Chapter 5

The treatment of English high-frequency verbs in the *Promptorium Parvulorum* (1440)

Kusujiro Miyoshi

Soka Women's College in Tokyo, Japan

What is the first dictionary that treats quite a few English high-frequency verbs, discriminating their senses and indicating their conjugated forms, with listing their relevant idiomatic phrases, especially phrasal verbs? It has usually been thought that one and only correct answer to the question is Samuel Johnson's Dictionary of the English Language. My answer is different; it is the 1440 edition of the *Promptorium Parvulorum*. This dictionary has long attracted quite a few authorities as the first English-Latin dictionary, but, as far as I can judge, its treatment of English high-frequency verbs has little been investigated. My purpose lies in filling this void. As to the procedure of my analysis, I will adopt a sampling method, selecting 128 entries related to 11 verbs, namely cast, come, fall, get, go, make, put, set, take, throw and turn. Then, I will analyze how the dictionary treats individual verbs, phrasal verbs and other relevant notable phrases. If a dictionary published more than three hundred years before Johnson's Dictionary closely treats English high-frequency verbs as I mentioned at the beginning, one generally accepted notion about the history of English lexicography may have to be revised.

1 Introduction

I want to begin my paper by posing this question: "What is the first English dictionary that treated quite a few high-frequency verbs, discriminating their senses and indicating their conjugated forms, with listing their relevant idiomatic phrases, especially phrasal verbs?". In my understanding, it has generally been believed that one and only correct answer to it is Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary of the*

Kusujiro Miyoshi

English Language which was published in 1755. If such is the case, is this answer according to the fact? Concerning the point, Anne McDermott and Rosamund Moon once remarked the following in their paper:

> [Johnson] was the first to deal systematically with such fundamental features of the English language as phrasal verbs, common polysemous verbs such as *take* [...], participial adjectives, verbal nouns, and many others. (McDermott & Moon 2005: 153)

If we disregard one word "systematically" in this sentence, whose concept they do not expound in the paper, this statement may become quite off the mark.

The reason for this is due to the fact that there are two perspectives to define an English dictionary. One perspective is to regard it as a monolingual dictionary, which may justify to see Johnson's *Dictionary* as the first that detailed the senses and usage of English high-frequency verbs.

However, there is another perspective. For one thing, we know Henry Wheatley's pioneering survey of the history of English lexicography in the work entitled the "Chronological notices of the dictionaries of the English language" (Wheatley (1865)). In this work, Wheatley treats English-Latin dictionaries, as well as English monolingual dictionaries. And we also know Gabriele Stein's monumental book in the philological research on English lexicography, whose title is *English Dictionary Before Cawdrey* (Stein 1985). She, in this book, mainly deals with historic bilingual and polyglot dictionaries published in England before 1604.

These examples manifest the fact that, for Wheatley and Stein, the category of English dictionaries includes not only monolingual ones but also those which show how English words and phrases can be translated into and explained in other languages. Such a situation also applies to the *Oxford History of English Lexicography* (Cowie 2009) edited by A. Cowie and the first and second volumes of the *Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers* (Franzen 2012) whose editor is Christine Franzen.

On this condition, if we are to take the second perspective, which is comprehensive, it is far from correct to mention Johnson's *Dictionary* as the answer to the question at the beginning. Then, what is actually the first English dictionary that bears the features I have referred to in the question? My answer to it is that, out of the dictionaries whose reprints and reproduced versions are available today, it is the 1440 edition of the *Promptorium Parvulorum*, the title meaning the "storehouse for children". This is the first English-Latin dictionary issued at Norfolk in the period of Middle English by an anonymous author attributed to a

person named Galfredus Grammaticus, a monk and grammarian, according to R. C. Alston (1968). We can know the contents of the dictionary through its modern reproduced version which was edited by A. Mayhew and published by Early English Text Society in 1908.

Then, this dictionary, the *Promptorium*, which was compiled more than three hundred years before Johnson's *Dictionary*, has long attracted many authorities until today for the reason of its being the first English-Latin dictionary, being treated in their research papers and books, including Wheatley (1865), Starnes & Noyes (1946), Wells (1973), Hüllen (2006), Sauer (2009) and Bately (2009), with the culmination of Stein (1985) and Stein (1997) in terms of meticulousness. However, as far as I can judge, research which is specialized in its treatment of English high-frequency verbs has yet to be performed. My purpose in this paper lies in filling this void.

