biblical glossary in text order, and an alphabetical wordlist – with vulgar Latin, Romanic and German glosses.

Sextus Pompeius Festus, 2nd c. abridgement of Verrius Flaccus’s De verborum significatione.
Lit. Collison 1982, 34; Engels 1961, 2; Sandys 1921 I, 200.

Stephanus of Byzantium, Ethnica, 5th c., alphabetical Greek geographical lexicon.
Lit. Daly 1967, 66; Sandys 1921 I, 379.

Suda, 10th c., large Greek alphabetical lexicon; a combination of glossary and encyclopaedia.
Lit. Collison 1982, 45; Matoré 1968, 43; Sandys 1921 I, 407f.
Ed. 1499, and many other early editions.

Suetonius Tranquillus, Prata, 2nd c., encyclopaedia (now lost) which was a source for later authors and compilers.
Lit. Nettleship 1885: 248; Sandys 1921 I, 209f.

Valerius Harpocration, The Technical Terms of the Ten Orators, 1st c. A.D., lexicon of the language of Attic orators, quotes extensively from the works of poets, historians, travellers, and others.
Lit. Daly 1967, 33; Sandys 1921 I, 326.

Verrius Flaccus, De verborum significatione, 1st c. BC, first treatise on Latin language, abridged by Sextus Pompeius Festus in the 2nd c. AD, and further abridged by Paul the Deacon in the 8th c.
Lit. Collison 1982, 30f.; Engels; Hessels 1910, 125f.; Lindemann 1994, 91; Nettleship 1895, 158; Sandys 1921 I, 200; Weijers 1989, 139.

Vocabularius brevilogus, late 14th c., Latin alphabetical dictionary, based on the Catholicon and its predecessors. Divided into three parts – Nomina, Verba and Indeclinabilia. Mss. usually contain German glosses. Source for the printed Vocabularius breviloquus compiled by Johannes Reuchlin.
Many mss.

Vocabularius Ex quo, c.1400, alphabetical Latin dictionary often containing German glosses, based on large Latin dictionaries and on the Vocabularius brevilogus.
Ed. Eltville 1467 and many other early editions; Grubmüller/Schnell 1988.
Many mss.

Walafrid Strabo, Glossa ordinaria, 9th c., a glossary of terms in the Vulgate; later much copied and revised.
Lit. Collison 1982, 42; Sandys 1921 I, 485.
2. **New Printed Works to 1539**

Calepino (Ambrogio), *Dictionarium*, large Latin dictionary, which later became a popular polyglot dictionary for nearly 3 centuries. All modern European languages, as well as Hebrew and Greek, appeared in the *Dictionarium* at one time or another, but all editions follow the alphabetical order of Latin, making Latin the only entry point.

Ed. Reggio nell’Emilia 1502; 200+ editions to 1779.

*Catholicicon abbreviatum*, also known as *Catholicicon parvum*, *Vocabularius brevidiae*, *Vocabularius breviloquus*, first printed Latin-French dictionary, based on a manuscript belonging to the *Aalma* series. A small dictionary (approximately 13,000 articles) whose purpose was to teach Latin to students.

Ed. see Bibliography: Part C.

Estienne (Robert),

*Thesaurs*. A Latin dictionary which is considered to be the foundation of modern Latin lexicography. It is notable for the quantity and the quality of citations from Latin classics. The *Thesaurs* included French forms in the first edition of 1531 and the second of 1536. French was omitted from Estienne’s third and last edition printed in 1543.

Ed. 1531, 1536, 1543 (Estienne), + many later editions.

*Dictionarium Latino-gallicum*. A bilingual Latin-French dictionary based on the *Thesaurs* but intended for students. Names of writers and other authorities are omitted.

Ed. 1538, 1543, 1544, 1546 (Estienne), 1552, 1561.

*Dictionaire Francoislatin*. The first printed bilingual French-Latin dictionary. It appeared in 1539 and is regarded as the cornerstone of modern French lexicography. Improvements were made in the 1549 edition, which laid more emphasis on the quality of French.

Ed. 1539, 1549 (Estienne); 1564 (Thierry); 1573 (Nicot-Dupuis); 1606 (Nicot).


Grapaldus (Franciscus), *Lexicon de partibus aedium*, thematic Latin dictionary comprising 24 chapters, each describing the furnishings and apparatus of a particular part of a house. One of the sources of Calepino’s *Dictionarium*.

Ed. Parma 1494 and many later editions.

Le Talleur (Guillaume), *Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus*, large Latin-French dictionary, closely related to the manuscript *Dictionarius* of Firmin Le Ver and the manuscript *Glossarium gallico-latinum*. Based on the *Catholicicon*, Papias, Hugutio, the *Vocabularius breviloquus* and other texts.

Lit. Le Verdier 1916, 120f.; Lindemann 1994, 244f.; Merrilees 1990, 289;
Ed. Le Talleur, Rouen c.1490; Morin, Rouen 1500.
Ed. in progress Merrilees/Edwards.
Nebrija (Aelio Antonio de), *Lexicon o dicionario latino-español*, Latin-Spanish alphabetical dictionary compiled by Spanish grammarian and humanist Nebrija, whose sources are not yet determined. Reversed in 1495 as Latin-Spanish *Vocabulario español-latino*. Basis for Catalan adaptation of 1507 (*Diccionario latín-catalán catalán-latín*), which is the source for the Latin-French *Vocabularius nebrissensis*.


