LINGUISTIC PROBLEMS
WITHIN THE TRADITION
OF THE 15TH CENTURY GLOSSARY
MEDULLA GRAMMATICE

The tradition of the *Medulla Grammatice* comprises nineteen known manuscripts and four fragments. All are located in England and dated within the 15th century. To the early 1400’s belong Lincoln ms. 88, Shrewsbury XVI, Stonyhurst MS. XV (A.1.10). The remainder are dated mid-to-late within the century. They are Additional mss. 24640, 33534 (circa 1460), and 37789; Bristol Univ. ms. DM 14; Canterbury D. 2, Downside Abbey 26540; Harley 1000, 1738, 2181, 2257, 2270; Holkham misc. 39, Lincoln ms. 111, Pepys 202; Rawlinson C 101. Only one manuscript is internally dated, St. John’s (Cambridge) 72 C 22, 16 December 1468. Concerning the fragments MS. Brasenose College, Oxford UB S.2.87-8 is preserved on four leaves having very little of *P, Q* and *R*. It is dated mid-century. The Bristol University ms. DM 1, containing 459 entries of *C* and six entries of *D*, on three leaves, is dated ante 1425. Also early are ms. Rawlinson D. 913 in the Bodleian, composed of one leaf of the letter *I*, and the Gloucester MS. GDR/ZI/31, in the Gloucester Records Office, containing two double-columned leaves of the letter *S*.

The Bristol DM 1 and the Gloucester GDR/ZI/31 are the only published material in the form of full critical editions within the tradition of the *Medulla Grammatice* as well as the only published
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1. For Ioannis and Marina, who so generously joined in welcoming me into the Vrailas family those many years ago, and who give us so much joy.
mss. within the many traditions of the history of Latin and Middle English glossography.

Entries are in Latin with glosses or interpretations in Middle English. Not infrequently transliterated Greek appears with Latin and/or Middle English as glosses. Sometimes Hebrew (and even more expected but rarer French) makes its appearance. The French, it seems, only appears in the Gloucester fragment. The interchange of these languages in this work reflects the culmination of a linguistic tradition that dates from the early centuries A.D., i.e. Jerome, the Old and New Testaments, Isidore, and Festus, through the Latin, Greek, and Old English glossaries of the 7th, 8th and 9th centuries and on into the 12th and 13th century wordlists and glossaries of Johannes de Janua and Hugutio of Pisa, as well as bears witness to the remarkable dialectal phenomenon which mirrored the changes in the Middle English language throughout the area at the time.

The principal problems in glossography are the lack of context and abundant disorder.

A.S. Way, the nineteenth century editor of the Promptorium Parvulorum, one of the three major glossaries produced in England during the 15th century, remarked in his introduction: “The MSS. of the Medulla are more numerous than those of the Promptorium: They vary in their contents in a remarkable degree; it might indeed seem that each transcriber made such modifications of the text as pleased him, or that he engrafted upon it the additional words and explanatory glosses which he found inserted by any previous hand.” Michael Lapidge supports this perception when he says: “Of all texts, glossaries are the most prone to scribal interference: to selective copying, interpolation, omission, and so on.” To attempt to establish a text in such circumstances can be bewildering. For example, the complete “Gloucester” fragment contains 123 extant entries out of approximately 15 to 20,000 lost, judging from the other more complete mss. in the tradition, representing a collection of words and phrases reflecting virtually every aspect of
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Theoretical and practical life, since its substance is derived from supralineal and marginal inserts made in copies of every conceivable type of 'literary' transmission. Having collated the major manuscripts of the tradition of the \textit{Medulla Grammatice}, after transcribing the Stonyhurst manuscript, I am now in the midst of providing a critical edition of the Stonyhurst manuscript, with my coeditor, Joseph McGowan, Professor of Old and Early Middle English, and our two assistant editors, Drs. Ashby Kinch and Sean Pollack.

I have chosen the Stonyhurst MS. for its unique combination of virtues, i.e., being, to date, the earliest of the manuscripts (a.1425) and being complete, having some 20,000 entries within seventy-one folios. The Harley 2257 contains 195 folios, and the St. John's (Cambridge) has 119 double-columned folios. Also the Additional 33534, Lincoln 111, and Harley 2270 are quite extensive, each ranging from between 125 and 175 folios, double-columned, approximately containing 35,000 to 50,000 entries. In all, the tradition encompasses between one-third and one-half a million entries. In relation to the material which constitutes the nineteen manuscripts and four fragments of the \textit{Medulla Grammatice}, not to mention the enormous glossographical reserves worldwide, the edition of the Stonyhurst manuscript upon which I am currently involved, is little more than a 'scribal twitch'.

I believe that the following \textit{sigla} will facilitate the comparison of manuscripts of the \textit{Medulla Grammatice}:

\begin{itemize}
  \item A = Additional MS. 24640
  \item A2 = Additional MS. 33534
  \item A3 = Additional MS. 37789
  \item B = Bristol DM14
  \item C = Canterbury MS. D. 2
  \item D = Downside Abbey 26540
  \item H = Harley 1000
  \item H2 = Harley 1738
  \item H3 = Harley 2181
  \item H4 = Harley 2257
  \item H5 = Harley 2270
  \item Hm = Holkham misc. 39
  \item J = St. John's (Cambridge)
  \item L = Lincoln 88
  \item L2 = Lincoln 111
  \item P = Pepys 2002
  \item R = Rawlinson C 101
  \item S = Stonyhurst A.1.10
  \item Sh = Shrewsbury XVI
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Fragments:}

- Brasenose College, Oxford UB S.2.87-8.
- Bristol DM 1
- Gloucester GDR/ZI/31
- Rawlinson D. 913

Every glossographical manuscript of every tradition creates seemingly insoluble problems. The all encompassing problem, focal to any treatment of a manuscript dealing with a glossary (the predecessor of the modern dictionary) is that of alphabetization, i.e., how one copes with the hydra-like difficulties involved in setting a glossary in verbal order. The three concepts I feel to be of prevailing importance are: first, that of verbal families; then, the curious system of phonetics undertaken by the scribes, and finally the (in)consistency of alphabetical lettering within a given word from the start of that entry. This last theory, i.e. alphabetization as far as four or five letters, is a commonly thought panacea, based unfortunately upon the misconception that Anglo-Saxon glossaries being earlier have less sustenance, i.e. two to three letters alphabetized. I don’t mean to suggest that this is incorrect, but only that the argument cannot stop there. To my thinking, there is no room for self-satisfaction. Every rule proposed ought to be seriously investigated, especially if it purports to provide a broad solution.