As to the procedure of my analysis, I will adopt a sampling method, selecting 128 entries related to 11 verbs. To be concrete about the point, the *Promptorium* provides the number of entries specified in the parentheses for each of the verbs of my selection, like this: *cast* (10), *come* (5), *fall* (6), *get* (4), *go* (15), *make* (47), *put* (14), *set* (10), *take* (6), *throw* (6) and *turn* (5).

Here, there are two notes to be added. One concerns the fact that the spellings in the *Promptorium*, a dictionary issued at Norfolk in the period of Middle English, seem to be often archaistic and dialectal to our modern eye. In the case of the infinitives of verbs, especially, the author of the dictionary often spells our modern words *get*, *put*, *set* and *take*, for instance, as *getyn*, *puttyn*, *settyn* and *takyn*, applying infinitive endings at his region in the period. (In this regard, we may also have to remember one historical aspect of English grammar that the use of *to* was yet to be fully consolidated for indicating an infinitive at his time, except for the case where the notion of a purpose is expressed.)

(In relation to such points of Middle English, Gloria Mambelli's paper "A dictionary of the languages of medieval England", which is included in this book, is judged to be highly useful to know how the language has been and will be treated in relevant dictionaries.)

The other note concerns the lemmatization of relevant entries in the dictionary, to which I will attach considerable importance. Regarding this point, Stein has remarked the following, based on her investigation made from an overall viewpoint:

> It looks as if the author [of the *Promptorium*] explains the English words before he gives the Latin translation. [...] This unusual lemmatization derives

> obviously from the practice of changing Latin-English entries into English-Latin ones, The English lemma is thus basically still an explanation of a former Latin-English dictionary. (Stein 1985: 98–99)

Suppose this statement of hers is also applicable to the treatment of English high-frequency verbs in the dictionary, including the discrimination of their senses and the provision of entries on their conjugated forms and that on their relevant idiomatic phrases, still, this will not affect the fact that the *Promptorium* is the earliest existent dictionary that lists relevant words and phrases, which, I judge, once again, should be weighed heavily and should not be made light of.

On the premise of what I have discussed so far, I will, in the following, first overview the treatment of the infinitival and conjugated forms of English high-frequency verbs in the *Promptorium* (Section 2). This will compose my preliminary analysis. Then, after having finished the task, I will go into the details of how the dictionary treats individual verbs (Section 3), phrasal verbs (Section 4) and other notable phrases (Section 5). This allocation of sections is based on three points which I regard as characterizing English high-frequency verbs: (1) having irregular conjugations; (2) having multiple senses; and (3) forming quite a few idiomatic phrases.

2 Its treatment of the infinitival and conjugated forms of English high-frequency verbs

In analyzing how the *Promptorium* treats the infinitival and conjugated forms of English high-frequency verbs, as well as of their related phrases, I will perform the task from three viewpoints: (1) the treatment of their infinitival and gerundive forms; (2) that of their past-participial forms; and (3) the provision of an overview. In performing this task, I will also indicate the basic structure of entries in the dictionary related to the high-frequency verbs.

2.1 The treatment of infinitival and gerundive forms

The reason why I here discuss the treatment of the infinitival forms and that of gerundive forms together is due to the fact that, within the range of my scope, there are four cases where the *Promptorium* provides two entries for the same verb, one for the infinitival form and one for the gerundive form, to which I also want to refer with the recognition that pointing this fact will be beneficial to my later analysis.

Then, to show two cases out of the four, they are as the followings:

Puttyn, or leyyn: *Pono, -is, -sui, -re*; 3com., *act.: Colloco, -as, -aui, -re; prime con., act.*

Puttynge, or leyynge: *Possicio, -nis; Collacio, -nis*; omnia *fem.*, 3 *Ded.*

————————

Throwyn, or castyn: *Iacto, -as; prime* con., *act; Projicio, -is, eci, -re*; 3 con., *act.*

Throwynge, or castynge: *Iactura, -e*; fem., *prime; Iactas, -tus; masc.*, 4.

