ANGLIA
JOURNAL OF ENGLISH PHILOLOGY
ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ENGLISCHE PHILOLOGIE

DE GRUYTER

Bethany Christiansen*

Scytel: A New Old English Word for 'Penis'

Abstract: In this paper, I examine the Old English word *scytel*, which appears in the Old English *Medicina de quadrupedibus*. I argue that, contrary to definitions offered in current Old English lexical aids, *scytel* does not mean 'dung', but rather 'penis'. In the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*, OE *scytel* translates Lat. *moium* (from Greek μοιόν) 'penis'. I begin by tracing the development of the definition/s of *scytel* in the lexicographic tradition (Sections 1.1 and 1.2) and in editions of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* (Section 1.3). Starting with Bosworth-Toller (1882–1898), *scytel* (1) was defined as 'dung', apparently on the misperception of an etymological relationship between *scytel* (1) and Old English *scitta*, n. 'shit'. Section 2 offers a discussion of the manuscripts containing the Old English *Medicina de quadrupedibus* and its Latin source text, and Section 3 contains a discussion of the two relevant recipes that contain OE *scytel* (1). In Section 4.1 I show that, in fact, *scytel* (1) cannot be etymologically related to any *scit-/scīt-* 'shit' words in Old English, as the two derive from separate Germanic (Gmc.) and Proto-Indo-European (PIE) roots. In Section 4.2, I argue that the scribe of the manuscripts containing *scytel* could not have written a non-etymological <y> for /i/, which eliminates the possibility that *scytel* is connected to *scit-/scīt-* 'shit'. It becomes clear, as demonstrated in Section 4.3, that *scytel* (1) 'penis' and *scytel* (2) 'dart' can be reconciled as a single dictionary entry, with 'penis' as a metaphorical extension of 'dart'. I demonstrate in Section 4.4 that, from a cross-linguistic perspective, 'dart' > 'penis' is a well-attested semantic shift. Ultimately, it is clear that the Old English translator/s of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* correctly translated the rare Latin word for 'penis' they encountered in the source text.

1 Introduction

In this research, I subject three related entries in Joseph Bosworth and T. Northcote Toller's *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (hereafter BT) to a philological reassessment – *scytel* (1) 'dung', *scytel* (2) 'dart', and *scyttel*, *scytel* (3) 'bar, bolt' – to

*Corresponding author: Bethany Christiansen, Ohio State University
E-Mail: christiansen.35@osu.edu

demonstrate that *scytel* (1) 'dung' is incorrectly defined in the dictionary and in all lexical aids that draw their definitions from BT. While lemma (1) is defined incorrectly as 'dung', lemmata (2) and (3) are still correct. *Scytel* (1) occurs only twice in the extant Old English records, both times in the Old English *Medicina de quadrupedibus*, where it translates the Latin word *moium* (from Greek μοιόν) 'penis'. The Anglo-Saxon translator/s of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* was/were proficient and consistent in his/their translations of technical Latin anatomical, physiological, and therapeutic terms, and the translation of *moium* 'penis' as *scytel* is no exception. The technical expertise shown by the translator/s of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* fits well with the current scholarly thinking on the high level of Latin medical literacy of the compilers and translators of Anglo-Saxon medical works.[1]

1.1 The Major Reference Work: Bosworth-Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*

BT, as most readers know, is a work that has gained its current form through the efforts of a number of scholars over a period of centuries. As it stands now, BT is composed of a revised edition published from 1882–1898, which is based on Bosworth's 1849 *Compendious Anglo-Saxon and English Dictionary* (itself based on Bosworth's 1838 dictionary and grammar) which, along with Bosworth's papers and notes, were scrupulously compiled, revised, and substantially increased by T. Northcote Toller after Bosworth's death in 1876. BT is now accompanied by a separate supplement written by Toller, published in 1921, and an enlarged supplement complete with addenda and corrigenda by Alistair Campbell, published in 1972. This much is generally known.

What is less well known is that the material published in the 1882–1898 dictionary is rather less indebted to Bosworth than we typically assume. First, Bosworth passed away before completing even the first eight letters of the alphabet of the 'new' dictionary (his 1838 and 1849 efforts at a dictionary being much maligned by contemporary reviewers), leaving to Toller the messy task of compiling *H* to *Y* from his notes.[2] Bosworth's early dictionaries relied heavily on what had been the standard dictionary until his own time, namely, Edward Lye's *Dictionarium Saxonico et Gothico-Latinum*, edited by Owen Manning and pub-

---

1 Kesling (2016); Doyle (2017).

2 I rely on Baker (2003) for details on the construction of *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*.

lished in 1772 (hereafter Lye-Manning). Many of the entries of Bosworth 1838 are translations into English of Lye's Latin definitions of Old English words. Availability of editions such as Kemble's *Beowulf* (1833–1837) and Thorpe's *Cædmon* (1832) in the early nineteenth century – not to mention the proliferation of the new science of Comparative Philology – meant that when Toller took over the gargantuan task of remaking the dictionary upon Bosworth's death in 1876, he had far more resources at hand than Bosworth had; and predictably, the definitions that were printed under Toller's imprimatur were, in many cases, significantly different from what was published in Bosworth (1838; 1849).

1.2 The *scytel* lemma(ta) in Bosworth-Toller

It is useful to trace the evolution of the entry that became *scytel* (1) 'dung' in the 1882–1898 BT. For some reason, the definition of *scytel* (1) in Lye-Manning (1772) and in Bosworth (1838; 1849) is closer to the meaning I will offer. Toller, however, seems to have changed the definition to something less correct in BT (1882–1898). In Lye-Manning (1772) – and adopted wholesale and translated into English by Bosworth (1838; 1849) – there is only one lemma whose headword is *scytel*, and the definition provided is "*a moment*: momentum, testiculus, *Med. ex. Quadr.* 2.10".[3] This single textual reference is to one of the two recipes examined below in Section 3.[4] In BT (1882–1898), Toller has expanded what was one entry in Bosworth (1838; 1849) to three entries with the headword *scytel*, namely *scytel* (1), (2), and (3) described above. The definition 'testiculus' for *scytel* in Lye-Manning (1772) and Bosworth (1838) is not readily explicable, for testicles do not appear as an ingredient in either of the two recipes of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* that

---

3 For *scytel* glossed as "momentum", see Pheifer (1974: 101). A reviewer helpfully supplied the following details: Lye-Manning based their definition of *scytel* "momentum: a moment" on an earlier lexical resource, Somner's *Dictionario Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum* (1659). Lye-Manning seem to have misinterpreted *momentum* as 'moment', when in fact, *momentum* in the text from which the Épinal-Erfurt gloss comes refers to the 'lever or beam of a balance' (literally: 'that which moves'). Somner, in turn, probably took his definition of *scytel*, "ut scutel, momentum", from the Corpus or Cleopatra Glossaries.

4 The issue of the total number of occurrences of *scytel* (1), (2), and (3) and its variants is treated below in Section 4.3. Suffice to say here that out of all occurrences recorded in the *DOEC*, all but one are either *scytel* (2) 'dart' or *scytel* (3) 'bar, bolt'. In fact, there are two occurrences of *scytel* (1) in the Old English corpus if one takes into account all manuscript witnesses of the *Old English Herbarium*. The *DOEC* does not include the manuscript London, British Library, Hatton 76 bearing the second instance of *scytel* (1).

contain the word *scytel*, either in the Old English translations nor in the relevant recipes in any Latin manuscript.[5]

The most likely explanation for Lye-Manning's interpretation of *scytel* as 'testiculus' is that Lye-Manning made an educated guess based on the context of the ingredients in the remedy: what Lye-Manning and Bosworth call "*Med. ex Quadr.* 2.10" (De Vriend 1984: *Medicina de quadrupedibus* III.14; see Section 3) is an aphrodisiac remedy. This remedy follows another aphrodisiac remedy that calls for *sceallan* 'testicles' as the primary ingredient – and here, Lye-Manning correctly identify *sceallan* as 'testicles'. Thus, it seems reasonable to think Lye-Manning understood *scytel* to mean 'testicles' in a remedy that immediately follows, and which purports to treat the same medical condition (i.e., to effect sexual arousal). At any rate, no other explanation seems likely.

By the time Toller edited and revised Bosworth's dictionary for the 1882–1898 printings, 'testiculus' was no longer part of the definition, nor was 'momentum'; they were replaced by separate entries for *scytel* 'dung', *scytel* 'dart', and *scyttel* 'bolt'. Unlike Bosworth and Lye-Manning, Toller had access to the more mature writings of the Comparativists such as Eduard Sievers, whose work allowed for lists of true cognates, that is, meaningful lexical comparanda amongst the Germanic languages. And by the time of the publication of the final volume of the revised dictionary, much work had been done in the field to establish the principles of the regularity of sound change. This knowledge, along with the spelling variants for *scytel* provided in BT (1882–1898), provides a window into Toller's thinking concerning these three entries. For *scytel* (1) 'dung', Toller gives the variant *scitel* with an <i>, and for *scytel* (2) 'dart', he gives the variant of *scutel* with an <u>. Finally, for *scyttel* (3) he gives the variant *scytel*, and defines it as a 'bolt' (which is also an available definition of *scytel* (2)).[6]

---

5 See Section 2 below for a discussion of the manuscripts containing the Old English *Medicina de quadrupedibus* and its Latin source text, and Section 3 for a discussion of the two relevant recipes that contain OE *scytel* (1).

6 Whether independently or not, Clark Hall-Meritt (1960) comes to similar conclusions about *scytel* (1) and *scytel* (2) as BT, though they split BT's *scytel* (3) off as a separate entry. Clark Hall-Meritt offer two subdefinitions for *scytel*: The first subdefinition indicates an underlying form *scutel*, and is defined as 'dart, arrow', and 'tongue of a balance' from the Erfurt glossary (this must refer to *momentum*). The definition 'tongue of a balance', as one reviewer pointed out, must come from Du Cange (1883), part of whose definition of *momentum* is 'languette de balance'. The second subdefinition indicates an underlying form *scitel* (a form that is not attested) and is defined as 'excrement'. Clark Hall-Meritt construct a separate entry for *scyttel*, *scyttels* 'bar, bolt' (BT *scytel* (3)), presumably on the perception of a separate form, e.g., the preponderance of geminate *-tt-* and the *-els* variant form, as well as separate semantics. This particular construction has some merit, as I discuss in Section 4.3 below.