One “packet” of words within the letter A of the Stonyhurst MS. stresses a consistent alphabetization between four and as much as eight letters on average and belies a couple of already agreed upon statements about alphabetization. Consider the fourty-three word segment from “Anti” to “Antrotous” (dealing only with the lemmata). “Anti” is followed by “Antichristus”, “Ancipo”, “Antidicomarite”, “Antidotum”, “Antífrasis”; then the pattern of perfectly ordered alphabetization is upset by the intrusion of “Angion”. However, being the exception to the rule, it conforms to another rule of alphabetization which is that words of a foreign nature seem to be exceptions to proper alphabetization. And “Angion” is quite an exception! After one verifies that in none of our vast Latin sources does the word “Angion” exist, the pursuit of perhaps a Greek or Hebrew word is made, and after the gloss “valde” allows us to understand what might be called for here, granting as well a similarity in sound between “Ang” and “Egg”, the word “Egigion” gives the proper parallel to “valde”. (Notice that this scribe has disregarded the earlier, first appearance of “Angion” without a
gloss, only a blank just over one hundred entries before). According to the rules of transcription this word “Eggion” and its baggage should be moved to the appropriate alphabetical position under the letter E, thereby allowing the scribe to continue correctly with “Antigonus”. The following two words belong to a family, hence order is taken as given, be it a two (as here) or a five or seven line segment elsewhere. And so, it proceeds over the forty-three word “packet”, all in perfect alphabetization. In regard to this impressive though altogether infrequent example, the reader should realize that a two or three alphabetized word pattern is not unusual and further in some instances alphabetization is not applied. The rule, safe to anticipate, is that no fixed rule is applicable. One finds one’s way by intensive study and, to be sure, divine intervention.

The idea of a foreign word being exempt from alphabetization, as we understand it, is borne out in the following example: “Arma”, “Argirius”, “Armamentum”. Here is evidenced a Greek word “Argurion” in the middle of a family connection which is placed in a position of emphasis.

But more extensive verbal families are split as in “Amo, Amatorius, Amator” separated from “Amor”, “Amoreus”, “Amorosus” by a block of eight perfectly colourless words. Is the split verbal family suggesting a neatly framed segment which was passed by librarian to copyist verbally or in writing to be kept together, or is it reflecting a deliberate abuse of alphabetization as in “Anacorita”, “Anabolandrium”, “Anacorialis et cus” when, in fact, the scribe stresses the family connection by glossing “Anacorialis et cus” by “pertinens anacorite” referring beyond a doubt to the entry “Anacorita”; or, “Anagoge”, “Anagogeticus”, “Ananias”, “Anagogitice” (read: -goge-), whereas alphabetization is clearly maintained in the three line entry: “Anaglipha”, “Anaglipharius”, “Anagliphus”?

At times, even the motivation on the part of the scribe to sustain the family unit might reveal something very unexpected. On the surface, “Arietulus, Arieto, Arietulus” are not surprising. However, it is more than possible that attention is focused upon “Arieto” because the scribe, either this one or the few before, is attempting to emphasize this word for its rarity of meaning. The gloss of “Arieto” is “to bleten”, which is not found with this meaning in the Middle English Dictionary. Perhaps the scribe realized that this is
a special meaning and wished to highlight it. Another example of
the scribe’s effort to make entries clearer is seen in the following
“package”: “Amphi greece circum latine” on top and framed intention­
ally by the same “Amphi” entry and gloss at the bottom,
thereby enclosing all but one word (I have no notion why!) having
an “Amphi-prefix”.

Yet note the idyllic family arrangement “Ancilla” (noun),
“Ancillaris” (adjective), “Ancillo” (verb), “Ancillor” (deponent verb), “Ancillula” (diminutive noun) all so neatly presented! Then,
on the other end of the alphabetic spectrum, casting aside all prin­
ciple, there is the curiously chiasmic: “Annuo, inmente, graunte”,
“Annus, a zer”; “Annuo, to inmente, to graunte”, “Annuus, of a zer”.
This seems inexplicable and is justifiably bewildering.

Consider, then, the versatile minim which, understood, normal­
izes alphabetization in many circumstances. $M$, $N$, $U$ and $I$ are
severally interchanged throughout the massive manuscripts which
comprise the *Medulla Grammatice*. Just two brief examples to set
one thinking in this area: “Anelia, Anelitus, Auello, Anellus,
Anelo”, a convenient, yet consistently agreeable arrangement:
“Auell-Anell-”, $u$ and $n$ being interchangeable palaeographically.
Again, “Anguis, Augurius, Angulus”.

A few words should be said about the transference of similar
sounding letters such as $p=b$ and vice versa, as well as $c=ch$, $b=u$
(vocalic), $t=c$. Let two examples serve to peak the interest of the
curious. First, the very stark: “Aratellum, Aracunicula, Arator­
culus”. Or, more interestingly, “Aquibibet, Aquiuomus, Aquila”.
Here we have a double function: the $b$ of “Aquibibet” is absorbed
by the $u$ of “Aquiuomus”, and then one returns to the three-sylla­
bled “Aquila” after that. By now one is predisposed toward some
hidden purpose, and rightly so. In only the St. John’s manuscript,
of all nineteen manuscripts of the *Medulla Grammatice*, is it
clearly evinced that we are dealing with the $u$ (vocalic) sound
because the scribe has written “Aquiovomus”. In all other manu­
scripts (except Harleian MS. 2257 which has lost the letter $A$) the
word is written as $u$ which in manuscript could be $u$ or $n$. Hence,
we have a *hapax legomenon*, the importance of which cannot be
overestimated. On this joyful note (a new Latin word for the dictio­
naries) I’ll conclude this all too detailed, brief account.
It is well to note that this treatment of alphabetization dealt with only the first letter of this glossary; all examples are drawn from A. There are gems awaiting those who wish to burrow.

There is an entry and gloss of some considerable implication and importance which reads: *Stirium est gutta cadens congelatata, an ykkle*, followed by the statement: *Tunc bonus est ignis dum pendent stiria tignis.* This second statement incidentally appears only in G and H4 which, of itself, clearly indicates a copying of H4 by G. But the disparity in the other part is bothersome. H4 reads: *Stirium est gutta fluens vel cadens congelata anglice, a cokerbelle,* a gloss far from one of the expected forms of *ikel*.