Here, when seeing Latin words corresponding to the entry-words ending with "-yn", we understand that they are indicative present forms, meaning that the verbs *puttyn* and *throwyn* treated are infinitives. As to the head-words with "-ynge", they are gerunds, not present participles, as their corresponding Latin words *possicio* and *iactura* are, respectively, nominal forms.

As to other two cases, they are the followings, which show the same situation as above:

Settyn and plantyn: *Planto, -as, aui, -re; prime con., neut.*

Settynge, or plantynge: *Plantacio, -nis; fem.* 3.

————————

Takyn, or resevyn: *Accipio, -is, cepi, -re, -ceptum; Capio, -is, cepi, -re, captum [...].*

Takynge, or resevynge: *Accepcio, -nis: Suscepcio, -nis*; omnia *fem.*, 3: *Caplura, -re; fem., prime.*

Out of the 128 entries of my analysis, 42 concern the words with "-yn" and 19 concern the words with "-ynge". However, as to entries on infinitival forms, this does not mean that they are limited to 42 in number. When relevant Latin words are browsed through, it becomes found that the *Promptorium* provides 102 entries on infinitival forms of verbs and verbal phrases, with the use of the spellings as *cum* for *come, goon/gon* for go and *make*, as well as *makyn* for *make*. Concerning the number of entries related to gerundive forms, they are limited to 19. With regard to present-participial forms, which may be confusing with gerundive forms, the *Promptorium* is judged not to treat them, at least within the range of my scope, also when Latin words listed are seen over.

Kusujiro Miyoshi

2.2 The treatment of past-participial forms

For the treatment of English past-participial forms, we can see the dictionary usually provides the participle perfect passive and adjectival forms of Latin words, as seen in the following three entries:

> **Cast**, or castyde: *Iactus, -ta; Proiectus, -ta, -tum.*
>
> —————–
>
> *Sette*, or putte: *Positus, -ta, -um; Collocatus, -a, -um.*
>
> *Put togedyr*, or onyd: *Contiguus*, -a, -um.

The author of the *Promptorium*, performing in this way, provides 7 entries on English past-participial words and phrases within the range of my scope. As to preterit forms, which are the same with past-participial forms in our modern English, as the cases of *cast*, *put* and *set*, we cannot see their treatment in the dictionary.

2.3 The provision of an overview

Then, how often does the *Promptorium* provide entries on infinitival and conjugated forms of verbs and verbal phrases for each of the 11 verbs of my scope? Concerning the point, we can produce Table 11; here and hereafter, the abbreviations "inf.", "ger." and "pp." stand for, respectively, "infinitival", "gerundive" and "past-participial".

The distribution of the three forms being quite uneven among entries on relevant verbs, it is hardly possible from this table alone to tell what principle(s) the author of the dictionary might have based himself on in providing such entries. However, it may at least be said that the table presents an overview of the historically most primitive treatment of English high-frequency verbs in lexicography.

3 Its treatment of individual verbs

Having described an overview in the previous section concerning the treatment of the high-frequency verbs in the *Promptorium*, I, in this section, aim to clarify how the dictionary deals with the relevant verbs individually from two perspectives: (1) the provision of entries on their infinitival and conjugated forms; and (2) the discrimination and indication of their senses in the English language.

For this purpose, I will collate Tables 11 and 11 which I produce based on my investigation; the former concerns entries whose head-words include the senses

Table 1: The number of entries on infinitival and conjugated forms of verbs and verbal phrases in the *Promptorium*

	inf.		ger.		pp.		
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	total
cast	7	70.0	1	10.0	2	20.0	10
come	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5
fall	3	50.0	2	33.3	1	17.7	6
get	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	4
go	15	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	15
make	47	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	47
put	9	64.3	2	14.3	3	21.4	14
set	6	60.0	3	30.0	1	10.0	10
take	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	6
throw	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	0.0	6
turn	0	0.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	5
total	102	79.7	19	14.8	7	5.5	128

Please approve this new table

of the verbs and the latter entries whose head-words do not include them, in both of which I arrange the head-words in accordance to their infinitival, gerundive and past-participial forms, with indicating, for reference, Latin word/words the author of the dictionary provides for each.