The variant spellings that Toller provides for (1) and (2) are revealing. Specifically, the *scitel* spelling of *scytel* (1) 'dung' clarifies Toller's connection of *scytel* (1) to Old English words with the roots *scit-*/*-scīt-*, which appear in *bescītan*, v. 'to shit' and *scitta*, n. 'shit'; moreover, as Toller must have known, OE *scit*/*-scīt-* 'shit' has many Germanic cognates (e.g., Present-Day German *Scheiße*, Icelandic *skít*). However, as I point out below, for etymological and phonological reasons, *scytel* cannot be a variant of *scitel* (nor does the word *scitel* actually appear in the surviving sources of Old English, as far as I can tell), and *scytel* is not etymologically related to the Germanic words for 'shit'. The reasoning behind the variant *scutel* provided for *scytel* (2) 'dart' is less clear, unless he perhaps assumed an *i*-mutated /u/ that connected the Old English word to ON *skutill* 'harpoon' and OHG *scozila* 'harpoon, missile/projectile'; which is true, etymologically speaking, but which does not exist in the Old English textual record as such (the closest is *scutil* in the Cleopatra Glossary).[7] At this point, it is enough to say that Toller perceived a connection between *scytel* (1) and a nonexistent *scitel (or at least, a form which does not survive in the records), which justified his definition of *scytel* (1) as 'dung'.

1.3 OE *scytel* in Editions of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*

Toller is not the only one to have perceived a connection between *scytel* (1) and OE *scit*/*-scīt-*. In fact, the first time that *scytel* is defined as 'dung' is in T. O. Cockayne's idiosyncratic translations (1864–1866) of the Old English medical texts – including the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*, the only text to contain *scytel* (1). Cockayne, a close contemporary of Bosworth, working in the mid- to late-nineteenth century, was also unable to benefit from the discoveries of the Comparativists and their method of establishing reliable cognates. Always fascinated by the arcane, Cockayne translated the Old English medical texts using as many perceived cognates – including false friends – as he could find. The result was at the time and remains to this day a difficult to read, archaizing, and slightly ludicrous set of translations (see Van Arsdall 2002). Despite the drawbacks of Cockayne's translations, they were for more than a century the only modern translations of the often obscure medical language of the Old English medical texts, and philologists have drawn consistently from Cockayne's translations. It is possible that Cockayne's translation influenced Toller in his revised editions of BT (1882–1898).

---

7 I discuss the etymologies of *scytel* and related forms in Section 4.1 below, and I analyze the variant forms of *scytel* in Section 4.3.

They may have also arrived at similar results independently. In the latest critical edition of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*, editor De Vriend defines *scytel* as 'dung' in his glossary, presumably on the basis of BT (1882–1898) and Cockayne (1864–1866). Unlike any of the previous philologists mentioned here, De Vriend knew that *scytel* translated Latin *moium* and claimed that the Old English translator had made a mistake.[8]

2 The Textual Sources: The *Herbarium* and the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*

The Old English *Medicina de quadrupedibus* can be considered a component treatise of the *Old English Herbarium*. The *Old English Herbarium* is a translation of a Latin version of the *Enlarged Herbarium*. Like its Old English translation, the *Enlarged Herbarium* contains a number of once-distinct medical treatises that began to travel together as a medical compendium, probably by the beginning of the fifth century. The central treatise of the *Enlarged Herbarium* is a relatively long work by a Pseudo-Apuleius on the healing properties of plants, usually containing approximately 130 chapters, called in scholarship the *Herbarius*.[9] Early in its existence, the *Herbarius* developed into separate versions, which gave rise to at least three recensions: α, β, γ.[10] To each of the recensions was appended a treatise by Pseudo-Dioscorides: to the α-class manuscripts, the *Curae herbarum* of Pseudo-Dioscorides was attached, while a separate Pseudo-Dioscoridean treatise, the *Liber medicinae ex herbis femininis*, attached to the β-class manuscripts. With the

---

8 De Vriend (1984: 331) in his Explanatory Notes explains that "*Moium* (= *mugium* in [*Medicina de quadrupedibus* XII.13] means 'penis'; see Souter 1949). The Anglo-Saxon translator did not know the word, mistranslated it and also misinterpreted the last clause, thus giving the cure the appearance of being out of place in the context".

9 The component treatises of the Latin *Enlarged Herbarium* and their individual transmission histories are treated most usefully in Collins (2000), particularly at pp. 154–167. For a discussion of how the Old English *Enlarged Herbarium* fits into the wider manuscript context of the Latin *Enlarged Herbarium*, see Collins (2000: 148–238, esp. 179–196). De Vriend (1984: xlv–lx) describes in detail the interrelationships of the Latin source texts and the translations into the *Old English Herbarium* and the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*.

10 These recensions were first identified by Howald and Sigerist (1927) and have been widely accepted since then. The only minor revision to the recensions (mostly the α-recension) has been carried out by Grape-Albers (1977). Her work is based entirely on illustrations and is less useful for elucidating the relationships of manuscripts in terms of contents, i.e., component treatises, chapters, recipes, and origins or transmission of treatises and chapters.

α- and β-recensions traveled a treatise by Sextus Placitus Papyriensis called the *Liber medicinae ex animalibus*.[11] The *Liber medicinae ex animalibus* also has two versions, namely, the A-version, which typically travels in manuscripts containing an α-class *Herbarius*, and the longer B-version, which typically travels in manuscripts containing a β-class *Herbarius*.[12]

The *Old English Herbarium*, surviving in four manuscripts,[13] is a translation of an α-class *Herbarius* and an A-class *Liber medicinae ex animalibus*. It also contains *De taxone* and *De moro*.[14] It is unusual that the *Old English Herbarium* contains recipes from both of the Dioscoridean treatises, the *Curae herbarum* and the *Liber medicinae ex herbis femininis* (Hofstetter 1983). At this time, no other manuscripts of the *Herbarium* have been identified as containing both Dioscoridean treatises, whether in the same combination of chapters as the *Old English Herbarium* or in some other combination. In scholarship on the *Old English Herbarium*, all the treatises in the animal medicine section are collectively referred to as the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*, a title bestowed on it by Cockayne. It is important to note that the four manuscripts of the Old English *Medicina de quadrupedibus* are independent witnesses of a single Latin to Old English transla-

---

11 The *Liber medicinae ex animalibus* was probably written in the fifth century and appended to the growing *Herbarium* by the early sixth century; see Collins (2000: 166), De Vriend (1984: lxii–lxiii).

12 Two minor treatises that often appear with the *Liber medicinae ex animalibus* are an anonymous treatise on the badger (sometimes called *De taxone*; often prefaced by *Epistula ad Marcellinum*, a dedicatory epistle of obscure origin) and, more rarely, an anonymous treatise on the mulberry (sometimes called *De moro*). Although *De moro* contains remedies derived from plant material, the treatise has been placed with the animal medicine material, after the *Epistula* and *De taxone*, but before the *Liber medicinae ex animalibus*. De Vriend (1984: lxiv) believes that *De moro* was placed there by mistake.

13 (1) London, British Library, Harley 585 (s. x ex. or xi in.), Ker (1957: no. 231), Gneuss and Lapidge (2014: no. 421), Beccaria (1956: no. 75); (2) London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius C.iii (s. xi[1] or xi med.), Ker (1957: no. 219), Gneuss and Lapidge (2014: no. 402), Beccaria (1956: no. 74); (3) Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 76 (s. xi med.), Ker (1957: no. 328), Gneuss and Lapidge (2014: no. 633), Beccaria (1956: no. 85). Manuscript (4) is much later and as such is not included in most catalogues: London, British Library, Harley 6258B (s. xii ex.–xiii in.), not included as a catalogue entry in Ker (1957) (though it is mentioned on p. xix), Gneuss and Lapidge (2014), or in Beccaria (1956). A complete description of Harley 6258B can be found in Doane (1994). A complete description of each of these manuscripts and their interrelationships can be found in De Vriend (1984: xi–xliv).

14 In the Latin as in the Old English manuscripts of the *Herbarium*, there is typically no visible differentiation amongst the various treatises except one: that the plant medicines (*Herbarius* and *Curae herbarum* or *Liber medicinae ex herbis femininis* or all three) are separated from the animal medicines (*Liber medicinae ex animalibus*, and if they are included, the *Epistula ad Marcellinum*, *De taxone*, and *De moro*).

tion (i.e., they are copies of the same Old English exemplar), and no one manuscript can be based on another (De Vriend 1984: xliii).

The exact Latin exemplar of the Old English translation of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* is unknown. Even so, we can compare the Old English translation of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* to a certain group of Latin manuscripts with little trouble. The Old English translation present in all four manuscript copies is very similar to the South Italian Group of α-class manuscripts. The best text of this group of three manuscripts is Lucca, Biblioteca Governativa, no. 296 (Beccaria 1956: no. 91), and it is this manuscript that bears the strongest linguistic and textual relationship to the Old English translation in the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*. Lucca 296 is collated in Howald and Sigerist's 1927 edition of the Latin *Herbarium*, and De Vriend provides the Latin text of the *Liber medicinae ex animalibus* of Lucca 296 as a parallel text in his edition of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* for the sake of comparing the Old English translation to it.[15] Moreover, the *Liber medicinae ex animalibus* of Lucca 296 does not disagree in any way with readings from other A-class manuscripts collated in Howald and Sigerist (1927) for any recipes discussed in this paper. Therefore, to the best of our knowledge there is no meaningful difference between the Old English translator's Latin exemplar and the Latin text that I include here.

The Old English *Medicina de quadrupedibus*, with fourteen chapters on medicines derived from fourteen animals, contains the two occurrences of the word *scytel* that I analyze in this research. I use the chapter and recipe numbering of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* from De Vriend (1984). The Latin text of *Liber medicinae ex animalibus* (source text of twelve of the fourteen chapters of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*, including those chapters that contain the word *scytel*) comes from Howald and Sigerist (1927) and follows their chapter and recipe numbering.

3 Remedies of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* Containing the Word *scytel*

The word *scytel* appears in two recipes in the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*: III.14, from the chapter on the stag, and XII.13, from the chapter on the bull.[16] In each

---

15 See De Vriend (1984: liv–lv) for his explanation of which Latin manuscripts he chooses as parallel text for which sections of the *Herbarium* and *Medicina de quadrupedibus*.
16 Recipe III.14 is omitted in Cotton Vitellius C.iii, but it is present in the other three manuscripts (Harley 585, Hatton 76, and Harley 6258B). Recipe XII.13 is present in Cotton Vitellius C.iii, but is

instance, *scytel* is a translation of Lat. *moium* (or its spelling variant *mugium*) from the source text.[17]

In the first recipe, III.14, the first words are *Wið þæt ilce* 'for the same', which refers to the previous recipe that claims to 'arouse [the recipient of the medicament] for sex' (*Wifgemanan to aweccanne*, from Lat. *Ad concubitum excitandum*). Thus, the recipe that contains *scytel* is meant as an aphrodisiac:

III.14 On the stag

Wið þæt ilce nim heortes **scytel** 7 cnoca to duste, do on wines drync, hit hæleð þæt ilce.[18]

'For that same [condition], take a stag's *scytel* and grind [it] to powder, put [it] in a drink of wine, it will heal the same [condition]'.[19]

Item **moium** eius tritum et potui sumptum idem facit ad quod supra.[20]

'In the same way, its penis ground up and taken as a drink does the same thing as the above'.