To begin with, *Stirium* is rare within glossaries (it appears in this instance only three times within the nineteen mss. of the *Medulla*, here in the Gloucester fragment, Harley 2257 (H4) and Canterbury). The common spelling within the tradition is *stiria* which the *MED* chooses, however incorrectly, to read instead of *Stirium* under the entry *ikel = icicle*. The Gloucester gloss: “an ykkle” with double *k* is an unattested spelling of the *ME icel*. Its variants might serve to suggest that the Middle English souffle has not risen to its proper level. Confer: Shrewsbury = *an ykke* [read: *ykle*], Holkham = *an ykyl*, Canterbury = *a nykle*; Pepys = *a nekill*; Rawlinson = *a nycle*, *an yceykyl*; Harley 2270 = *an ysicle*; Downside Abbey = *ane y se zokyll*; Lincoln 111 = *Iys*; Harley 2181 = *an drope of yse*. In the *MED* there is an entry: ‘coke-belle’ with only the definition: ‘A small bell’. The *OED* provides for this two additional meanings: ‘A spring wildflower’, and ‘An icicle’. Of course, the latter is what we want but apparently there is no record of the meaning before 1645, found in a Diary in the Kentish Dialect: ‘My breath turned into many cock-bells as I walked.’ Before that nothing. Although ‘stirium’, when ‘congelatized (!)’, leaves little doubt of the meaning, the *Medulla* has hereby provided a word: ‘cokerbelle’, of novel spelling and sense, earlier by at least 150 years than its earliest attested reference.

So, just as H4 gave us ‘cokerbelle’ unique to the tradition and the earliest reference to it in the language, G in its flashes of

---

perverted brilliance provides us with words like *Stringillus*, which is unique not only to the tradition but to the language, with its gloss ‘gawgge’ as a Middle English spelling unattested in the *MED*. Further Middle English nutriment is given by the word *ashenne* in G’s phrase: ‘bak undre asshenne’ the gloss of a Latin entry word whose garbled state can only be understood by the Gloucester scribe. He left it, presumably, as he found it: *Subusinerco* (read *Subcinerizo*). The editor cannot.

Nor have the ears been cleared sufficiently, it might be argued. There is a delightful ‘clog’ amidst the offerings for *Suauium*. Family relationships (*stemmata*) are observable in this word: see G and H4 which read *osculum*, along with J and H2, a fine choice; R, C, H5 and P give us the x-rated version: *basium cum saliua mixtum*; and then, to douse the passion, a budding family: A2 and S provide the very curious but similarly sounding *osculum* (S) and *hostilum* (A2): obviously the end of a very friendly relationship whether verbally or visually.

The general structure of the glossary is informative: a Latin lemma (most of the time, excepting transliterated Greek and Hebrew occasionally) is followed by the genitive singular, if a noun; masculine lemma followed by feminine and neuter endings, if adjective; and, first singular as lemma followed by 2nd singular present indicative active or deponent, if verb; all of which is usually followed by the abbreviation for *id est*, and then by the English and/or Latin word or phrase serving as gloss. In the process of transcription and collation of the major mss. of the *Medulla Grammatice* there have been three recurrent points of interest. First, the discovery of hitherto unattested Middle English words which broaden the philological dimensions of the period. Secondly, new Latin words (and Greek) and novel senses of words regularly appear, in turn, extending the parameters of these languages. Finally, unique variant spellings occur frequently, due in large part to recitative copying and auditory memory, offering additional linguistic and phonological evidence in both Latin and Middle English to significantly influence the direction of medieval lexicography.

A former colleague and dear friend, David Jost, the scholar responsible for the amazing accomplishment of the editing of the etymologies of the 3rd and 4th editions of Houghton Mifflin's *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, a while ago, in consultation at the Middle English Dictionary, said to me, as we were working upon the etymology of a gloss, words to the effect that I am touching upon an interesting aspect of one part of an enormous field. What is needed in order to make some sense of these persisting problems is a huge data bank with transcripts of all the glossarial works in the common languages of Middle French, Medieval Latin, and Middle English. At that time nothing had been done since the days of A. S. Way's 1865 edition of the *Promptorium Parvulorum*; Herrtage's edition of one of the many mss. of the *Catholicon Anglicum* and the ubiquitous Wright-Wulcker, a selective glossary ranging from the 8th to the 15th centuries, both the latter done in the 1880's. Of course, individual attempts were made on smaller and even more selective glossaries, Merritt in the mid part of the 20th century and Oliphant and Wieland even now. Since microfilm is available, and even 'blowups' from them, which, in turn, becomes the authoritative source, the manuscript can be seen as becoming dispensable (dreadful as that may sound).

But now, decidedly for the good, Brian Merrilees and Bill Edwards have produced a monumental edition of a work of Latin-French glosses and interpretations of the 1440's. It's on the shelves. Its title: *Le Dictionarius de Firmin Le Ver*. It provides the format of the 15th century dictionary. It lists and defines the words which were thought the functional baggage of the day. Of course it was

cumulative, but at some point organized and produced in a most readable format thanks to the insights of its editors. In other words the basic need referred to by David Jost has begun to be realized for the first time by two scholars from the University of Toronto. It is a benchmark production in the finest tradition: Brepols. The plot never thins nor thickens, it just goes on! But here a couple of years into the millenium we have the first real attempt at producing a large, complex edition of a richly rewarding series of glossographical mss. in about 125 years. This is the beginning of Dr. Jost’s network. This, of course, includes Anne Grondeux’s outstanding edition, as well as the critical editions of the two manuscripts of the *Medulla Grammatice* mentioned above.

What this field does most effectively is make one realize and become more and more aware of the dearth of glossographical entries in the major dictionaries of the period and beyond. In great part the *MED*, the *OED*, *DMLBS*\(^\text{16}\), *Tobler-Lommatzsch*\(^\text{17}\) and *Godefroy*\(^\text{18}\) are devoid of the assistance of this tradition so that when we check a reference in any of the above that relies upon a gloss, we receive, if anything at all, incomplete information at best, and often incorrect. This is in part due to the fact that palaeographical training had a long way to go in the early days as well as that many of the people who were and presently are tinkering with glosses haven’t the languages needed for the job. So we are left with incomplete words, unexplained definitions, and remarkably novel linguistic forms, most of which appear nowhere with the partial, sporadic exception of Du Cange. Hence, the need for a greater network of scholars discovering ever-new equivalences. Even a handbook of format and figures, expectations of problems, common or otherwise, people to whom to refer when in a quandary (and I can assure you we are all there a lot of the time, if for no
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\(^\text{17}\) Allfranzösisches Wörterbuch, eds. A. Tobler and E. Lommatzsch, Berlin, 1925–.

other reason the incompleteness or incomprehensibility of the material) over what this Latin, French, Greek, Hebrew or English word could mean in its slender context.