3.1 The provision of entries on infinitival and conjugated forms of verbs

Saying thus, however, as to the provision of entries on individual verbs in the dictionary, I judge it is enough to point out this fact from a comprehensive viewpoint, with reference to the two tables which I mentioned above; out of the 26 entries provided for the 11 verbs, 14 are for infinitival forms, 8 are for gerundive and 4 are past-participial, the detail of which is as indicated in Table 11.

Kusujiro Miyoshi

Table 2: Entries on verbs in the *Promptorium* where their senses are "specified" in the head-words

"inf." (Latin)	"ger." (Latin)	"pp." (Latin)
"**Castyn**, or brakyn" (*vomo*)		
"**Castyn**, or trowyn" (*iacto, jacio*)		
"**ffallyn**, or ouer trowyn" (*cado, ruo*)		
"**ffalyn**, or happyn" (*accidit, eacenit*)		
"**Gettyn**, or wynnyn" (*lucror, obtimeo*)	"**Gettyng**, or havying be wynnyng" (*lucrum, adquisicio*)	
"**Puttyn**, or leyyn" (*pono, colloco*)	"**Puttynge**, or leyynge" (*posicio, collacio*)	"**Put**, or leyd" (*positus*)
	"**Puttynge**, or schowynge" (*pulsus*)	
"**Settyn** and plantyn" (*planto*)	"**Settynge**, or plangynge" (*plantacio*)	
"**Settyn** and ordeynyn" (*statuo*)		
"**Settyn**, puttyn, or leyn" (*pono, colloco*)	"**Settynge**, or puttynge" (*plantacio*)	"**Sette**, or putte" (*positus*)
"**Takyn**, or resevyn" (*accipio, capio, apprehendo, sumo, tollo*)	"**Takynge**, or reseyvynge" (*accepcio, omnia, captura*)	
"**Throwyn**, or castyn" (*iacto, projicio*)	"**Throwynge**, or castynge" (*iactura, iactus*)	

Table 3: Entries on verbs in the *Promptorium* where their senses are "not specified" in the head-words

"inf." (Latin)	"ger." (Latin)	"pp." (Latin)
		"**Cast**, or castyde" (*iactus*)
"**Cum**, or come" (*venio*)		
	"**ffallyng**" (*defectus*)	"**ffalle**" (*casus*)
"**Goon**" (*pergo, vado, eo, gradior*)		
"**Makyn**, or make" (*facio, compono, psalmo*)		

Table 4: The number of entries on infinitival and conjugated forms of individual verbs in the *Promptorium*

	cast	*come*	*fall*	*get*	*go*	*make*
inf.	2	1	2	1	1	1
ger.	—	—	1	1	—	—
pp.	1	—	1	—	—	—
total	3	1	4	2	1	1
	put	*set*	*take*	*throw*	*turn*	total
inf.	1	3	1	1	—	14
ger.	2	2	1	1	—	8
pp.	1	1	—	—	—	4
total	4	6	2	2	—	26

Kusujiro Miyoshi

3.2 The discrimination and indication of the senses of the individual verbs and conjugated forms of verbs

What is important here is the reason why the *Promptorium* provides such number of entries for 11 individual verbs. When the point is examined, we can notice the fact that in the head-words of 20 entries out of the 26, which make up 76.9%, the dictionary indicates the senses of the verbs, as reflected in Table 11. If I am to numerically show the situation, *Table 5* is obtained.

Table 5: the number of entries on infinitival and conjugated forms of individual verbs with the indication of their senses in the *Promptorium*

	cast	come	fall	get	go	make
inf.	2	—	2	1	—	—
ger.	—	—	—	1	—	—
pp.	—	—	—	—	—	—
total	2	—	2	1	—	—

	put	set	take	throw	turn	total
inf.	1	3	1	1	—	11
ger.	2	2	1	1	—	7
pp.	1	1	—	—	—	2
total	5	6	2	2	—	20

In this situation, when focusing our attention to the number of entries on the infinitival forms of verbs in *Table 5*, we can notice the author of the *Promptorium* providing more than one entry on each of *cast*, *fall* and *set*, indicating their senses in English. It may safely be said here that we can see the first discrimination of the senses of English high-frequency verbs in a dictionary.