The underlying logic of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* is often 'like treats like' or 'sympathetic medicine', to borrow a folklorist's term.[21] In other words, natural

---

missing from Hatton 76, Harley 585, and Harley 6258B. Both Harley 585 and Harley 6258B contain imperfect copies of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*; Harley 585 includes only *De taxone*, *De moro*, and the first four chapters of *Liber medicinae ex animalibus*, and Harely 6258B contains only *De taxone*, *De moro*, and the first 12 chapters of *Liber medicinae ex animalibus*, with only four recipes in Ch. 12, which for this MS is the chapter on the bull. Hatton 76 is missing 2 or 3 folios at the end of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* text; these were physically cut from the codex sometime after its binding, and these folios would most likely have contained the remaining chapters of the text, and the relevant recipe from the chapter on the bull. The total number of occurrences of *scytel* in the manuscripts is four, with one occurrence in each manuscript. However, the *DOEC* lists only one occurrence of *scytel* in the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*, the one found in Cotton Vitellius C.iii, XII.13.

17 For details on the textual survival of *moium*, see n. 27.

18 This reading is from Hatton 76. Harley 6258B is essentially the same, with only minor spelling variations: *(marginalia: Item ad idem) Wið þæt ilce nim heortes scytel 7 cnoca to duste, do on wines drinc, hit haleð þat ylce* (De Vriend 1984: III.14).

19 Translations from Old English and Latin are my own.

20 The Latin text is from Howald and Sigerist (1927: 237, col. *a*, l. 59–60).

21 The 'like treats like'-principle, sometimes called 'sympathetic medicine' or 'sympathetic magic', is a way of conceptualizing the 'logic' of medico-magical remedies popularized by J. G. Frazer's (1906–1915), *The Golden Bough*. The term, though borrowed, is a useful one, as sympathetic medico-magic is apparent in greater and lesser degrees in much early medieval medicine. This is particularly true of medical treatises derived from Pliny's *Natural History*, such as the *Liber medicinae ex animalibus* (the Old English translation of which makes up the bulk of

materials (plant, animal, and mineral products) are believed to have a particular 'power' (Lat. *virtus*, OE *mægen*),[22] and those powers are exploited to treat the condition to which there is a perceived affinity or correspondence. Thus medicines in the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* that purport to treat sexual dysfunction have a high probability of containing an animal's sexual organ;[23] examples include recipe III.14 above, as well as III.13, which uses stag's testicles as the primary ingredient for *Wifgemanan to aweccanne*, 'arouse [the recipient of the medicament] for sex'.

The logic of sympathetic magic seems not to apply in the next recipe that contains *scytel*, however; or if it does apply, it does so in a manner less apparent to the modern reader. In XII.13, from the chapter on the bull, *scytel* is the primary ingredient for what appears to be a facial cosmetic:[24]

XII.13 On the bull

Gyf þu wylle don beorhtne andwlitan, nim fearres **scytel**, cnuca 7 bryt 7 gnid swiðe smale on eced, smyre mid þone andwlatan, ðonne byð he beorht.

'If you want to have a clear face, take a bull's *scytel*, pound and crush and rub [it] very small in vinegar, smear the face with it, then it will be clear'.

Ut splendidam faciem facias, **mugium** tauri in aceto maceratum et contritum, illitum, splendidam faciem facit.[25]

'In order to make your face shine, the penis of a bull in vinegar soaked and ground together, smeared, makes a shining face'.

---

the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*). Unfortunately, not much has been written on magic in Pliny; see, e.g., the lack of any treatment of magic in the otherwise excellent volume by French and Greenaway (1986).

22 The powers of medicinal herbs and early medieval people's reverence for those powers is usefully discussed in Dendle (2008), particularly at pp. 54–57. The powers, or potency, of herbs is in the medieval mindset undifferentiated from divine potency, say, of the sacrament, with one exception; in Dendle's words: "plants, stones, and certain exotic animals stand out in one crucial respect: unlike the other created beings, the divine energy locked within them can be predictably and systematically teased out" (2008: 54).

23 Whence also, we suspect, Lye-Manning's interpretation of *scytel* as 'testiculus'. See Section 1.3 above.

24 There are a number of remedies in the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* that may be understood as cosmetics, in that they specifically address spots or blemishes on the face. These use varied primary ingredients, though a common ingredient is bile (e.g., VI.6: *Wið dropfagum andwlatan, wudubucan geallan [...]* 'For a spotty face, wood buck gall [...]').

25 Howald and Sigerist (1927: 269, col. *a*, l. 48–50).

In III.14, *scytel* translates *moium*, a Latin borrowing from Greek μοιόν (meaning 'male genitalia'; Souter 1949, s.v. *moium*). The form of the word in XII.13 is *mugium*; spelling variants include *muium*, likely a matter of orthography, and *mugillum*, likely a diminutive.[26] The *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* defines *moium* as "pars verenda animalium" ('the sexual part of animals'), with the possible derivative of *mugillum* "parva mentula" ('little penis'). In both Latin and Greek dictionaries, *moium*/μοιόν is difficult to find.[27] The only known survivals of the Latin form of the word come from three texts. The first is the *Liber medicinae ex animalibus* (the main Latin source text for the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*), already discussed. The second is the anonymous *Mulomedicina Chironis*, a treatise of veterinary medicine roughly contemporaneous with the composition of the *Liber medicinae ex animalibus* (*c*. fifth century).[28] In both the *Mulomedicina* and *Liber medicinae ex animalibus*, the word refers to the sexual organ of a hoofed animal (a horse in the *Mulomedicina* and a stag and a bull in the *Liber medicinae ex animalibus*). There is a possible survival of Lat. *moium* in a late-tenth-century Bamberg medical manuscript as well (Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Msc. med. 2; old shelfmark: L.III, 6), though the spelling *muiabulum* is somewhat dissimilar.[29] In this manuscript, too, the word refers to the penis of a bull as a medical ingredient: **Muiabulum** *taurinum cumbure tritum* 'burn the bull penis, ground up' (Jörimann 1925: 77).

---

26 In a private correspondence with J. N. Adams, K. D. Fischer suggested that *mugium* should be amended to *muium* (Adams 1995: 420).

27 Only two Latin lexical aids mention Lat. *moium* or any of its variants, namely, Souter (1949) and *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* (1900 – [in progress]). For Greek, only Liddell and Scott (1940) include μοιόν, who define it as "= αἰδοῖον" 'genitals'. Liddell and Scott list a single attestation of μοιόν, found in Herodianus. The passage of Herodianus it survives in does not provide any context clues for its meaning or use beyond what Liddell and Scott include, as it is only part of a discourse on pronunciation: "ἢ καὶ θηλυκῶς λέγεται, μοιόν τὸ αἰδοῖον" 'which, for the female, is said μοιόν "genitalia"' (Lentz 1867: I, 376). Neither the word *moium* nor any of its variant forms appear in Goetz's wide-ranging *Corpus glossariorum Latinorum*, which includes the glossae collectae and glosses that might be expected to contain such a word, such as the so-called *Hermeneumata*. The apparent rareness of *moium*/μοιόν is only part of the difficulty in uncovering the meaning and textual occurrences of both Greek and Latin words; there is also the difficulty of dictionary-makers' reticence regarding words belonging to sex-related lexical sets. For this problem in Old English dictionaries, see Christiansen (2015).

28 Oder (1901: 108–109); Adams (1995: 421).

29 This manuscript, which contains *Gynaeciorum epitome* of Theodorus Priscianus, *De pessis* of Psuedo-Cleopatra, *Cura omnium causarum matricis*, among other treatises, is available as high-quality images through the Kaiser-Heinrich-Bibliothek, in partnership with the Bamberg Staatsbibliothek: <http://bsbsbb.bsb.lrz.de/~db/0000/sbb00000138/images/index.html>.

Certainly, there is not much evidence for the survival of Lat. *moium* or any of its variants in the textual record. Where it does appear in late Antique texts, *moium* consistently refers to the penis of a large quadruped, specifically that of a bull or stag. It may be that the word bore the specific lexical meaning of 'penis of a quadruped'. But it is equally likely that *moium* had a broader meaning and referred to a kind of mammalian penis (the kind that emerges from a preputial sheath during mating), or, more broadly yet, it may have been just a word – crude or neutral – for 'penis' that happens to survive in the textual record in reference to the penis of a bull or deer. Without further contextual evidence for the use of Lat. *moium*, it is impossible to make any specific claims about its connotative use. Nor can we know with any precision what the Anglo-Saxon reader-translator who encountered it thought it meant. But the fact that *scytel* – a word that compositionally means 'that which shoots out' – translates *moium*, a word for 'penis', means that the Anglo-Saxon translator, at least, did not assume that it meant 'kidney' or 'fat' or any other easily recognizable organ or substance.

4 Lexical Semantics of OE *scytel*

Contrary to Toller and Cockayne's understanding, it is unlikely that *scytel* means 'shit'. First of all, there is no etymological, formal, or semantic relationship between the two Old English roots, *scit-/scīt-* (from Gmc. ablaut forms **skit-/*skīt-* < zero-grade and e-grade PIE **(s)ḱei-d-*)[30] and *scyt-/scēot-* (from Gmc. ablaut forms **skut-/*skeut-* < zero-grade and e-grade PIE **(s)ḱeu-d-*). The diachronic development of *scytel* from Proto-Indo-European through Germanic with two distinct reconstructed etyma and the synchronic usage of *scytel* in the Old English period (which clearly shows its relationship to fast-moving projectiles), demonstrates a salient difference between *scit-* words and *scyt-* words in Old English. I also demonstrate that the so-called 'confusion' between <i> and <y> in phonology and in writing practice is both more limited in late West Saxon than is usually recognized and not applicable in the case of *scytel*; in other words, *scytel* cannot be a 'mistaken' spelling for the unattested **scitel* 'shit'.

In the following section, I lay out the argument for *scytel* (1) as a word for 'penis' rather than 'shit'. The argument begins with the lexical semantics of *scytel* (1) reconstructed through diachronic and synchronic analyses. I then assess the

---

30 The writing of **(s)* in **(s)ḱei-d-* and **(s)ḱeu-d-* is a representation of the so-called 's-mobile', a fairly common Indo-European phenomenon that appears inexplicably sometimes in word-initial position, and thus occurs in some reflexes and not in others. It is a purely formal structure, and does not seem to have lexical or semantic function (Southern 1999: *passim*).

phonology and orthography of *scytel* (1) in its manuscript context, and finally proceed to the cross-linguistic analogues which demonstrate that, based on the semantic sources of words for 'penis' in other Indo-European languages, 'that which shoots (out)' is a much more likely source for a 'penis' word than a 'shit' word.