Some of us are already "carving up our turf", when, in fact, there is far too much "land" to worry about such conflicts. Georg Goetz, whose magisterial work: *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* 19, preoccupied most of his creative life (1888-1923) was heard to have said that the depths of Glossography will never be fully plumbed. Simply realize that the major sources of most of this work: Papias' *Elementarium* 20 and John of Janua's *Catholicon* 21 still remain in manuscript form, some of which have not even been catalogued, let alone edited. This is all new ground; younger, not to mention experienced scholars, don't even know of the existence of the body of these works on Glossography. And we wonder why Medievalists in English, Greek, Latin and French departments are diminishing, not taken seriously in curricular discussions, and generally not funded to carry out their research!

In Glossography you can't be expected to believe that there could be such synchronic thought patterns and uninterruptedly clear and concentrated copying to allow for a smooth process, so that when you read an introduction to a text edition that proposes a stemma you are dealing with something precise. Since the creators of the actual process are not around to give us any hints, allow two masters of the field, Lindsay and Thomson in their *Ancient Lore in Medieval Latin Glossaries*, to encourage us: "Glossaries are ... hasty makeshifts, the mere result of massing the word-collections that were available at this or that monastery and then rearranging the mass. In fact, there was often no 'compiler' properly so called. The original glossary was not made (by mental effort); it grew (by the mechanical fusion of the different parts of a volume which had been made a receptacle for 'glossae collectae' of various authors); the derivative glossaries exhibit only the mental effort of selecting
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or recasting or combining previously published items. Consider the entry *Stix*, the river. It’s glossed one way and another by the tradition: *pena infernalis* of A2, *palus infernalis* of the late clique: C, H5 and R; and *pars infernalis* of Lincoln 111 (L2), S and H2. H4 has the entry but does not gloss it. Why? too common! G has the entry and does gloss it with *infernum*: unique in its choice over the entire tradition. If only we paid attention to C H5 and R along with *Le Ver: palus infernalis*. That is simply the proper gloss! Or is it that simple?

I think I’m getting somewhere with a root of three families comprised of C, R and H5 (with Hm and P not infrequently included) if only considering the brief range of 123 entries of the Gloucester fragment of the *Medulla*; then A2 and Stonyhurst (S) agreeing 24 times, and finally St. John’s (Cambridge) known as J and Harley 1738 (H2) in agreement 26 times in familiar, if not identical, territory. Consider the word: *Stola*. J and H2 gloss it as ‘a stole’; Additional 33534 (A2) and S as ‘a stole or a manere clothinge’; C, R, H5, and P as ‘a stole et genus panni’. This expands the interest in that G and H4 provide identical and unique readings, their source unmistakably documented from Isidore. In *Subagito* G and H4 are identical and unique; C, R, H5, and P, however subtly, extend their gloss and perhaps ‘tip their hands’ to the glossographical process: redaction not being a far cry from improvisation. C reads: ‘to stere’, P increases that by: ‘to stere, to dryeve’, and finally, R and H5 outdo the preceding with: ‘to stire or dryve or chase vnder’. Here, it seems, is an example of one scribe ‘improving upon’ what he has before him. And, of course, these are extensions of ‘improvement’. Consider two entries compared within the Medullan tradition itself and then with *Le Ver: Stratus-a-um* and *Studium*. *Stratus* is given two glosses over the entire tradition of the *Medulla*. However, in just one manuscript, *Le Ver* provides seven adjectives. *Studium*, inversely represented in the *Medulla*, offers the conventional notions of the word: zeal, pursuit, devotion to life’s concerns, whereas the single ms. of *Le Ver* further abstracts the *applicatio animi* of the *Medulla* with “ad aliquid peragendum cum summam voluntate”, a phrase which,

there would be no argument, sums up the attitude toward scholar­ship of a man so highly respected in the field, James Sledd, when even confronted with the following layers of confused lexicography, which I quote directly from its source, the Gloucester ms. of the Medulla Grammatice: “Strucio nomen grecum quod latine asida appellatur gallice an ostrice.” Was this done just after the dinner bell was sounded? It turns out that Strucio is more Latin than Greek; asida though only once I have found in Latin usage (Peter Damian), is primarily Greek meaning ‘stork’ not ‘ostrich’. Other sources suggest that gallice should read anglice. However, one feels that compression might be intended because surely ‘ostrice’ is a reasonable variant either of the English or the French. Le Ver reads: “Strucio = ostruche, ostriche”.

Judging from each manuscript the scribe is confronted with what appears to be insurmountable problems, for which he was barely trained. The major languages evidenced in this tradition are mostly Latin, some Greek, less Hebrew, the very languages which were known in time past as “tres linguae sacrae”. The dimensions of unfamiliarity with these languages were extensive. Consider this delightful scribal shortcoming. The Stonyhurst manuscript reads: “Camur ge”, glossed by “crooked” or “curved”. I looked to the Harley 2257 which was considered by A. S. Way, the editor of the Promptorium Parvulorum, as “the most valuable MS. of its kind in the British Museum”. I hoped, dare I say expected, to find some corroboration. Instead, however, I thought it best to stop there. The Harley manuscript had entry and gloss as follows: “Camur gree, wronge latine”. First of all, Camur is Latin, not Greek. The closest Greek is κατασκόπειον which means “vaulted chamber”. Of course, the Stonyhurst scribe gets only one part wrong (perhaps for purposes of clarity I should say incorrect!) by virtue of omission. Harley 2257 errs in both quarters since wronge is not Latin either.