Besides, when we also see the number of entries on conjugated forms of verbs in *Table 5*, as well, it is seen that the *Promptorium* provides 9 entries on such forms whose head-words include the senses of verbs. Then, back to Table 11, it shows 2 cases where entries are provided on infinitival, gerundive and past-participial forms whose senses are the same, the head-words of which are the followings:

   "**Puttyn**, or leyyn", "**Puttynge**, or leyynge" and "**Put**, or leyd".

   ———————

   "**Settyn**, puttyn, or leyn", "**Settynge**, or puttynge" and "**Sette**, or putte".

Table 11 also shows 4 cases where entries are provided on infinitival and gerundive forms whose senses are the same: "**Gettyn**, or wynnyn" and "**Gettyng**, or havying be wynnyng"; "**Settyn** and plantyn" and "**Settynge**, or plangynge"; "**Takyn**, or resevyn" and "**Takynge**, or reseyvynge"; and "**Throwyn**, or castyn" and "**Throwynge**, or castynge".

4 Its treatment of phrasal verbs

Having analyzed entries on the 11 verbs in the *Promptorium* individually, I will deal with those on idiomatic phrases related to the verbs in the following two sections, beginning with its treatment of phrasal verbs.

With regard to the phrasal verb, there are quite a few concepts about it. Here, in this section, I define it as the following, lumping together what are called that of literal meanings and that of figurative meanings

(i) that regarded as a transitive verb: an intransitive verb + a preposition(s)/a transitive verb + an adverbial particle(s).

(ii) that regarded as an intransitive verb: an intransitive verb + an adverbial particle(s).

And to produce two tables concerning entries on phrasal verbs of the dictionary, like the ones I have produced for the analysis of entries on its individual verbs in the previous section, based on this definition, they are *Tables 6* and *7*.

As to the tables of the number of entries, I, this time, produce them in accordance to each of the two tables, *Tables 6* and *7*, as *Tables 8* and *9*, for the reason that the situation is clearly revealed by adopting this way, as far as the treatment of phrasal verbs in the *Promptorium* is concerned.

When seeing these numerical tables, we can soon find two notable facts. That is, the tendencies seen from Tables 8 and 9 are in stark contrast with those in the case of individual verbs in two respects. One concerns the fact that the author of the dictionary only provides a small number of entries on the conjugated forms of phrasal verbs; to be concrete, he provides 7 (1+4+2) entries on them out of 27 (7+20), which make up 25.9%, as compared to the case of entries on individual verbs where 12 entries are given for their conjugated forms out of the 26, accounting for 46.2%. The other concerns the fact that his provision of entries on phrasal verbs whose head-words include their senses are also small in number; he, in the case of individual verbs, giving 20 entries whose head-words include their senses out of the 26, accounting for 76.9%, provides only 7 entries on phrasal

Kusujiro Miyoshi

Table 6: Entries on Phrasal Verbs in the 'Promptorium' Where Their Senses are "Specified" in the Head-word

"inf." (Latin)	"ger." (Latin)	"pp." (Latin)
"**Cum aftyr**, or follow" (*succedo, sequor*)		
"**Goyn abowten**, or wynlyllyn" (*circumeo*)		
"**Go behynd**, or folow" (*sequor, descenao*)		
"**Goo to**, or begyn a dede" (*aggredior*)		
"**Puttyn a-wey**, or re-fusyn" (*repudio, refuto*)		
"**Puttyn forth**, as man doth his hand or oder lyke" (*porrigo, extendo*)		
		"**Put togyder**, or onyd" (*contiguus*)

verbs whose head-words include their senses out of 27 (7+20), which make up 26.9%.

These two facts may give an impression as if the author's treatment of phrasal verbs were quite slovenly and far from satisfactory. Still, he actually treats 27 such idioms related to the 11 verbs, which can hardly be thought to be small in number for the first dictionary that lists the idioms. Then, how can we interpret the contradictory situations? There will be two answers to the questions. One of them is the extension of Gabriele Stein's analysis which I have referred to in Section 1, that is, the author of the *Promptorium* changed Latin-English entries of his sources into English-Latin ones, the English lemma being basically still an explanation of a former Latin-English dictionary, concerning his treatment of individual verbs and phrasal verbs, as well. However, does this answer clarify the reason for the stark contrast between his treatment of individual verbs and that of phrasal verbs which I have stated above, as well as the reason for his treatment of quite a few phrasal verbs?