4.1 The Proto-Indo-European and Germanic Evidence for OE *scytel* vs. the Old English 'Shit' Words

An etymological examination demonstrates that OE *scytel* is not derived from the same Proto-Indo-European etymon as the Old English words with the 'shit' meaning (OE *scitta*, n., *bescītan*, v., etc.). OE *scytel* comes most immediately from Gmc. **skutilaz*, a noun formation with the suffix **-la-*. The Gmc. **-la-* suffix becomes the *-el/-il* family of deverbal suffixes in Old English, which accounts for the *-el* of *scytel*.[31] Two other languages also have reflexes from Gmc. **skutilaz*, namely ON *skutill* 'harpoon' and OHG *scozila* 'harpoon, missile/projectile', whence the formal and semantic reconstruction of Gmc. **skutilaz* 'projectile'. The 'missile' meaning of Gmc. **skutilaz* directly gives OE *scytel* (2) 'dart'. Gmc. **skutilaz* is related to Gmc. **skutan*, n. 'shot' (whence OE *scot* 'a sudden movement'). Words derived from the Gmc. **skut-* root descend from the zero-grade of PIE **(s)ḱeu-d-* (that is, a pre-PGmc. **sku-d-*). The *e*-grade of the same Proto-Indo-European root plus enlargement **(s)ḱeu-d-*[32] gave **skeutanan*, v. (whence OE *scēotan* 'to shoot, move quickly').[33] The broad meaning of the Proto-Indo-European etymon is 'throw, shoot, rush'.[34]

---

31 See more on suffix *-el* from Gmc. **-la-* below.

32 The PIE **ḱeu-* root produces reflexes with broad meanings of 'move quickly' or 'shoot', e.g., Lithuanian *šáuti* 'schießen, schnell laufen' ['to shoot, run quickly'], Old Church Slavonic *sovati* 'drängen' ['press/thrust'], Old Church Slavonic *isunǫti* 'herausziehen, zücken' ['yank, draw quickly'] (Seebold 2011, s.v. *schießen*). See also Watkins (2011), s.v. **(s)keud-*; Pokorny (1959–1969), s.v. **(s)keud-*.

33 It is worth noting that the 3rd pers. sing. present form of *scēotan* is *scȳt*, and here the /yː/ is the result of *i*-umlaut of the diphthong **/io/ < Pre-OE **/iu/ (i.e., OE *scȳt < *scȳtþ < *sciutiþ < Gmc. *skeut-i-*); see Hogg (1992b: § 3.7 and § 5.83) for details on **/iu/ < */eu/ and *i*-umlaut of **/io/, and Campbell (1959: § 732) for details on the West Saxon syncope and assimilation of the 3rd pers. sing. present personal endings that occur in this case.

34 Pokorny (1959–1969), s.v. **(s)keu-* 'werfen, schießen, hetzen' ['throw, shoot, rush']. Note that Pokorny reconstructs this etymon with plain **k* rather than palatal **ḱ*, but as the reflexes he indicates here are all centum languages, and the Germanic plain **k* variant is derived from the earlier **ḱ* form, this is not problematic for my argument.

By contrast, the Old English *scit-*/*scīt-* 'shit' words derive from Gmc. **skit-* (yielding OE *scitta*, n.) and Gmc. **skīt-* (yielding OE *bescītan*, v.). These Germanic roots, **skit-*/**skīt-*, are reflexes of two different grades of the PIE **(s)ḱei-d-* root plus *-d-* enlargement:[35] the short vowel of Gmc. **skit-* is the regular outcome of the zero-grade (PIE **(s)ḱi-d-*), and the long vowel of Gmc. **skīt-*[36] is the regular outcome from the *e*-grade (PIE **(s)ḱei-d-*). While Old English reflexes of PIE **(s)ḱeu-d-* are numerous, the Old English reflexes of PIE **(s)ḱei-d-* with the *-d-* enlargement are limited to two extant words and one reconstructed one: the extant words by now are familiar to readers of this paper, namely, OE *scitta*, n. 'shit'[37] and OE *bescītan*, v. 'to shit'. The third Old English word, securely reconstructible from early Middle English evidence, is **scītan*, v. 'to shit'.[38] Clearly, OE *bescītan*, v. and OE **scītan*, v. derive from Gmc. **skītanan*, v., an *e*-grade formation from PIE **(s)ḱei-d-*. On evidence from the reflexes across the Indo-European family, the basic Proto-Indo-European root **(s)ḱei-* means something like 'separate, cut (apart), divide'.[39]

While PIE **(s)ḱeu-d-* and PIE **(s)ḱei-d-* are formally similar – both bear palatal stop *ḱ* (phonemic value /c/), *s*-mobile (see n. 30) and a *-d-* enlargement whose semantics are unknown – they are distinct Proto-Indo-European roots with clearly divergent semantic and lexical reflexes in daughter languages across the Indo-European family (see n. 32 and n. 35). The separate Proto-Indo-European roots produced distinct Germanic roots with Old English reflexes which are phonologically and semantically distinct from one another: PIE **(s)ḱeu-d-* produced Gmc. **skeut-* and **skut-*, which in turn produced the cluster of Old English words surrounding the 'move quickly' meaning (*scot*, n. 'shot'; *scēotan*, v. 'to

---

35 The PIE **ḱei-* root with or without the *s*-mobile produces reflexes with broad meanings of 'cut, separate, divide', including Sanskrit *chinátti* 'to cut off, to split', Greek σχίζω 'to cut off, to split', Lat. *scindō* 'to cut, to tear', Lithuanian *skíedžiu*, *skíesti* 'to separate, to divide' (Orel 2003, s.v. **skītanan*).

36 The *e*-grade gives most of the reflexes found in the Germanic languages, both nouns and verbs, including OHG **beskīzan* 'to defecate' (Present-Day German *scheißen*, v.), Old Norse *skítr*, n. 'excrements' (Icelandic *skit*, n.), Middle Low German *schīt*, n., Middle Low German *schiten*, n., West Frisian *skite*, n., etc. (Orel 2003, s.vv. **skītanan*, **skītaz*).

37 OE *scitta*, with a short vowel and geminate consonant, derives from Gmc. **skitjon*. There is a small amount of later evidence for a long vowel variety with a single consonant, OE **scīta*, in place names and in the regional pronunciation of PDE *shite* [ʃaɪt]; see *OED* s.v. *shit*, n. and adj.

38 Evidence for the existence of OE **scītan* proposed by the editors of the *OED* is ME *shīten*, v. 'to defecate' (*OED* s.v. *shit*, n.; *MED* s.v. *shīten*, v.).

39 Pokorny (1959–1969), s.v. **skei-* 'schneiden, trennen, scheiden' ['cut, separate, divide']. Watkins (2011), s.v. **skei-* 'to cut, split'. Watkins traces **skei-* back to **sek-*, with **skei* as an extension of **sek-* (PIE **sek-* gives Latin *sec-āre* 'to cut', and an extended *o*-grade gives Gmc. **sok-ā* > OE *sagu* 'saw', for instance).

shoot'; *scytel*, n. 'that which shoots out; dart, arrow'; *scytta*, n. 'shooter'). PIE **(s)ḱei-d-*, by contrast, produced Gmc. **skit-* and **skīt-*, which in turn produced Old English 'shit' words. Thus, it is clear that there was a salient semantic and formal difference between 'shit' words and 'shoot' words in Old English.

A further morphological element that requires discussion here is the suffix *-el* of *scytel*. The *-el* suffix belongs to the same family as suffixes *-l/-ol/-il/-ul/-el(e)*, which is a common deverbal suffix in Old English. Kastovsky (1992: 384) categorizes the *-el* family as suffixes that form nouns denoting action, agent, object, result, instrument, etc. of the stem they attach to.[40] The *-el* group includes action nouns such as *hwyrfel* 'circuit, whirlpool'; object/result nouns such as *fyndel* 'invention'; agent nouns such as *æftergengel* 'successor', *bydel* 'herald'; instrumental nouns such as *sceacel* 'shackle', *tredel* 'sole of the foot', and *spinel* 'spindle', among others. The different forms of the *el*, *-ol*, *-il* suffix are a result of different class vowels attaching to the Germanic deverbal suffix **-la-*.[41]

Kluge (1926: § 90) examines the semantics of different types of the Gmc. **-la-* suffix with different class vowels (what he calls *mittelvokale* 'middle vowels'), and indicates that the **-ila-* suffix with the *i*-vowel, from which the *-el* of *scytel* is formed, primarily creates masculine words for instruments (*Mit dem mittelvokal i bildet dieses suffix am liebsten männliche Gerätenamen*; § 90). He provides a long list of words under this category of masculine words for instruments formed from **-ila*.[42] Sauer's study of the *-el/-il* family in the Épinal-Erfurt glossaries confirms that masculine instrument names remain the largest semantic category for the suffix in his Old English corpus as well (2001: 306). The fact that the Gmc. **-ila-* suffix typically forms words for instruments (see n. 42 below) supports the evidence of the two cognates with *scytel*, Old Norse *skutill* and Old High German *scozzila*, that *scytel* was first a word for a tool or weapon, a common semantic source for words for penis (see Section 4.4).

---

40 See also Sauer (2001) for an important consideration of the behavior of the *-el/-il* suffix family in the Épinal-Erfurt glossaries, and for his discussion of suffix productivity and analyzability in historical stages of the language.

41 See Koch (1868–1869: I.3, § 86); Kluge (1926: § 90–91); Meid (1967: § 87, § 89). It is worth noting that Koch, in a long list of Old English words with forms derived from Gmc. **-la*, glosses OE *scytel* as 'Harpune, Geschoß' ('harpoon, missile/projectile'), with cognates in ON *skutill* and OHG *scozila*.

42 For instance, he lists, from Old Norse, *lykell* 'schlüssel' ['key'], *sniþell* 'sichel' ['sickle'], *skutell* 'harpune' ['harpoon'], among others; from Old English, s*cytel* ['dart, arrow'], *býtel* ['hammer'], *brigdel* ['bridel'], among others; from Old Low German, *slutil* 'schlüssel' ['key'], *biril* 'korb' ['basket'], *wurgil* 'strick' ['rope'], among others; from Old High German, *zugil* 'zügil' ['reins'], *meiʒil* 'meissel' ['chisel'], *scôzzil* 'geschoss' ['missile, projectil'], among others.

4.2 The <y>-Spelling of OE *scytel*

It is entirely possible that at least Bosworth, if not also Cockayne, understood the etymological distinction between Gmc. **skit-*/**skīt-* words and Gmc. **skeut-*/*skut-* words and their separate reflexes in Old English. If that is the case, their constructed connection between *scytel* and *scit-*/*scīt-* must have been a result of a perception of 'confusion' between <i> and <y> spellings (possibly a perception of 'confusion' between /i/ and /y/ phonemes) in late Old English. In other words, Toller's listing *scytel* (the attested form) as having the spelling variant *scitel* (not an attested form) indicates that he takes /i/ to be the etymological vowel, and <y> spelling as an innovative rounded form /y/,[43] or else he takes it as a phonemically unimportant scribal variant. I demonstrate in this section that it can be neither, and the <scytel> spelling of the manuscripts represents etymological /y/ and not /i/.