Consider the Stonyhurst reading: “Smathus: conpugnans.” Although the Pepys ms. gets part of the gloss wrong, “Simachus: machina, pugna”, Canterbury gives us what is needed: “Simachus: machia, pugna.” This is, of course, the Greek σύμμαχος. Smathus doesn’t quite do it. Behold the etymologist at work: the entry,

Cenobates glossed generally throughout the tradition as “qui propter cenam super funem ambulat,” ‘he who because of dinner walks upon a rope.’ The problem is that Cenobates is a misbegotten attempt at a phonetic variation upon the Greek word σχοινοβάτης ‘a rope walker’, which, incidentally, does appear within the S section of the manuscripts. A mistaken etymology based upon a misspelled entry word in Greek. We also come to realize that our scribe has a touch of dyslexia. The Stonyhurst scribe writes: “Achilus: a folde”. But it should read: “Achilous [Acheloos is the proper entry word, based upon the Greek: Ἀχέλοος Achelous, a river in Greece]: a flode.”

Another category of linguistic interest is that of the way in which the scribes within the tradition handle a Greek transliterated entry glossed by Latin and/or English. An example of this in the Gloucester fragment is that of Stoa = porticus. It is a fine equation. H4, H5, R, C, P, L1 and L2 get it right as well. But note the disparate variations upon the Greek transliteration by others of them: H2 reads Stoicia; S has Stetis, J reads Stota; A2 provides Stoan; A3 offers Stitia. It seems they have taken a distant measure of Greek. It is simply not a strong point for scribes, overall, in the Middle Ages.

Note that Stoa and its family: Stoicida, Stoicus and Stoica are omitted in Le Ver. The Greek lemma Strophin is also omitted, not to mention Strogula which is found only in the Medulla in two mss., G and H4, with no interpretation anywhere. On the other hand, Stromaticium, Stropharius and Stomacosus show a distinct similarity in the Medullan Gloucester and Le Ver. However, before one expels that final breath of anticipation or frustration in one direction or another consider this: G reads: “Strophos grece conversio latine.” Here one observes a memorable reversal. All the other mss. agree with G but H4 which reads: “connectio”. In Glossography one simply awaits the unexpected, and for the most part is not disappointed.

A 15th century scribe was within a thousand year tradition that distanced him from the grammar of Greek. Bernice Kaczynski, in her seminal Medieval Academy volume, remarks: “The fundamental problem for medieval students who wished to learn Greek was that they had no proper grammar of the language. There was no authoritative textbook that presented, in terms familiar to users of Latin, an analysis of the structure of Greek. Medieval students
were for the most part denied a systematic consideration of the features of the language — of its sounds, its words, its syntax. Without an elementary grammar, they were obliged to turn to a varied and in the end unsatisfactory collection of materials." The tradition of the *Medulla Grammatice* provides a remarkable variety of spelling. The English language in this period, i.e. 1100 to 1500, and in the case of this glossary, the 1400s (early to late), was quite volatile. During one of many forays into the *Medulla*, I came upon the word *Armelausa*, which I had earlier read in a Greek papyrus I had edited, a receipt for garments: "ἀρμαράυσιν πρόσπινον α ἕναν." In the *Medulla* it is spelled three ways, arme, arma, armi-, and it is normalized in Isidore as *armilausa* (Lindsay 1911). It is defined as that which is divided before and behind and is opened; closed only across the shoulders, as if *armicausa*, but with the letter c removed. My text provided the first appearance of the word in papyri: 'appapaúcnv meaning 'a military cloak'. It seems to have been a phonetic variation upon "ἀρμελαύσιν. Indeed, it created as much difficulty in both languages, producing in Medieval Latin as many as 14 variant spellings. It might be said that the Greeks had considerable foresight in glossing γλώσσα by 'tongue', thereby emphasizing the remarkable fertility of the medieval mouth.

Perhaps by two examples I might be able to show how the tradition of the *Medulla* was precariously passed on by both scribe and editor. The entry word *Agrammatus* seems far from accurately grasped. Witness the variations in spelling: Pepys, Canterbury and Harley 1000 read *aggraminatus*; Add.33534 has *agranimatus*; St. John’s (Cambridge) has *agronamatus*; Stonyhurst and Add.24640 have *agramiatus*. The only manuscript which allays our compounded doubts and supports the spelling as we know it is

---

Harley 2270: *Agrammatus*. I stress this final point because amidst these phonetic shifts there is not only a scribal but an editorial problem: the *MED* has the entry “Agraminatus (read: Agrammatus)”. Possibly the editor was influenced by the correct spelling of the Greek word and interpreted the *i* flourish for a nasal abbreviation, thereby coming away with the reading *agraminatus* instead of the accurate, if unexpected *agramiatus*. And yet, just so that I don’t give a lasting impression that any of us who deal with the subject of scribal comprehension of Greek really know the full extent of the problem, consider an entry which apparently caused no difficulty to the scribes but did to some editors. We have little hesitation about the word *Acheron*, one of the great rivers of the Underworld. But interest is aroused when one realizes that only two manuscripts — Canterbury and Pepys — refer to the expected “palus infernalis” and “Infernus”. The others offer the initially puzzling “salue vel gaude”, and Harley 1000 adds “Aue”. Whether their source had it or they emended it, what probably lies behind the word is what the sound of the word suggested: Ἀχέρων the participle used as imperative, in Greek meaning ‘fare thee well’, common in the New Testament as a form of greeting. Note that under the letter *C* in most manuscripts *Chere* is glossed “Aue salue gaude”. One might have turned to Latin Grammars for a few *scintillae* of the Greek language. Authors such as Donatus, Priscian, Macrobius, and well before them, Quintilian, came to one’s aid by comparison of noun and verb forms, and rhetorical terms in both Greek and Latin. But the organized learning was, unfortunately, constantly stilted.

The most popular source for Greek were *Hermeneumata*, school books in Greek and Latin. These contained stories of the mythological past compared to more recent historical figures, fables, lessons and examples of gnomic wisdom, better known as *idiomata*. This material overtime was further distilled into groups or categories of words (*glossae collectae*) reflecting occupations, social and religious customs and geographical data in both languages. In addition to this came the exhausting task of excerpting all Greek used by Latin authors and giving translations of the words and phrases. Here we have only to think of Quintilian, Festus, Jerome, Boethius, Isidore and Cassiodorus. This is the “stuff” of the medieval glossary.
Substantial work by Walter Berschin, and Michael Herren, as well as Bernice Kaczynski, among others, emphasizes that there is a wide range of ability in Greek throughout the Middle Ages. Criticism includes on the one hand the remark “The Middle Ages knew no Greek"29”, an attitude which became dogma under the pen of Bernard Bischoff: “Before the Middle Ages the teaching of Greek had practically ceased in the West and it was fatal for the future that no useful Greek grammar on a Latin basis survived; attempts to produce something of the sort which were made from the ninth century on, in part by Irish scholars, had no success... Lexicographers and grammarians collected from the already lifeless and inflexible lore of Greco-Latin glossaries and from the works of Saint Jerome and others a much mixed mass of Greek words. They handled it not only without knowledge of Greek grammar but with simplifying arbitrary preoccupations instead of knowledge. Greek nouns including feminines had to end with os or with on, Greek verbs with in or on, and so on. This sort of Greek was propagated by the most common Latin grammars, Derivationes, and the like. It was much used for the most daring etymologies30.” On the other hand there is Walter Berschin’s comment with the richness of a generation behind him: “How often we come across single Greek letters, names written in Greek, Greek alphabets and other such interests in and study of the Greek language31.”