Another is the answer that the author of the *Promptorium* basically treat usual phrasal verbs at his time whose senses are not necessary to be explained in head-words in relevant entries. From this viewpoint, the reason of the situation that the indications of the senses in head-words, as seen in "**Cum aftyr**, or folow", "**Goo**

Table 7: Entries on Phrasal Verbs in the 'Promptorium' Where Their
Senses are "Not specified" in the Head-words

"inf." (Latin)	"ger." (Latin)	"pp." (Latin)
"**Castyn a-wey**" (*abico, proicio*)		
	"**Castyng downe** or a-wey" (*proieccio*)	"**Cast downe**" (*deiecio, prosterno*)
"**Cum dowyn**" (*descendo*)		
"**Cum in**" (*ingredior, introeo, ineo*)		
"**Cum to**" (*advenio*)		
	"**ffallyng dowyn**" (*epilencia*)	
"**Goone a-forne**" (*precedo*)		
"**Goon aftyr**" (*succedo*)		
"**Goon a-wey**" (*recedo, descedo*)		
"**Goo forthe**" (*procedo*)		
"**Gon owte**" (*exeo, egredior*)		
"**Puttyn aftyr**" (*propono*)		
"**Puttyn a-fore**" (*prepono*)		
"**Puttyn a-wey**" (*depono, expello, depello*)		
	"**Puttyn owt**, or away" (*eruo*)	
		"**Putt to** anythynge" (*appono*)
"**Takyn a-wey** by strength or violens" (*extorqueo*)		
	"**Throwynge downe** fro hey place" (*precipicium*)	
	"**Turnyng abowte**" (*versio, giriversio*)	

71

Kusujiro Miyoshi

Table 8: The number of entries on phrasal verbs "with" the indication of their senses in the *Promptorium*

	cast	come	fall	get	go	make
inf.	—	1	—	—	3	—
ger.	—	—	—	—	—	—
pp.	—	—	—	—	—	—
total	—	1	—	—	3	—
	put	set	take	throw	turn	total
inf.	2	—	—	—	—	6
ger.	—	—	—	—	—	—
pp.	1	—	—	—	—	1
total	3	—	—	—	—	7

Table 9: The Number of Entries on Phrasal Verbs "without" the Indication of Their Senses in the 'Promptorium'

	cast	come	fall	get	go	make
inf.	1	3	—	—	5	—
ger.	1	—	1	—	—	—
pp.	1	—	—	—	—	—
total	3	3	1	—	5	—
	put	set	take	throw	turn	total
inf.	4	—	1	—	—	14
ger.	—	—	—	1	1	4
pp.	1	—	—	—	—	2
total	5	—	1	1	1	20

to, or begyn a dede" and "**Puttyn a-wey**, or refusyn", signify that the relevant phrasal verbs concern those of figurative meanings, not literary, seems to become understandable, the indications being a special type of annotation to avoid the confusion of readers. If this is the case, there will be no wonder if the author intended to list as many phrasal verbs as possible in the dictionary.

5 Its treatment of other notable phrases

By the words "notable phrases" included in the title of this section, I mean phrases which are thought to be usual at the time of the author of the *Promptorium*. This means that the head-words of entries as the followings, which only explain the senses of Latin words provided, are totally irrelevant to such phrases:

> **Turnyng** fro bad to goode: *Conversio, -is; fem.*, 3.
>
> **Turnyng** fro gode to bad: *Peruersio, -is; fem.*, 3.
>
> **Turnyng** of divers ways: *Diverticu lum, -i; neut.*, 2 [...]: *Diversiclinicum, -ij; neut.*, 2 [...].

From this viewpoint, entries concerning *make*, which are comprised of 47 entries out of the 128 related to the 11 verbs of my scope, that make up 36.7%, are very special. Out of the 47 entries, 45 entries, most of which concern *make* as a causative verb, seem to be provided for usual phrases at the time of the author of the dictionary. For this reason, I will, in the following, mainly investigate entries on idiomatic phrases related to *make*, pointing out remaining entries on such phrases complementally after the task.