To begin, I address the phonological reality underlying the early- to mid-eleventh-century manuscripts that contain a copy of the Old English *Medicina de quadrupedibus*, written in typical late West Saxon. In short, the matter of the so-called 'confusion' between /i/ and /y/ in Late West Saxon is overstated.[44] What is seen by some as mass confusion of /y/ for /i/ and /i/ for /y/ is in fact a number of separate phonological processes that are localized to specific phonetic environments and/or specific manuscripts, as Campbell (1959: § 315–319) makes clear.[45]

---

43 I follow Hogg (1992a, 1992b) in maintaining a conservative stance on the issue of qualitative differences between long and short vowels in Classical Old English. As Hogg (1992b: § 2.8) states, "there may indeed have been a qualitative difference between long and short vowels, the former being slightly higher, the latter being more centralized"; however, Hogg (1992a: 3.3.1.1) claims that the only evidence of qualitative difference in the long and short phoneme pairs is found in /æ/ and /æ:/. Thus, since we lack evidence for qualitative differences in either phoneme pair at issue here, namely, /i/ and /i:/, /y/ and /y:/, and since the primary distinction in Old English was quantitative rather than qualitative, I follow Hogg's practice of not indicating qualitative distinctions between long and short vowels. The quality of long vs. short vowels does not affect the argument presented here.

44 E.g., Luick (1914–1940: § 287) shows that unrounding of /y(:)/ to /i(:)/ appeared in Old English manuscripts from the end of tenth century, e.g., *stirian* for *styrian* ('stir, move'), *fillan* for *fyllan* ('fill') etc., as a widespread process, and that in isolated cases there appeared inverse spellings of <y> for /i(:)/. This has generally been misinterpreted as widespread confusion of the two distinct phonemes.

45 Campbell describes one other set of cases in which non-etymological <y> may appear for <i>: Spellings of <y> for <i> appear very rarely in isolated manuscripts "where there is nothing to cause rounding" as in MS Laud Misc. 509 of the *Old English Heptateuch* (1959: § 317). To this we may add the so-called '*sel* group', which in late West Saxon, has *y* appearing for earlier *e* (though probably not in a linear *e* > *y* move). There are more cases, conditioned by specific phonetic environments,

Although Campbell lists multiple environments in which non-etymological /y/ may appear in place of some other vowel, he describes only one phonological process that could account for the appearance of /y/ for /i/ in an eleventh-century manuscript. This is the one process that is of interest here, for Toller and Cockayne implicitly assumed a nonetymological /y/ for /i/ when they defined *scytel* as 'shit', with an earlier /i/ being a necessity for a proposed (but unattested) **scitel* < **skit-* 'shit'; that is, via the process by which /i/ becomes /y/ either before or after a labial, i.e., /f/, /(h)w/, /p/, /b/, /m/,[46] or after a labial and before /r/, e.g., etymological <micel> (/i/) becomes <mycel> (/y/), <cirice> (/i/) becomes <cyrice> (/y/). Certainly, this phonetic environment does not apply in the case of <scytel>, where <y> follows a palatal fricative and precedes dental stop. So it is highly unlikely that <scytel> bears an etymological /i/ that has become /y/ through regular sound change.

    The second consideration in the 'confusion of *i* and *y*' matter is orthographic rather than phonological. A typical feature of late West Saxon orthography was the (usually inconsistent) practice of spelling function words that had etymological /i/ (specifically, short /i/) with <y>. As Campbell (1959: § 318) points out, this is most common in cases of *þes*, which are often spelled with <y>, e.g., *þysne*, *þysses* ('this'), etc. These types of spellings are frequent in the manuscripts under consideration.[47] However, these spellings do not seem to represent any phonological reality (i.e., rounding of the high front vowel) as their distribution is grammatically determined rather than determined by phonetic environment. That is, nonetymological <y> frequently appears for /i/ in function words, e.g., <hyt> 'it', <gyf> 'if', <hyra> 'their', <byþ> 'is' (3rd pers. sing.), but this cannot be

---

where /i/ appears for etymological /y/, changes that are not relevant for the consideration of the *scytel* word (see Campbell 1959: § 315–317 for a discussion of these instances). The picture that emerges is not 'widespread confusion' as some scholars seem to believe, but rather, multiple independent phonological processes that produce different outcomes, with the result that, in certain predictable phonetic environments, non-etymological /i/ may appear for /y/ and vice versa (excluding the rare isolated phenomenon described in Campbell 1959: § 317).

46 I follow Campbell (1959: § 50) in calling /f/ (both voiced and voiceless allophones) labial.

47 For an in-depth discussion of the language and spelling found in the manuscripts containing the *Old English Herbarium* and the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*, see De Vriend (1984: lxviii–lxxix). De Vriend does not point out any particular instances of non-etymological <y> beyond the usual case of <y> for <e> (/y/ for /e/) in what Campbell calls the '*sel* group' (e.g., *hwylc* 'which', *sylf* 'self', *syllan* 'give'). This is, of course, a separate phenomenon from any /i/ > /y/ change; see Campbell (1959: § 325). I did not notice any unusual <i> for <y> spellings beyond a few before <n> which may have a rounding effect (e.g., *wungynde* for *wuniende*). It is worth noting, however, that De Vriend does not include <i/y> variation in his critical apparatus (1984: lxxxvi); so it may be that some information on this issue is missing. However, the presence of <y> for each instance of *scytel* in the manuscripts is secure, as I checked each manuscript personally.

considered part of a sound change, as sound change is only phonetically deter-mined.[48] Outside of the phonetic contexts outlined above, non-etymological /y/ does not seem to generally appear as an orthographic variant in content (open-class) words in the manuscripts containing the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* (see Section 2 above, esp. n. 16). Needless to say, *scytel* is an open-class word, and the scribal pattern of writing <y> for /i/ does not pertain.

Thus, there is no reason to believe that the <y> of *scytel* in the manuscripts is non-etymological, both for the phonetic and orthographic reasons outlined above. It is also significant here that in each of the four manuscripts that represent the *Old English Herbarium* – manuscripts that, moreover, must be independent witnesses of a single exemplar of a single translation (see Section 2 above) – each preserves the word *scytel* with the *y*-spelling. This is the expected result if <y> represents a phonemic value of /y/. However, if the <y> were simply a scribal variant and not representative of an underlying phonetic reality, then we might find one or two occurrences of *scytel* spelled with an <i>.

Scribes were not always consistent in their orthographic practices; so it is not unreasonable to think that <i> and <y> were interchangeable in some manuscript contexts. However, /i/ and /y/ (like /iː/ and /yː/, and /i/ and /iː/, etc.) were still securely separate phonemes in Old English at the end of the tenth century,[49] the *terminus ante quem* of the Old English translation of the *Herbarium* and compo-nent treatise, the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*. Thus, *scytel* – with semantics that are clearly separated from *scit-/scīt-* as established above – cannot reasonably have a variant form with an /i/. The two stems developed along separate semantic and morphological paths, beginning with Proto-Indo-European and arriving in Present-Day English with *shuttle* and *shit*, as is evident from the synchronic and etymological evidence. As shown from the phonological evidence, there is no possibility for the 'confusion' in late Old English that would allow for the spelling of (unattested) *scitel (< OE *scit-/scīt-*, 'shit') as *scytel* in the Old English *Medicina de quadrupedibus*.

There is, however, a preservation of the word *scitol* in the Old English *Leech-books*; the context in which the word is used makes it clear that this word is

---

48 Luick (1914–1940: § 287) also considers the spelling of <y> in words like <hyt> 'it' as represen-tative of the unrounded vowel /i/, for there is no phonological trigger for rounding in these words. As he states, "Andererseits tritt in jenen Glossen gelegentlich, in den spätwestsächsischen Texten in weitem Umfang auch *y* für ursprüngliches *i* auf, auch in Fällen, wo kaum Rundung eingetreten sein kann, wie *hyt* 'es', *ðrydda* 'dritter', *ys* 'ist', *ytt* 'ißt'" ('On the other hand, *y* for original *i* also appears occasionally in some glosses in a wide range of late West Saxon texts, also in cases where rounding scarcely could have occurred, like *hyt* 'it', *ðrydda* 'third', *ys* 'ist', *ytt* 'eat').
49 Hogg (1992a: § 3.3.1.1); Lass (2006: § 2.4.2).

etymologically and compositionally related to OE *scit-* words. This word, composed of the stem *scit-* 'shit' and *-ol*, a deverbal suffix in the same suffixal family as *-el* (see Section 4.1 above) probably means 'laxative', that is, 'that which brings about defecation' (*OED* s.v. *shit*, v.). The *Leechbook* remedy reads thus:

> Ne biþ him nanwuht selre þonne he þa þicge þa [mettas] þe late melten and swa þeah ne synd **scitole**.

> 'There is nothing better for him than that he eat foods that slowly liquify [= digest slowly] and nevertheless are not laxatives' (Cockayne 1864–1866: II, 178–179).

Unlike *scytel*, which derives from Gmc. **skutilaz*, OE *scitol* is probably a later Old English formation from the Old English verb **scītan* and deverbal suffix *-ol*.[50] The *Leechbooks* were written no later than the middle of the tenth century,[51] and many remedies are drawn from earlier exemplars (Cameron 1983; Meaney 1984; Doyle 2017). There is no reason to believe that the <i> of *scitol* represents an unrounded /y/. First, the meaning seems to derive easily from the etymological root *scit-/scīt-* 'shit', not *scyt-/scēot-* 'shoot'; second, because /i/ does not precede a palatal (as outlined above), there is no phonetic environment in which /i/ could become /y/ in a tenth-century manuscript.

4.3 Reconciling the Dictionary Entries of *scytel* (1), *scytel* (2), and *scytel* (3)

From a synchronic perspective, we have a relatively plentiful attestation of *scytel* (2) and (3) and their spelling variants. The *DOE Corpus* (*DOEC*) provides 29 total occurrences of *scytel* and its spelling variants: *scytel*, *scytels*, *scyttel*, *scyttels*, *sciutil*, *scytil*, and *scutil*, and another 2 occurrences of *fore-scyttel*.[52] Of these 29

---

50 While it is not impossible that *scitol* 'laxative' was derived from an otherwise unattested Germanic form **skitilaz*, the lack of reflexes from such a form in other Germanic languages makes it seem unlikely. Even if it had been formed on an otherwise unattested Germanic form **skitilaz*, it still clearly derives from Gmc. **skitanan* and ultimately PIE **(s)k̑ei-d-*.