It becomes immediately apparent that there are serious shortcomings in our scribes’ encounters with the Greek language. Under the letter A alone in the Stonyhurst manuscript some entries prove ‘interesting’. “Acros ge (should be Acron meaning ‘highest point’), mons le” (duplicated later on in case you missed it the first time); “Adria ge, petra le” probably just the reverse since, although petra can be Latin as well as Greek, Adria cannot be Greek; “axonia (miswritten for axioma) dignitas”. Finally, we are given the entry and gloss: “Andron vel andros interpretatur vir” (the lemma should read: Aner, since Andron and Andros are not legitimate lexical forms).

30. Ibid.
The *Medulla* scribes employ no Greek script. The entries so labelled *ge* are all transliterated. This is a further step removed from the attempt in earlier periods of actually transcribing the Greek letters. Both activities led to disastrous outcomes. Although numbers naturally vary among manuscripts, I have found in tallying the manuscripts generally that hellenized roots and forms constitute about 15-20% of all entries.

The dimensions of content are extensive, ranging from the ethereal to the mineral, and stretching from the political to the ethical. Consider the frothy physical effect of “Affros *ge* spuma *le*”, or the quiet nobility of the Greek *Alce* glossed by *virtus vel fortitudo*. Both *annax* of prehistory and *basileus* of later times are known as *rex* and *imperator* respectively. *Archon* is latinized as *Archos* and glossed as *princeps*. And what more appropriate for the lordly potentate than *doxa* meaning *glory*. However, to show even more enthusiasm, as it were, one manuscript alone (Harley 17383 32) inserts “eudoxa = bona gloria”.

There are, of course, the immediately understood fixtures of the languages, accurately conveyed: “Nice *ge*, victoria *le*; Pir *ge*, ignis *le*; Pistis *ge*, fides *le*; Siche dicitur anima; Polis: opidum; Carpos *ge*, fructus *le*; Croma *ge*, color *le*; ffisis *ge*, natura *le*; Gala *ge*, lac *le*; Theos *ge*, deus *le*; Tragos *ge*, hircus *le*; Cosmos *ge*, mundus *le*.”

Some slight inaccuracies are found as a result of the tendency of over-hellenizing: “Cronon [read: Cronos] *ge*, tempus *le*. Again gender is no obstacle when writing *stomos* instead of *stoma*, glossed by the Latin word for *mouth*: *os*. Perhaps there was even some natural attraction between the Greek and Latin nominatives: *stomos* and *os*. Then we observe the syllabic addition of *on* to the perfectly respectable *ge* which produces the entry and gloss: “Geon *ge*, terra *le*. We find “glicon [instead of the normal and coincidentally much more latinized correct Greek form: γλυκύς] *ge*, dulcis *le*.”

In our scribe’s head *lithos* (stone) becomes “lites” glossed by “lapis *le*”. “Machina *ge*, pugna *le*” causes only momentary hesita-

---

tion. Apparently a mere nasal abbreviation was improvised since *machia*, the correct form meaning *fight* or *battle* is not as common a word. A little more remote is "menon (should be *mneme*) ge", glossed by "memoria le".


The Greek was just too much to mouth when confronted with the equivalent of the Latin "emissarius : apompennis". Admittedly the messenger was meant to move with dispatch, but with *pennis*! The Greek word is ἄπομπαντος: "one sent from".

*Aychos* for *vrsa = bear* may seem quite a stretch but not if one imagines confronting a late byzantine Greek hand or a hand who tried to: y is not far from the fast open rho and surely a florid k could be seen to account for the c and curled ascender of the h, with t accounted for by the lower curve of the h. Hence the expected ἄρκτος.

What can one make of "Eleyson ge mons le" after realizing that the next entry: "Eleyson ge miserere le" was probably the influencing phonetic factor? Well, if it isn’t Mt. Dicte, it must be Mt. Helicon, the haunt of the Muses. After all, we can’t afford to worry about rough breathings, i for y, and gutturals for sibilants!

What about "Calon ge, alueus le". One of the important techniques in determining a solution to a glossographical entry is to work backward from a certainty such as *alueus*, interchanging vowels and dipthongs in the Greek. Καλός is a perfectly fine neuter noun meaning *wood*; also its form is that of the neuter nominative and accusative of καλός meaning ‘fair or noble of aspect’. But they won’t do for the proper conjunction with ‘belly’ or ‘womb’. We are looking for κοῖλον ‘cavity’ or ‘hollow’.

We merely smile and empathize with the befuddled enthusiasm of "Aer ge, breb le", or "Apasia ge, unsuffryng le".

A harmless but memorable Hellenic moment is *Stoax*, which is generally agreed upon as meaning ‘ruina’. Cf. *Le Ver*; not so the *Medulla* where we find *Sto* and second singular ending as as one word: *Stoas* in A2; *Storax* in J; and *Stodix* in D. Was it a problem of auditory memory, i.e. *Styx*? The spelling as we have it does not
appear in the lexica. However the Downside Abbey scribe could not resist missing the point and glosses the word: ‘urina’.

Distortion of Greek, as above, is one thing: fabrication is another. Note the charming example: “Abdomen ge, pinguedo le”. What is being conveyed here is that Abdomen is a Greek word, that is, (equivalent to) pinguedo, which is a Latin word. But Abdomen is not Greek. What probably happened was that the scribe having seen in the exemplar: “Abdomen grece i. pinguedo le” conceived of grece as the resolved form of the abbreviation: ge. Not so, however. Grece means grese in Middle English which, in turn, is our very own grease. Indeed, lexicographical editing can be a slippery business.