5.1 Notable phrases related to *make*

To show the head-words of the 45 entries with Latin words provided, they are as indicated at *Table 10*; the abbreviation "RAEI" in the parentheses stand for "reference to another entry instructed".

In this table, we can see two notable facts. One is the fact that all head-words of the 45 entries are infinitival forms and the other is the fact that none of the head-words include the senses of relevant phrases, which may strengthen the possibility that the author took trouble of giving such indications only when they are necessary, far from simply inverting Latin head-words and English explanations in Latin-English dictionaries which may have been his sources, as to which I have suggested in the previous section.

Kusujiro Miyoshi

Table 10: Notable Head-words in Entries Concerning 'Make' in the 'Promptorium'

1	"Makyn able" (*abilito*)	2	"Makyn a seth" (*satisfacio*)	3	"Makyn better" (*melioro*)
4	"Makyn bytter" (*exacerbo, similiter*)	5	"Makyn blake" (*denigro*)	6	"Makyn blunte" (*obtundo*)
7	"Makyn clene" (*mundo, purifico*)	8	"Makyn cumnawnte" (*pango*)	9	"Makyn drunkyn" (*inebrio*)
10	"Make dul" (*hebito, obtundo*)	11	"Makyn evyn" (*equo*)	12	"Make fette, or fatte" (*inpinguo, sagino*)
13	"Make fowle" (*deturpo, sordido*)	14	"Make gay" (*orno*)	15	"Make fre" (*manumitto*)
16	"Makyn harde" (*induro*)	17	"Makyn hevy in herte or sory" (*contrusto, mestico*)	18	"Makyn hevy in wytte" (*grauo*)
19	"Make Ioy" (RAEI)	20	"Make knowyn" (*manifesto, natifico*)	21	"Make large" (*amplio*)
22	"Make lawful" (*legitimo*)	23	"Make lene" (*macero*)	24	"Make lesse" (*minoro*)
25	"Make meynd" (*commemoro*)	26	"Make wonderful, or mervelyows" (*mirifico*)	27	"Make mery and gladyn oder mene" (*letifico*)
28	"Make myry, or be mery in hert or chere" (*letor, iocundor*)	29	"Makyn more" (*maioro*)	30	"Make nesch" (*mollifico*)
31	"Makyn perfyte" (*perficio*)	32	"Make playne" (*plano*)	33	"Make pleyne" (*conqueor*)
34	"Make plentyows" (*ffecundo*)	35	"Make qveynte, or wonderful" (*mirifico*)	36	"Make redy" (*paro*)
37	"Make rych" (*dito*)	38	"Make paste" (*intero*)	39	"Make sacrifyce" (*sacrifico*)
40	"Make sekyr in grawnte" (*ratifico, confirmo*)	41	"Make sythy" (*elucido*)	42	"Make solemnyte" (*solemnyzo*)
43	"Make tokyn to a noder" (*nuo, annuo*)	44	"Make wery" (*ffatigo, lasso*)	45	"Make with chylde" (*impregno*)

Incidentally, it may be interesting to note the point that there are two cases where the author discriminates the use of phrases: (1) "**Makyn hevy** in herte or sory" (No. 17) and "**Makyn hevy** in wytte" (No. 18); and "**Make mery** and gladyn oder mene" (No. 27) and "**Make myry**, or be mery in hert or chere" (No. 28). The senses of *makyn hevy* and *make mery/myry* being not indicated, this fact may be regarded as the reflection of the author's consciousness about the difference of semantic domains between the English phrases and Latin words provided for each. If this is the case, it may indicate his exquisite sense of language.

5.2 Remaining notable phrases

Table 11 shows the situation of the head-words in 10 remaining entries which are thought to concern usual phrases at the author's time.

In this table, it is seen that the author only allocates senses to the phrases *cast werk* and *settyn at noʒt*, providing two head-words of conjugated forms, other head-words being infinitival forms without the indications of senses.