51 Ker (1957: no. 264); Gneuss and Lapidge (2014: no. 479); Beccaria (1956: no. 82).

52 We should note, however, that the *DOEC* makes it clear that the spelling variants provided by BT are almost entirely incorrect: there is no *scitel* variant for *scytel* (1); there is no *scutel* variant for *scytel* (2) 'dart' (though there is *scutel* glossing Lat. *momentum*); and there is no *scyttle* variant at all. There is however the common spelling of *scyttel(s)*, which can be either *scytel* (2) or *scytel* (3), and *scytil*, a spelling variant found with two occurrences in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary, glossing Lat. *momentum* 'lever or beam of a balance', literally: 'that which moves'; see comments on *momentum* in Section 1.2 above, esp. n. 4. For the *-els* suffix variant, see below. The two

total occurrences,[53] the dominant meaning is 'bar, bolt'. As outlined in Section 1 above, BT (1882–1898) offers three separate entries with *scyt(t)el*[54] as headword: *scytel* (1) 'dung', *scytel* (2) 'dart', and *scyttel*, *scytel* (3) 'bar, bolt'.[55] There is sufficient evidence for *scytel* (2) and (3) in the record, and I have no quibble with Toller's definitions of (2) and (3). However, I think it is useful to consider the tripartite division of the *scytel* lemmata. As lexicographers and astute users of dictionaries know, the division of an entry into one headword with three subdefinitions, or three separate entries with the same headword, is a decision based on the perceived distinctions among the meanings. Are meanings (1), (2), and (3) different *enough* to be three separate entries? I suggest that they are not, and that at least the first two entries ought to be resolved into one entry with two subdefinitions. *Scytel* (3) 'bar, bolt' is more complicated, and the most conservative position regarding it would be to maintain *scytel* (3) as a separate entry in the dictionary, for reasons I explain below.

The etymological evidence makes clear that the oldest reconstructable meaning for pre-OE *scytil is 'that which shoots out'. Its oldest and its primary meaning is 'dart, missile' (currently *scytel* (2)). The metaphorical extension from *scytel* (2) 'dart, missile' to *scytel* (1) 'penis' is an uncontroversial semantic shift (see further Section 4.4 below). It is worth mentioning here that there are both transi-

---

occurrences of *fore-scyttel* seem to mean a specialized kind of door-bolt; BT defines it as 'a forebolt; bar', glossing Lat. *repagulum*.

53 With the spelling <scyttel>, the *DOEC* has 11 occurrences (of which, 4 occur in glosses); with <scyttels>, 7 occurrences (of which, 4 occur in glosses); with <scytel>, 3 occurrences (of which, 1 occurs in a gloss); with <scytels>, 3 occurrences (of which 1 occurs in a gloss); with <sciutil>, 2 occurrences (both in glosses); with <scytil>, 2 occurrences (both in glosses); with <scutil>, 1 occurrence (in a gloss). There are also 2 occurrences of <fore-scyttel> (not in glosses); I count *fore-scyttel* separately since it is a separate entry in BT, though its spelling with *-tt-* and *-el* aligns with the predominate spelling of *scyttel*. See the *DOEC* for the specific texts in which all of these variants of *scyt(t)el(s)* occur.

54 The geminate /tt/ in *scyttels* is a fairly common form and may be a result of Gmc. *tj, e.g., hypothetical Gmc. **skutjisla-*, or **skutjila-* for *scyttel*. However, there do not appear to be any reflexes in other Germanic languages from Gmc. **skutjisla-* or **skutjila-*, so it may be that the geminate is a result of analogy with related words that bear an etymological geminate, e.g., Old English *scytta* from Gmc. *skutjōn (see Hock and Joseph 2009: 151–172 for the pervasiveness of analogy in language change).

55 The number of attestations each of *scytel* (2) 'dart' and *scytel* (3) 'bar, bolt' in the *DOEC* is useful here: *scytel* (2) 'dart' occurs twice, and once with the metaphorical extension of 'shooter' (a similar extension occurs in PDE *he is a good shot*, where *shot* refers primarily to the object that is shot and by extension to the person who made the shot); *scytel* (3) 'bar, bolt' is far more numerous in the textual records, occurring 19 times (with one of those occurrences referring to the 'bolt' of chain fetters). There are only two attestations of *scytel* (1), and only one of these is recorded in the *DOEC* (because of the principles of manuscript collation in this corpus; see n. 16 for details).

tive and intransitive interpretations of *scytel* (1) as 'penis'. Intransitively, 'that which shoots out' may specifically refer to the kind of penis that retracts into a preputial sheath, a common mammalian penile type. During mating, this kind of penis must extend outside the abdominal sheath (Schatten and Constantinescu 2007: 33–37). Thus, *scytel* as 'that which shoots out (from the penile sheath in the abdominal cavity)' is a readily understandable semantic connection. The connection may also be made to a transitive understanding, namely, *scytel* as 'that which shoots out (seminal fluid)'. We may also consider that if *scytel* (1) 'penis' is a metaphorical extension of *scytel* (2) 'dart', then *scytel* (1) may be an informal or *ad hoc* metaphor for 'penis' based on vocabulary relating to words for weapons. Such a move would not be surprising in the context of typical semantic sources of words for penis, as explained in Section 4.4 below. Thus, a more accurate construction of the dictionary entry for *scytel* would be the following: *scytel* I. a. 'dart, missile; arrow'; *scytel* I. b. 'penis' (by metaphorical extension).

The more difficult question is what to do with BT *scytel* (3) 'bar, bolt', and specifically, whether it ought to be resolved with *scytel* (1) and (2), or whether it should be a separate entry. The reason that it may be more accurate to represent BT *scytel* (3) 'bar, bolt' as a separate entry is that the 'bar, bolt' meaning occurs far more frequently with the *-els* suffix than the *-el* suffix, and more frequently with geminate *-tt-*. Of the 19 occurrences of *scyt(t)el(s)* and its variants in the *DOEC*, 11 out of 11 of the <scyttel> spellings and 7 out of 7 of the <scyttels> spellings mean 'bar, bolt'; only 1 other spelling, <scytels>, means 'bar, bolt' in *DOEC*. The pattern shows a clear tendency for 'bar, bolt' meaning to be spelled with the geminate *-tt-* and/or the *-els* suffix. It may be that *scytel* 'dart, missile' and *scyttels* 'bar, bolt' were formed in Germanic as separate derivations from the **skut-/*skeut-* root, and with separate meanings. However, whether we can reconcile the *scyttels* 'bar, bolt' with *scytel* I.a. 'dart, missile; arrow'; I.b. 'penis' depends on whether we consider *-els* as a suffix sufficiently distinct from *-el*. In his analysis of the *-el/-il/ -ol/-ul/-l* family in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary, Sauer (2001) considers *-els* as a variant belonging to the *-el* family: when *-els* appears in his corpus, there also appears a form of the word with the same meaning, bearing the same stem and the *-el* suffix, e.g., *bridel/bridels*, *gyrdel/gyrdels*, *smygel/smygels*.[56] Kastovsky

---

[56] Sauer (2001: 299) explains the origin of *-els/-ils* as "secretion plus ensuing metathesis, i.e., when a word (word-stem) ended in *-s* and had the suffix *-l*, then *-sl* was regarded as the suffix, and this was then metathesised to *-ls*". Meid (1967: § 90) and Kluge (1926: § 98) both consider the Gmc. suffix *-*(i)sla* (> Old English *-ils/-els*) as separate from the suffixes that formed the Old English *-el/ -il/-ol/-ul/-l* family, but this is not the deciding factor for whether the suffixes remained separate in Old English.

(1992), on the other hand, considers *-els/-ils* as a separate suffix family, though of the "same semantic type" as what he calls the "*-el(e)/-l(a)/-ol*" suffix family.

If we consider *-els* as part of the same suffix family as *-el*, following Sauer (2001), we may consider *scyttels/scytels* as simply variant forms of *scytel/scyttel*. Such a move would allow BT's *scytel* (1), (2), and (3) to be reconciled into a single entry. And certainly, a semantic shift that leads from *scytel* (2) 'dart, missile' to *scytel* (3) 'bar, bolt' is not difficult to conceptualize. Like the *scytel* (2) 'dart' > *scytel* (1) 'penis' shift, the 'dart' to 'bar' shift could have occurred first by means of metaphorical extension which was then lexicalized. The relationship between *scytel* (2) 'dart' and *scytel* (3) 'bar, bolt' would, in that case, be based on the quick forward motion of a relevant object. Such a metaphorical extension makes more sense in the context of medieval locking mechanisms: doors of halls and manor houses had a wooden or iron bar that could be swiftly 'shot' horizontally through brackets mounted on the door and wall to prevent the door from being opened (Wood 1981: 338).[57] The relationship between the meaning 'dart' (= 'that which is shot') and 'bar, bolt' (= 'that which is shot') is thus fairly close; these two meanings of *scytel* align fairly closely with OE *scēotan* 'to shoot out'; moreover, there are a number of instances of co-occurrence of *scēotan* and *scytel*,[58] which may provide supporting evidence that the Anglo-Saxon speaker perceived a connection between *scēotan* 'shoot' (or *scyttan* 'to shut', also from Gmc. **skut-*, v.) and *scytel* 'bar, bolt' in these instances.[59]

---

57 The following evocative description of the iron bars of the doors being 'shot' comes from a twelfth-century homily on the Gospel of Nicodemus found in London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D.xiv: *And seo helle þone deofel ut adraf, and cwæð to þan arleasen þegnen, Belucað fæste þa ændelease gaten and toforen sceoteð þa ærene and þa irene **scyttel**es* 'And hell drove out that devil, and said to the dishonorable thegn: the endless gates lock fast and the brazen and iron bars shoot forward' (Hulme 1903–1904, quoted from the *DOEC*).

58 There are two more examples in *DOEC* s.v. *scytel* that occur in collocation with verbs derived from Gmc. **skut-/*skeut-* > OE *scyt-/scēot-*. One occurrence with OE *scyttan*, v. 'to shoot, to shut', is found in a glossed hymn (Gneuss 1968: Hymn 102.3): *geunscyttað hire **scyttel**sas* (literally: 'unshoot their shots', translating Lat. *solvitisque seras eius* 'unlock their bars'). Another example with Old English *scēotan* 'to shoot' is found in the Old English *Dialogues of Gregory the Great* by Wærferth (Hecht 1900–1907: 234, l. 18): *þa cyrican beleac 7 mid **scyttel**um besceat 7 gefæstnode* '[he] locked the church and shot with the shots [shot the bars into place] and made it fast'.