Perhaps, by way of three more detailed reflections we might be able to determine the direction of competency in this elusive language. The Stonyhurst manuscript offers the entry and gloss: “ffronos ge prudens le”. A word with this spelling doesn’t exist in the Greek lexica. Fronus is found in a German-Latin medieval glossary and is attested in Diefenbach, in the sense ‘wise33’. However, this is not a Greek word, in spite of our scribe’s labelling it so. The appropriate equivalent in Greek is probably φρονίμος. With little surprise Harley 1738 omits the entry. Pepys unlike Stonyhurst makes it a noun: “ffronos grece est prudencia latine”. Fronus does not assume the nominal meaning prudencia. φρόνις is the usual word. Yet, no comment on this point is provided by either editor. A second entry is Stonyhurst’s “ffronitus: prudens, sapiens”. Pepys reinforces this: “ffronitus: wyse”. But Harley 1738 errs with “Fromtus: sapiens”. Here the problem of minims recurs: not m but ni makes the word.

Another word, apparently not too easy for us to deal with, is Anicius. For the most part, spelled this way (exceptions are: Anicnus in Harley 1738 and St. John’s (Cambridge), Amcius in Pepys) the gloss is fixed as either “non victus” or “no3t overcome”. Two comments might be made: the editor of the Pepys manuscript should be referred to the misarrangement of minims: and due to the fact that the Latin word appears nowhere other than in du

Cange and there dismissedly, the MED should have included it\textsuperscript{34}. Perhaps, it was not recognized. It is based upon two words, both Greek: α (privative) + νικάμι, to conquer.

Then there is a word of considerable interest to any glossator, and here it is mistreated by both scribe and editor. The ἄρεοπαγίτης, is a member of the council of the Areopagus, the high court of Greece in Athens, established originally on the hill of Ares. It comes into Latin as Areopagita and the glossaries know it well. There is general agreement that it is a “princeps et magister illius [Additional ms. 24640: istius] ville” (Stonyhurst, Harley 2270, Additional 33534, Additional 24640); another manuscript (Harley 1000) reads: “princeps et mater illius ville”. This, of course, is inconceivable in the context, yet it is clearly supported by the abbreviation mat in the St. John’s gloss. The other curiosity is the transcriber’s rendering of the Pepys manuscript: vir. To begin with, mr is the abbreviation of both magister and mater. Perhaps influenced by the α ending of the word Areopagita the St. John’s scribe expanded upon what he saw: mr and read it as mat = mater. One cannot, however, be as generous with the Canterbury scribe, nor with his transcriber who is silent on this point: “Ariopagita: princeps et mater illius ville”.

The reading of the Pepys manuscript is indeed more challenging: vir. What is clear on the microfilm are three minims followed by r with a marking above, which is far more pronounced than the i flourish. v cannot be read and the marking does not justify the i. The editor’s note reads: “The i in vir is marked very heavily.” Indeed, the very heavy marking is meant not as i but rather as an extensive abbreviation to which the scribe is calling attention by distinguishing it from the i flourish and even the nasal abbreviation. What is likely here is very simply mr (with macron) which is resolved as magister, thereby returning to what is sensible within the context.

But the better part of criticism should be constructive. This next selected group of entries and glosses has a common feature. The Greek is completely wrong, but with a saving grace: “ Arnos ge, agna le; Ceros ge, cornu le; Cinos ge, canis le; Ciros ge, manus

le; Creos ge, caro le; Matros (which he might have heard as Metros) ge, mater le; Nictos ge, nox le; Pedos ge, puer le; Rinos ge, auris le; Sarcos ge, caro le.” What is consistent about all these so-called Greek entries is that they are phonetically identically equivalent to the genitive singular of each of their Greek lemmata. Arnos should be Aren, Ceros should be Ceras; Cinos - Cuon; Ciros - Cir; Creos - Creas; Matros - Meter; Nictos - Nux; Pedos - Pais; Rinos - Ris; Sarcos - Sarx. With this as a possible helpmate consider: “Egea ge capra le”; αἵγα is the accusative singular of αἵζα and that is what I believe is represented here in its transliterated form. Egea does not exist as a form in either language. Also note how “Ota ge, auris le” emphasizes a similar feature: nominative plural: ὀτα for the nominative singular: ὀτα. There seems to be a pattern here, but how confident we should be in forming a conclusion is not so clear.

On the other hand, consistency is the hallmark of the following theme. It might be said with some assurance, that our scribes have a problem with “the vision thing”. Consider the treatment of the seemingly ubiquitous videre. To start with, something familiar: “Idyn ge, videre le”. No trouble. Here we have the second aorist form of ὀπάκα. From this point things begin to deteriorate. Next we find: “Historium ge videre le vel connoscere le”. A noun glossed by a verb! The Greek transliteration of historium is historion, which means ‘fact with proof’. Yet, what is needed here is the infinitive historein, ‘to observe or see’. Not all 19 manuscripts of the Medulla Grammatice mistake the form, but most do. Then there is the commonly agreed upon reading: “Dorcas ge, videre le”. Pepys and Harley 2257 provide the entry: Doreo (which, if possible, is less helpful). Actually ὀπάκα derived from the verb δέρκομαι, is based upon the perfect second singular: δέδορκας. It is a large bright-eyed animal of the Deer family, a gazelle. What the scribe might have been trying to do here was to present the form of the perfect infinitive (why the perfect tense, I don’t know he usually uses the aorist or the present). He misses the infinitive ending widely, but he does ‘see’ to the removal of the augment. A delightful puzzle!

There is a stunning example under M: “Man grece, videre latine”. The problem is sense. It makes none. Capitals are notorious, yet there is no note in any of the three transcribed manu-
scripts (Canterbury D. 2, Harley 1738, or Pepys 2002) to indicate that this problem was even recognized. But here is the remarkable irony. The answer is in “the hand”. If one checks the manuscript and notices the shape of the M: Μ, not unlike or, and realizes that an is the infinitive ending in Greek of the ὀπάκο class contract verbs, then one probably has tumbled to it already in ὀπάκ. The attraction of this entry is that it is a scribal error perpetuated by editors. An interesting addition is found in the Canterbury manuscript: “...vel quid est homo”, undoubtedly inserted by a thoroughly perplexed scribe to attempt to explain the entry Man which he considered to be English. However, the entry words of this glossary are consistently Latin with some transliterated Greek and Hebrew appearing occasionally. Never English. However, silence breeds assent. Somewhere amidst the exemplars or perhaps as early as the gathering of materials upon which the archetype was based, i.e. the stage immediately preceding that of the glossae collectae, the gloss oran was miscopied as Man, and what is of further interest, the word is misplaced alphabetically and exists only in so far as it is a mistake.