Reuchlin (Johannes), *Vocabularius breviloquus*, a monolingual Latin dictionary based on the fourteenth-century Latin-German *Vocabularius brevilogus*. The nomenclature is divided into 3 parts: Nomina, Verba and Indeclinabilia, each part being ordered alphabetically to the third letter. Usually printed with other grammatical treatises: *Ars diphthongandi* of Guarinus Veronensi and *De arte punctandi dialogus* and *De accentu* of Johannes Heynlin.

Lit. Barham 1843, 42; Daly/Daly 1964, 239; Lindemann 1994, 118f.
Ed. Amerbach, Basle 1475 + many other editions.

*Vocabularium latinis gallicis et theutonicis verbis scriptum*, early sixteenth-century thematically-arranged dictionary in three languages: Latin, French and German.

Ed. Thomas, Lyons 1514, and several later editions.

*Vocabularius nebrissensis/Epithoma vocabularum*, early sixteenth-century alphabetical Latin-French dictionary, intended for the use of preachers and students having some knowledge of Latin. The author is unknown but it is based on Gabriel Busa’s Latin-Catalan adaptation of Antonio de Nebrija’s Latin-Spanish dictionary.

C EDITIONS AND EXISTING COPIES OF THE CATHOLICON ABBREVIATUM

Series 1

Antoine Callaut, Paris

*Catholicum abbreviatum*
Paris, c.1482
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, C–195

*[Catholicum abbreviatum]*
Paris, c.1482–1484
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Rés. X.1599

*[Catholicum abbreviatum]*
Paris, c.1482–1484
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Rés. X.1598

*Jean du Pré* pour Antoine Vérard, Paris

*[Catholicum abbreviatum]*
Paris, 4 II 1485/1486
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Rothschild 2765

Louis Cruse (Loys Garbin), Geneva

*[Catholicum parvum]*
Geneva, c.1485
Genève, Bibliothèque publique et universitaire, Hb 1747 Rés.

*[Catholicum parvum]*
Geneva, 15 VI 1487
Paris, Bibliothèque Saint-Geneviève, OE 755(2)
London, British Library, IA.38439

Matthias Huss, Lyons

*Catholicon parvum*
Lyons, 31 III 1489/1490
Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 329 (anc. T.8. 591(1))
Lyons, Bibliothèque de l'Université catholique de Lyon, Inc. 17, Rés. 1

Unknown [printer of Guido, Casus longi], Lyons

*Catholicum parvum*
Lyons, c.1490
Chicago, Newberry Library, Inc. 8709.5
Engelhard Schultis, Lyons

Catholicum parvum
Lyons, c.1495
Saint-Mihiel, Bibliothèque municipale, 4°0.145
London, British Library, IA.42021

Martin Havard, Lyons

Catholicum parvum
Lyons, 1499/1500
XXXX
XXXX

Jean de Vingle, Lyons

Catholicum parvum
Lyons, c.1500
Toulouse, Bibliothèque des Frères mineurs Capucins, 953°

Unknown, Lyons

Catholicum parvum
Lyons, c.1508
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Rés.8°Z Don 594(360)

Missing Editions of Series 1

Unknown

Catholicum parvum
c. 1487
Beaulieux 1904: 378
Catalogue J. Bignon 1848
Missing

Unknown [printer of Baldovinus Sabaudiensis, Ars memoria]

Catholicum parvum
Lyons, c.1500
Solothurn, Zentralbibliothek
Missing
Series 2

Martin Morin, Rouen

*Catholicon abbreviatum*
Rouen, 30 VI 1492
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Rés. X.1600
London, British Library, IA.43953

Unknown [type used by Jean Bonhomme], Paris

[Catholicon abbreviatum]
Paris, c.1492–1496
Tours, Bibliothèque de l'Université de Tours, Section Droit-Lettres, Rés. 2021

Jean Morand, Paris

*Catholicum parvum*
Paris, 28 II 1497/1498 (pour Jehan Petit)
Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, Inc. M.38
*Catholicon abbreviatum*
Paris, c.1500 (pour les Frères de Marnef)
Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Inc. 4116 (4)

Jean Le Bourgeois, Rouen

*Catholicon abbreviatum*
Rouen, 13 III 1497/1498 (pour Pierre Regnault)
Cambridge, University Library, Inc. 5D. 18.s (2747)

Michel Le Noir, Paris

*Catholicon abbreviatum*
Paris, 2 V 1497

Jean Tréperel, Paris

*Catholicon abbreviatum*
Paris, 2 V 1499
Jena, Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, 4 Gl.IV. 38

*Catholicon abbreviatum*
Paris, c.1500
Chaumont, Bibliothèque municipale, A.1.G.7 (anc. T.831)
Nicolas de la Barre, Paris

Vocabularius breviloquus
Paris, 5 II 1510
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce V.182

Laurent Hostingue, Paris

[Vocabularius breviloquus]
Rouen, c.1511-1513
Caen, Musée de Beaux Arts, Mancel 341

Raulin Gaultier, Rouen

Vocabularius brevilloquus <sic>
Rouen, 1519
Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, Inc. p.124

Jehan Hérouf, Paris

Vocabularius breviloquus
Paris, 152. (last figure effaced)
Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, X8° 292

Incomplete and Missing Editions of Series 2

Unknown, Rouen

Catholicon abbreviatum
Rouen, c.1500 (pour Pierre Regnault à Caen)
Avranches, Bibliothèque municipale, E.279
Fragments of two folios

Jehan Lambert, Paris

Catholicon abbreviatum
Paris, 10 II 1506
Catalogue M.N. Yemeniz, 1867
Firmin-Didot 1868: 107
Wheatley, preface to Catholicon Anglicum, 1881
Beaulieux 1904: 378
Missing