59 See Sauer (2001) on the difficulty of determining the analyzability of compounds or suffixed forms.

4.4 Typical Semantic Sources of Words for 'Penis' and 'Shit'

From a cross-linguistic perspective, OE *scytel* is far more likely to mean 'penis' as a transferred meaning from 'dart' than to mean 'shit'. Indeed, 'pointed object' and 'pointed weapon' are common semantic sources for vulgar words meaning 'penis' (including Old English; remember that perhaps the oldest meaning of *scytel* is 'dart, arrow', along the lines of its closest Germanic cognate, OHG *scozila* 'harpoon, missile/projectile'). On the other hand, 'pointed object/weapon' are unattested semantic sources for words meaning 'shit'. In his dictionary of Indo-European synonyms, C. D. Buck (1949: § 4.492) lists several dozen terms for penis across Old Welsh, Old Norse, Welsh, Old High German, and other Indo-European languages.[60] Of the recognizable semantic sources of words for 'penis' (§ 4.492.3), he lists first 'pointed objects', under which he includes Danish *pik*, Swedish *pick*, PDE *prick*; Welsh, Cornish *cal*, British *kalc'h* (also Welsh *col* 'sting', Irish *colg* 'sword'); Welsh *llost* 'sting, dart, penis'; Irish *gae* 'spear' and 'penis'.[61] Clearly 'pointed object' is a valuable semantic source for words for 'penis'. In this category also belongs a rare Old English word for penis found only in a gloss,[62] namely, *pintel* (PDE *pintle* 'a kind of pin or bolt'; cognates in Middle Low German *pint*, *pitte*, Swedish dialectal *pitt*).[63] Welsh *llost* 'sting, dart, penis' is especially interesting here as a comparandum to *scytel* 'dart'.

---

60 C. D. Buck's inimitable dictionary provides synonyms across more than a hundred Indo-European languages in dozens of lexical domains, e.g., words for the natural world, words for anatomy, etc. The dictionary is organized onomasiologically, rather like a historical thesaurus. Buck focuses on Old Germanic languages and provides non-Germanic (often Latin, Sanskrit, Greek) words for comparison; it is a great resource for finding cognates. This work is much more than an historical dictionary in that every section contains valuable discussions of general trends in the data that contextualizes the lists of words for Indo-Europeanists and non-specialists alike.

61 Further forms under this heading of "pointed objects as source for vulgar words for penis" are the following: OHG *zumpfo*, MHG *zumpfe* (probably: Middle Low German *timpe*, Dutch dialectal *tump* 'tip, point'); Russian *chuj*, perhaps related to Russian *chvoj* 'pine needle'; Sanskrit *śepa-*, *śepas-* (related to Lat. *cippus* 'stake, post'); Spanish *carajo* (probably from Vulgar Lat. *caracium, Greek χαράκιον, diminutive of χάραξ 'pointed stake'); perhaps Welsh *pidyn*, Modern Breton *pidenn* (Buck 1949: § 4.492.3).

62 The gloss reads "*uirilius*: pintel" and comes from the Harley Glossary; see Wright (1884: § 3.103).

63 OE *pintel* is probably formed from a Germanic word *pint (for which there is currently no reconstructed form) and an Old English nominal suffix. Editors of the *OED* gesture vaguely toward a possible shared ur-form with PDE *pin*; Orel (2003, s.v. **pennō(n)*) connects ON *pinni* 'pin', OE *pinn* 'pin', Old Saxon *pinn* 'pin', OHG *pfin* 'nail' and provides as comparanda Middle Irish *benn* 'horn, point, tip' < PIE **bn̥d-no-*. OE *pintel* is presumably a derivation from a first element that existed in Old English and many other Germanic languages, plus the productive *-el* deverbal suffix

Buck's listing of words for 'penis' across Indo-European languages reveals two more semantic sources, including 'tool' (PDE *tool*, Modern Irish *gleas*; I add here OE *mannes getawa* from *Leechdoms* II.70, 7) and 'weapon' (OE *wæpen* 'weapon', and 'penis', whence *wæpned* 'male'; *TOE* 02.04.06.04.01). Lexical domains of 'pointed object', 'tool', and 'weapon' easily accommodate a word like *scytel*, which compositionally means 'that which shoots out', with lexicalized meanings of 'dart, arrow; bar, bolt' and 'penis' as a metaphorical extension.

Cross-linguistically speaking, the semantic sources for words meaning 'excrement, manure, shit' do not easily accommodate a word that compositionally means 'that which shoots out' and lexically means 'dart, arrow; bar, bolt'. As Buck explains, "In the Gmc. group and several of the other words [from languages listed in the section] the development is from 'separate', whence 'discharge from the body'" (1949: § 4.66). More specifically, the words for 'excrement' in the 31 languages he analyses in this section are "most often a specialization of 'filth'". Buck also emphasizes that the etymology of many 'excrement' words reflects the use of dung for fertilizing the land, e.g., the cognates OE *dung*, Swedish *dynga*, OHG *tunga*, etc., which represent a development from 'covering' to 'dung' as fertilizer. Certainly, *scytel* meaning 'dart, arrow; bar, bolt' fits only very uneasily in the typical semantic sources for 'excrement', namely, 'separation', 'filth', or 'covering'.

In fact, the trend identified by Buck is generalizable to Old English words for 'shit'. Of the nine words in the *Thesaurus of Old English* (*TOE*) under the entry 'faeces' (excluding the five words with infrequent attestations, whose rarity makes it difficult to establish their etymologies[64]), all derive from one of three semantic sources: 'covering (fertilizer)', 'filth/ mud', or 'separation'. Belonging to the 'covering (fertilizer)' group is only OE *dynge*.[65] From the 'filth/mud' source, we have OE

(possibly as a diminutive, as one reviewer pointed out; see Meid 1967: § 87 for use of Gmc. *-*la*- as diminutive). A number of North Sea Germanic languages have cognates with OE *pintel*, e.g., Old Frisian *pint*, *penth*, Middle Low German *pint*, MHG *pint*, German regional and nonstandard *pint*, Danish regional *pint*; cf. Icelandic *pintill* (seventeenth century), Norwegian regional *pintol*, Old Danish *pintel* (Danish regional *pintel*) (*OED* s.v. *pintle*). As another reviewer pointed out, Present-Day German has two more 'penis' words formed with a root plus the -*el* suffix, e.g., *Pimmel* (see Seebold 2011, s.v.) and *Schniedel*.

64 The four rare words not included in my analysis are *droge* (appears once in the *Leechbooks*), *mixendynge* (a composite easily derivable from *mix*/*meox* and *dynge*, both of which are analyzed above), and *scytel* (which of course I argue is not a 'shit' word at all). To this list I add OE *post*, as it occurs only 5 times, 3 of which are in the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*, and 2 of which are in a single recipe of Bald's *Leechbook*; its etymology is obscure.

65 Orel (2003), s.v. *đungaz*.

cwead[66] and *gor*.[67] The most common is the 'separation' source, with OE *scearn*,[68] *tord*, *tyrd(e)lu*,[69] and by metaphorical extension, *utgang* (from *utgang* 'exit' > 'anus' > 'that which emerges from the anus'; but the metaphorical extension could also be *utgang* 'exit' > 'that which goes out'). OE *meox*/*mixen(dynge)* 'excrement' and OE *migan* 'urinate' seem to derive ultimately from a Proto-Indo-European root that itself meant 'to urinate', *h₃meiǵʰ-.[70] Thus, none of the Old English 'shit' words for which there is sufficient evidence for analysis depart from the semantic sources provided by Buck.

To sum up:
– From diachronic (etymological) evidence, *scytel* is not formally or semantically connected to the Old English verb *scītan/*bescītan* 'to shit' or to the Old English nouns *scitta* 'shit' and *scitol* 'laxative'.
– For phonological and orthographic reasons, it is very unlikely that the <y> spelling of *scytel* represents phonological /i/, and thus *scytel* is unlikely to be a 'confused' form of a *scit*- word.
– From a historical cross-linguistic angle, *scytel* 'dart, arrow; bar, bolt' is far more likely to be a semantic source for a word meaning 'penis' than for a word meaning 'shit'.

5 Conclusion

The definition of *scytel* (1) as 'shit' in BT (1882–1898) and Cockayne (1864–1866) was based on two misapprehensions. First, neither Toller nor Cockayne knew that OE *scytel* translated Lat. *moium* 'penis' in the source text. Second, Toller and Cockayne seemed to believe that the spelling with <y> in *scytel* was non-etymological and actually represented an unattested word *scitel, either a case of rounding of etymological /i/ to /y/, or a case of non-phonemic spelling with a meaningless scribal use of <y> for /i/. De Vriend (1984) knew that OE *scytel* translated Lat. *moium* 'penis' of the source text, but seemed to believe that the translator had simply made a mistake in his translation, as he gives the meaning 'dung' for *scytel*

---

66 *OED* s.v. *quede*.

67 *DOE* s.v. *gor*; Orel (2003), s.v. *ʒuran.

68 From Proto-Indo-European *sek- with an -*r*- extension to *sker- 'to cut' (Watkins (2011) sv. *sker*-[1]; Pokorny (1959–1969) 4. *sker*-, § I. 938). This etymon also gives the following Old English words: (< Gmc. *skeran) *scieran*/*scearan* 'cut'; (< Gmc. *skeraz) *scēar* 'plough-share', *scearu* 'portion, division (of the body)'; (< Gmc. *skēr-ō- and *sker-ez-) *scēar* 'scissors'.

69 Orel (2003), s.v. *turđan.

70 Orel (2003), s.vv. *mixstuz, *miʒanan; De Vaan (2008), s.v. *meiō*.

in his glossary. I have shown that etymologically and synchronically *scytel* is not connected to OE *scit-*/*-scīt-*, and it is unlikely that <scytel> was written as an unetymological form of unattested **scitel* in the manuscripts. Thus, it is clear that *scytel* (1) as attested in the manuscripts containing the Old English *Medicina de quadrupedibus* is a reflex of Gmc. **skutilaz*, and bears the lexical meaning of 'dart' (currently *scytel* (2) in BT 1882–1898) and the metaphorical extension of 'penis' (the correct meaning of *scytel* (1) in BT 1882–1898).

For the etymological, phonological, orthographic, and cross-linguistic semantic reasons laid out above, we can attest that the Anglo-Saxon translator/s understood the word *moium*, though the word is not well attested in Latin texts that have come down to us. Words for sexual anatomy are often difficult to recover from the late Antique and early Medieval records that have survived; for not many texts outside of medicine, natural history digests, veterinary manuals, and possibly protection prayers are likely to contain non-euphemistic words for sexual anatomy. And even when words for sexual anatomy were written down – say, in veterinary manuals, such as the late-antique *Mulomedicina Chironis*, which is one of the few texts in which *moium* 'penis' survives – the kinds of manuscripts that would have contained such words were likely to be traveling in formats and in conditions that were not conducive to survival. In England, for instance, if the manuscript were illuminated, it had a much greater chance of surviving. The manuscripts containing the *Herbarium* were often illustrated, which may have contributed to their survival rates.[71] On the other hand, manuscripts of the *Mulomedicina*, if the text ever existed in England, were not illustrated, and probably traveled in unbound gatherings; once worn out, they would have been discarded. In short, the words μοιόν, *moium*, and *scytel* may not have been as rare as our textual records and our dictionaries suggest, and it seems likely, from the evidence laid out above, that our Anglo-Saxon translator/s had encountered a Latinized version of μοιόν in the form of *moium*, *mugium*, *mugillum*, or *muiabulum*. Not only had they encountered such a word, they also understood it and translated it correctly as 'penis'.[72]

Works Cited

Adams, James N. 1995. *Pelagonius and Latin Veterinary Terminology in the Roman Empire*. Leiden: Brill.