A final example under P should reflect the tenuousness of even a sub-literary tradition. St. John’s (Cambridge) reads: “Pransis .i. videre”. There are no Greek or Latin labels attached. Yet perplexity. In checking the other manuscripts the gloss is either viridis or viride, emphasizing the dyslexic approach of the St. John’s manuscript. What the scribe took from the exemplar might have been viride; but in the mental process of transposition of words he transposed letters. Viride and videre are too similar for comfort. He also had no notion of the meaning of the entry word: Pransis which is a desperate grasp at πράσινος meaning green.

Yet, in the next two examples, consider the unerring accuracy of the tradition and the consistency of the scribe. The Canterbury manuscript reads: “Filaxe grece, serva le”. The word φυλάττω means ‘protect’, as does servare. Filaxe is a precise phonetic transliteration of the aorist infinitive: φυλάξω. Then there is a most unusual and revealing entry and set of glosses, which cut through at least some of the false impressions about scribal Greek, and, I think, offers strong support to Walter Berschin’s attitude that more went on in Greek than we concede. The Bristol DM 1 manuscript of the Medulla offers the entry and glosses: “Chricis vel
secretum i. Judicium vel aurum". The manuscript belies the intention of the glosses. An emendation is necessary to sustain the point: *vel secretum* i. should read *i. secretum vel*, thereby setting each gloss on a parallel level. Five manuscripts (Cnt., Harl.2257, Harl.2270, St. John's, and Rawlinson C 101) confirm the emendation and one particularly emphasizes the intention of the tradition. St. John's reads: "Aurum judicium secretum dat tibi chrisis", translated 'Chrisis offers to you gold, judgment, and something hidden away somewhere.' Here we have a trifold gloss intending to suggest that three words with considerable phonemic similarity are entirely different in form and substance: Chricis representing *κρύπτως = secretum*; *κρίσις = iudicium*; and *χρυσός = aurum*. This verbal triptych demonstrates much more legitimate subtlety in the language than I've observed in the tradition of the *Medulla Grammatice* to date 35.

As I've tried to show above, the Medieval scribe had been confronted with a number of crises when dealing with the Greek language. Most, it appears, were insurmountable. However, how far have we come in 600 years in improving the condition of glossographical Greek? I've chosen two examples which do not prove encouraging. First, an example of the indomitable minim. The editor of the Harley 1738 manuscript transcribes the following entry and gloss as: "Mammotropus: qui dominus suggit." The problem is dominus, as well as not being aware of the meaning of Mammotropus. The editor believed that what he saw was *d* with three minims constituting the abbreviation for dominus. It doesn't however. The best it could do is *domini*, which cannot fit here grammatically. He expected an abbreviation here and he made sure he got one. He overlooked the simple adverb: *diu* which solves the problem: 'he who nurses for a long time'. But to the stage of life reflecting the position of master is overdoing it. Then there is a word of considerable interest to any glossator, which does double duty in highlighting the inability of both scribe and modern editor: Anthropos (written Antrophos). Although a most reasonable phonetic exchange of *t* for *th* and *ph* for *p*, one is nonetheless tanta-

lized by the variation: *antro + phos*, two Greek words meaning ‘light in a cave’ (something our scribes need plenty of from time to time). It is glossed as *homo* and labelled ‘indeclinable’. What is so indeclinable about *anthropos*? Yet, as caustic as we may wish to be about the scribe at this point, our criticism pales before the Harley 1738 transcriber’s attempt to understand it. He reads: *antraparhos*. And that is quite a reading! *Antru* (with macron over the *u*) is the word immediately below our entry and our editor mistakenly attached the macron to the *p* of *antrophos* above it, thereby construing *p* with macron beneath it as *par*. He also misread *a* for *o*.

To emphasize the point of the fragility of lexicographical progress when dealing with the Greek elements in glossaries I’d like to conclude with an example from the *OED*. I’ve picked on the *MED* enough over the years. The *OED* provides the entry: *writh*, a rare word which is compared internally to the word *writhe*, conveying the sense of “something twisted”, “a twisted band”, supported by three quotes from the 15th, 16th, and 19th centuries, respectively. The 19th and 16th century quotes are appropriate according to sense. However, the earliest quote furnished by the *OED* is out of place. It reads: “14...Latin-Eng. Voc. (MS. Harl.2257) Grani, a writh.” Harl. 2257 is a manuscript, perhaps as important as any other in the tradition, of the *Medulla Grammatice*. Both words in this citation are misread and misunderstood. *Grani* is not a recognizable Latin form for a word in an entry position in this glossary, or any other for that matter. If the minims were reread, the word could be taken as *grau*, which, however, when linked with *writhe*, as the *OED* conceives it, cannot make sense. The ablative case of *grauis* meaning “heavy” cannot stand here. But if conceived of as a transliteration from the Greek: *Graui* = ὑπακόφη which is a series of natural phonetic shifts (*u, v, ph, f*, freely inter-

---

36. See Arrigo Castellani’s “Transcription Errors”, in *Medieval Manuscripts and Textual Criticism*, ed. C. Kleinhenz, Chapel Hill, 1976, p. 167: “At times the editor transcribes poorly because he misunderstands or because he becomes fond of the first explanation that comes to mind and fails to go beyond that.” Later in the article (p. 169) he adds: “Anyone can make a mistake, even the most experienced and learned transcriber. The error, however, shall disappear when the editor examines the text with a critical eye. If what he would like to write or what has already been written does not offer a satisfactory meaning, or, moreover, if a given form is not quite probable, linguistically or historically, he must stop and attempt other possibilities”. 
change with one another, long and short \( i \) and \( e \) are also naturally exchanged — note particularly the similarity of \( iota \) and \( eta \) in Modern Greek), this would provide a nominative case which is within the range of the interpretation: \( writh = writ \). \( t \) and \( th \) are readily interchanged in Middle English. Hence, this 15th century quote from the Medulla Grammatice should be removed from under \( writh \) and put under \( writ \), which, of course, diminishes the antiquity of the word \( writh \) by as much as 170 years.

We have received from the Medieval scribes a rich linguistic glossographical inheritance. We can’t afford to squander it, if only for their sake.
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