6 Conclusion

Having known the treatment of infinitival and conjugated forms of English high-frequency verbs, as well as that of phrasal verbs and other idiomatic phrases, in the *Promptorium*, we may now safely say that it is the earliest known dictionary that substantially bears the features I mentioned at the beginning of this paper, thus being able to say that "the *Promptorium*, which was compiled as a 'storehouse' for children in the 1440's, is the first dictionary that treated quite a few high-frequency verbs, discriminating their senses and indicating their conjugated forms, with listing their relevant idiomatic phrases, especially phrasal verbs".

It is not that authorities until today have not approached to the point. In her meticulous analysis on the dictionary in the book published in 1997, Gabriele Stein investigates its head-words from a comprehensive and overall perspective, dealing with their prepositional phrases, past participles, infinitives and infinitive clauses, *etc.* and *etc.* I would say this analysis has clarified the whole picture of the dictionary. And I consider that after a holistic analysis a specialized analysis should follow. From this viewpoint, I aimed to conduct a specific analysis of the treatment of English high-frequency verbs in the dictionary concerning which Stein seems not to have done in relation to the history of lexicography.

One more point. If there is a grave misunderstanding that Samuel Johnson was the first lexicographer who detailed the high-frequency verbs, it may be due to

Kusujiro Miyoshi

Table 11: Remaining Entries on Notable Phrases in the 'Promptorium

"inf." (Latin)	"ger." (Latin)	"pp." (Latin)
		"**Cast werk**, or disposin"" (*dispono*)
		"**Cast lott**" (*sortior*)
"**Getyn by prayers**" (*impetro*)		
"**Goon in-to a place**" (*introeo, ingredior*)		
"**Goon on forte**" (*pedito*)		
"**Go slowly**" (*lento*)		
"**Go wrong**" (*devio, deliro*)		
"**Settyn at noꝛte**, or disposin" (*vilipendo, ffloccipendo, nichilpendo*)		
"**Settyn in yese and reste**" (*quieto*)		
	"**Takyn on honde**" (*manucapio*)	

exaggerating the movement to purify and stabilize the English language which arose at the beginning of the period of Late Modern English. I never deny the facts that the movement was historically large in scale and that it actually induced Johnson to compile his *Dictionary*. At the same time, however, I consider that we should not disregard the probability that there had been lexicographers of bilingual and polyglot dictionaries before him who had greatly troubled themselves for the treatment of the high-frequency verbs. I judge the figure who issued the *Promptorium* more than three hundred years before Johnson's *Dictionary*, or more than one hundred years before the birth of William Shakespeare, was one of such lexicographers.

Acknowledgments

References

Alston, R. C. 1968. *Promptorium parvulorum 1499* (English Linguistics 1500-1800 108). Menston: The Scolar Press Limited.

Bately, Janet. 2009. Bilingual and multilingual dictionaries of the renaissance and early seventeenth century. In Anthony P. Cowie (ed.), *The Oxford history of English lexicography*, vol. 1, 41–64. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Cowie, A. P. (ed.). 2009. *The Oxford history of English lexicography*, vol. 1. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Franzen, Christine (ed.). 2012. *Ashgate critical essays on Early English lexicography*, vol. 2: Middle English. Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate.

Hüllen, Werner. 2006. *English dictionaries, 800-1700: The topical tradition.* paperback edition. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

McDermott, Anne & Rosamund Moon. 2005. Introduction: Johnson in context. *International Journal of Lexicography* 18(2). 153–156.

Kusujiro Miyoshi

Sauer, Hans. 2009. Glosses, glossaries and dictionaries in the medieval period. In Anthony P. Cowie (ed.), *The Oxford history of English lexicography*, vol. 1, 17–40. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Starnes, DeWitt Talmage & Gertrude Elizabeth Noyes. 1946. *The English dictionary from cawdrey to johnson, 1604-1755.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Stein, Gabriele. 1985. *The English dictionary before Cawdrey.* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Stein, Gabriele. 1997. *John palsgrave as renaissance linguist: A pioneer in vernacular language description.* Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Wells, Ronald A. 1973. *Dictionaries and the authoritarian tradition: A study in English usage and lexicography.* The Hague & Paris: Mouton & Co. N.V., Publishers.

Wheatley, Henry B. 1865. Chronological notices of the dictionaries of the English language. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 10(1). 218–293. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-968X.1865.tb00472.x. (12 April, 2023).