Baker, Peter S. 2003. "Toller at School: Joseph Bosworth, T. Northcote Toller and the Progress of Old English Lexicography in the Nineteenth Century". *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 85: 95–114.

Beccaria, Augusto (ed.). 1956. *I codici de medicina del periodo presalernitano (secoli IX, X e XI)*. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura.

Bosworth, Joseph (ed.). 1838. *A Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language*. London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green and Longman.

Bosworth, Joseph (ed.). 1849. *A Compendious Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. London: John Russel Smith.

BT = Bosworth, Joseph and T. Northcote Toller (eds.). 1882–1898. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. London: Oxford University Press. Supplement by T. Northcote Toller. 1921. Oxford: Clarendon. Enlarged addenda and corrigenda by Alistair Campbell. 1972. Oxford: Clarendon.

Buck, Carl D. (ed.). 1949. *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages: A Contribution to the History of Ideas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, Alistair. 1959. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Cameron, M. L. 1983. "Bald's Leechbook: Its Sources and their Use in its Compilation". *Anglo-Saxon England* 12: 153–182.

Christiansen, Bethany. 2015. "Sexual Vocabulary and where Old English Lexicography has Historically Gone Astray". Paper presented at the annual meeting of the North American Association of the History of Language Sciences (NAAHoLS). Portland, OR.

Clark Hall-Meritt = Clark Hall, J. R. 1960. *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. 4th ed. with a Supplement by Herbert D. Meritt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [first ed. 1894].

Cockayne, Thomas O. (ed. and trans.). 1864–1866. *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft of Early England: Being a Collection of Documents, for the Most Part Never Before Printed, Illustrating the History of Science in this Country before the Norman Conquest*. 3 vols. Rolls Series 35. London: Longman.

Collins, Minta. 2000. *Medieval Herbals: The Illustrative Tradition*. London: British Library.

D'Aronco, Maria A. 1988. "L'erbario anglosassone: Un'ipotesi sulla data della traduzione". *Romanobarbarica* 13: 15–33.

D'Aronco, Maria A. 2003a. "Anglo-Saxon Plant Pharmacy and the Latin Medical Tradition". In: Carole P. Biggam (ed.). *From Earth to Art: The Many Aspects of the Plant-World in Anglo-Saxon England*. New York: Rodopi. 133–151.

D'Aronco, Maria A. 2003b. "The Old English Pharmacopoeia". *AVISTA Forum Journal* 13: 9–18.

Dendle, Peter. 2008. "Plants in the Early Medieval Cosmos: Herbs, Divine Potency, and the *scala natura*". In: Peter Dendle and Alain Touwaide (eds.). *Health and Healing in the Medieval Garden*. Woodbridge: Boydell. 47–59.

Doane, A. N. 1994. *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile*. Volume 1: *Books of Prayers and Healing*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.

De Vaan, Michiel. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Leiden/Boston, MA: Brill.

De Vriend, Hubert J. (ed.). 1984. *The Old English Herbarium and Medicina de quadrupedibus*. EETS OS 286. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DOE = *Dictionary of Old English in Electronic Form, A–H*. Ed. Antonette diPaolo Healey et al. Toronto: University of Toronto. <http:// www.doe.utoronto.ca> [last accessed 30 April 2018].

DOEC = *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*. 2009. Ed. Antonette diPaolo Healey et al. Toronto: University of Toronto. <http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/pages/pub/web-corpus.html> [last accessed 30 April 2018].

Doyle, Conan T. 2017. "Anglo-Saxon Medicine and Disease: A Semantic Approach". Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge.

Du Cange, Carolo Du Fresne. 1883. *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*. Niort: Favre.

Frazer, James G. 1906–1915. *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion*. 12 vols. 3rd ed. London: Macmillan.

French, Roger and Frank Greenaway. 1986. *Science in the Early Roman Empire: Pliny the Elder, his Sources and Influence*. London: Croon Helm.

Gneuss, Helmut. 1968. *Hymnar und Hymnen im englischen Mittelalter: Studien zur Überlieferung, Glossierung und Übersetzung lateinischer Hymnen in England*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Gneuss, Helmut, and Michael Lapidge (eds.). 2014. *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A Bibliographical Handlist of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100*. Toronto/Buffalo, NY/London: University of Toronto Press.

Grape-Albers, Heide. 1977. *Spätantike Bilder aus der Welt des Arztes: Medizinische Bilderhandschriften der Spätantike und ihre mittelalterliche Überlieferung*. Wiesbaden: Pressler.

Goetz, Georg, Gustav Loewe, Gotthold Gundermann, Wilhelm Heraeus, Paul Wessner and Wallace M. Lindsay (eds.). 1888–1923. *Corpus glossariorum Latinorum*. 7 vols. Leipzig/Berlin: Teubner.

Hecht, Hans. 1900–1907. *Bischof Wærferth von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen: Über das Leben und die Wunderthaten italienischer Väter und über die Unsterblichkeit der Seelen*. Leipzig: Wigand [repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1965].

Hock, Hans H. and Brian D. Joseph. 2009. *Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship: An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hogg, Richard M. 1992a. "Phonology and Morphology". In: Richard M. Hogg (ed.). *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Volume 1: *The Beginnings to 1066*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 67–167.

Hogg. Richard M. 1992b. *A Grammar of Old English*. Volume 1: *Phonology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hofstetter, Walter. 1983. "Zur lateinischen Quelle des altenglischen Ps.-Dioskurides". *Anglia* 101: 315–360.

Howald, Ernestus and Henricus E. Sigerist. 1927. *Antonii Musae de herba vettonica liber, Pseudo-Apulei herbarius, anonymi de taxone liber, Sexti Placiti liber medicinae ex animalibus, etc*. Leipzig/Berlin: Teubner.

Hulme, William H. 1903–1904. "The Old English Version of the Gospel of Nicodemus". *Modern Philology* 1: 579–614.

Jörimann, Julius. 1925. *Frühmittelalterliche Rezeptarien*. Zürich: Hoenn.

Kastovsky, Dieter. 1992. "Semantics and Vocabulary". In: Richard M. Hogg (ed.). *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Volume 1: *The Beginnings to 1066*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 290–408.

Kemble, John M. 1833–1837. *A Translation of the Anglo-Saxon Poem of Beowulf*. London: Pickering.

Ker, Neil R. (ed.). 1957. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Kesling, Emily. 2016. "Translation Style in the Old English Herbarium". *Notes & Queries* 63: 9–14.

Kluge, Friedrich. 1926. *Nominale Stammbildungslehre der altgermanischen Dialekte*. 3rd ed. Halle (Saale): Niemeyer.

Koch, C. Friedrich. 1868–1869. *Historische Grammatik der Englischen Sprache*. Volume 1, Part 3. Leipzig: Tauchnitz.

Lass, Roger. 2006. "Phonology and Morphology". In: Richard M. Hogg and David Denison (eds.). *A History of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 43–108.

Lentz, Augustus. 1867. *Herodiani technici reliquiae*. Volume 1. Leipzig: Teubner.

Liddell, Henry G. and Robert Scott (eds.). 1940. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Rev. and augmented by Henry S. Jones. Oxford: Clarendon.

Luick, Karl. 1914–1940. *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*. Stuttgart: Tauchnitz.

Lye, Edward and Owen Manning. 1772. *Dictionarium Saxonico et Gothico-Latinum*. London: Allen.

Meaney, Audrey. 1984. "Variant Versions of Old English Medical Remedies and the Compilation of Bald's Leechbook". *Anglo-Saxon England* 13: 325–368.

MED = Middle English Dictionary. 1952–2001. Ed. Hans Kurath, Sherman M. Kuhn, John Reidy and Robert E. Lewis. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/>.

Meid, Wolfgang. 1967. *Wortbildungslehre* [= Germanische Sprachwissenschaft. Vol. 3.] Berlin: De Gruyter.

Oder, Eugen (ed.). 1901. *Claudii Hermeri Mulomedicina Chironis*. Leipzig: Teubner.

OED = The Oxford English Dictionary. 2000–. 3rd ed. online. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://www.oed.com/> [last accessed 30 April 2018].

Orel, Vladimir (ed.). 2003. *A Handbook of Germanic Etymology*. Leiden: Brill.

Pheifer, J. D. 1974. *Old English Glosses in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Pokorny, Julius (ed.). 1959–1969. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.

Reszkiewicz, Alfred. 1973. *A Diachronic Grammar of Old English. Part I: Phonology and Inflections*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Sauer, Hans. 2001. "The Old English Suffix -el/-il/-ol/-ul/-l (> ModE -le, cf. beetle, girdle, thistle) as Attested in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary", in: Herbert Grabes (ed.). *Innovation and Continuity in English Studies*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang. 289–313.

Schatten, Heide and Gheorghe M. Constantinescu (eds.). 2007. *Comparative Reproductive Biology*. Ames, IA: Blackwell.

Seebold, Elmar (ed.). 2011. *Kluge: Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. 25th ed. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

Somner, William. 1659. *Dictionarium Latino-Saxonico-Anglicum*. London.

Souter, Alexander. 1949. *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Southern, Mark R. V. 1999. *Sub-Grammatical Survival: Indo-European s-mobile and its Regeneration in Germanic*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man.

Thesaurus linguae Latinae. 1900– [in progress]. Leipzig: Teubner/Berlin: De Gruyter.

Thorpe, Benjamin. 1832. *Cædmon's Metrical Paraphrase of Parts of the Holy Scriptures in Anglo-Saxon*. London: Society of Antiquaries of London.

*TOE = Roberts, Jane and Christian Kay with Lynne Grundy. 2017. *A Thesaurus of Old English*. Glasgow: University of Glasgow. <http://oldenglishthesaurus.arts.gla.ac.uk/>

Van Arsdall, Anne. 2002. *Medieval Herbal Remedies: The Old English Herbarium and Anglo-Saxon Medicine*. New York: Routledge.

Watkins, Calvert (ed.). 2011. *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*. 2nd ed. Boston, MA/New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Wood, Margaret. 1981. *The English Medieval House*. London: Ferndale.

Wright, Thomas (ed.). 1857–1873. *A Volume of Vocabularies. Revised by R. P. Wülcker as Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies,* 2 vols. (London 1884) [repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968].