

# Leeds Studies in English

## Article:

Hedwig Gwosdek, 'Subject Matter and its Arrangement in the Accedence Manuscripts and in the Early Printed Long Accedence and Short Accedence Grammars', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 24, (1993), 133-53

## Permanent URL:

[https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object\\_id=121800&silos\\_library=GEN01](https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=121800&silos_library=GEN01)



*Leeds Studies in English*  
School of English  
University of Leeds  
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

## Subject Matter and its Arrangement in the *Accedence* Manuscripts and in the Early Printed *Long Accedence* and *Short Accedence* Grammars

Hedwig Gwosdek

From the beginning of the fifteenth century Latin grammars written in Middle English have survived in manuscripts. They are short introductory treatises which represent the personal working notes of masters and pupils concerning formal instruction in this subject. With the aid of these tracts young schoolboys were taught morphology, elementary syntax, vocabulary and composition, and also methods of analysing Latin grammar. They were widely disseminated and also went into print. Their frequent reprinting from the end of the fifteenth century and during the first three decades of the sixteenth century bears witness to their popularity and to the high demand for them in grammar schools. The present article will consider versions dealing with the parts of speech based on Donatus' *Ars Minor*, the subject with which tuition normally began. The extant manuscripts and printed versions make possible a close and connected investigation of both, and raise questions about their characteristic textual features and about the possible links between them. An attempt will be made to indicate what is common to the manuscripts of the *Accedence* and the two printed versions, the *Long Accedence* (*LA*) and *Short Accedence* (*SA*) in subject matter and its arrangement.

The replacement of French by English as the medium of instruction in Latin, which started about the middle of the fourteenth century, was of great importance in elementary teaching. The Oxford schoolmaster John of Cornwall is said to have introduced this change at about the time of the Black Death (1348-49); and it must have led grammar masters to produce schoolbooks which reflected this linguistic change.<sup>1</sup> But it is only from the beginning of the fifteenth century that grammatical manuscripts in English survive. Thirty-six Middle English grammatical texts have been described and edited which are extant in a total of twenty-four manuscripts.<sup>2</sup>

Twenty-eight of the texts are versions of one of the four main treatises: the *Accedence* as the first of the main treatises, which is largely an English adaptation of its basic source, the *Ars Minor* of Donatus; the *Comparacio*, a short tract on comparison; the *Informacio* which treats elementary syntax; and the *Formula* which represents an expanded version of the *Informacio* tract. Apart from these there are eight texts which are the only copies of the treatises they represent. John Leylond, the well-known Oxford grammar master who taught from about 1400 until his death in 1428 can be connected with some of these grammatical treatises.<sup>3</sup> But the *Informacio*, a tract on syntax, is the only work which he has a strong claim to be author of, although the *Comparacio* may also originate with him. The tract on the parts of speech, the *Accedence*, may have already been in circulation, and he may therefore merely have used and revised it for his teaching. The remainder of the treatises can only indirectly be linked with him. Versions of all the treatises continued to be used and revised for elementary teaching throughout the fifteenth century.

After printing had come to England a number of printed versions of the *Accedence* manuscripts and the other treatises gradually became available, and replaced the manuscripts used in the classrooms. Twelve different manuscript versions of the *Accedence* are discussed here, and three printed versions of this grammar are extant: the *LA*, the *SA*, and the *Accidence*; these were used at the end of the fifteenth and during the first third of the sixteenth centuries.<sup>4</sup> Their dates of printing indicate that the extant versions of the *LA* and of the *SA* bridged the period from about 1495 to 1519. As for their chances of survival, the manuscripts and the printed books were equally liable to be destroyed or lost. There can be no doubt that the school texts which have come down to us represent only a very small proportion of those which were actually written and printed. They are those which survived destruction, ill usage and neglect after being replaced by different texts. Whole printed versions may have been lost forever. The three extant versions, the *LA*, the *SA*, and the *Accidence*, may therefore inadequately reflect the versions which were actually printed from the *Accedence* manuscripts.<sup>5</sup> The extant versions of both manuscripts and printed texts may thus give a very uneven picture of the tracts which were likely to have been available in both mediums, and circulated and used in the classrooms at that time.

This article seeks to illustrate how the parts of speech are treated, and in what varieties of arrangement the subject matter occurs in extant versions of both the manuscripts and the printed versions. In connection with this, the prevalent

methods of teaching will be discussed. Only the first edition of the *LA*, text A, and the first two fragmentary editions of the *SA*, texts I and K, which together cover almost the complete text, need to be examined for present purposes, because later editions of each version, though published in different printing houses, were in every case set up from reprints of the first edition of each version.<sup>6</sup> Bearing in mind the accidental nature of the textual evidence and given the imperfect state of our present knowledge about both manuscripts and printed versions, as well as of elementary education as a whole in England at this time, it is not possible to take into consideration all the factors which governed the production and dissemination of the manuscripts as well as their printing history. In such circumstances we can only draw on the information provided by the texts themselves. Both the manuscripts and the printed versions, nevertheless, are important in so far as they are the basis of many of the elementary grammars written in the Tudor period.

Nicholas Orme's book *English Schools in the Middle Ages*, published in 1973, was the first attempt to draw attention to the relationship between these elementary grammatical manuscripts and the printed versions.<sup>7</sup> David Thomson's research subsequently made it possible to give a broad account of fifteenth-century English grammatical manuscripts concerning elementary teaching and the link between manuscripts and printed versions. Earlier scholars, in pursuing different interests, for example A. F. Leach's emphasis on the institutional side of education, and Foster Watson's work on schools and learning in England at the time of the Renaissance, concentrated exclusively on printed treatises when referring to the curriculum, and did no more than mention or list them.<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, S. B. Meech was concerned only with manuscripts and, even then, only from the point of view of Middle English dialect. It is clear that printed versions of these manuscripts were not known to him.<sup>9</sup> During this earlier period of research printed treatises of this grammar, as with some other tracts, were considered to be the first of their kind, and different versions were attributed to John Hanbridge.<sup>10</sup> It will however become obvious that the printed versions continued the tradition of short manuscript tracts which began in Oxford as the centre of grammatical studies throughout the Middle Ages. The manuscript treatises which were disseminated from there did not circulate in a coherent and written-up form. Each schoolmaster revised and adapted material available to him in such a way as to form an individual version which best suited his teaching aims as well as local conditions. Texts of the same treatise therefore exhibit considerable variation.<sup>11</sup> The grammatical material a schoolmaster used for his teaching probably consisted of personal manuscripts to which from time to time

additions, excisions, and variations were made according to pedagogical necessity and access to grammatical sources.<sup>12</sup> It is certainly not possible to indicate the kinds and degrees of revision made by each master in each version. In general, his notes were probably intended to sum up and systematize his instruction. Though most of the actual treatises we have were written by schoolboys, and the transmission through such hands may explain in part the distortion which is a characteristic feature of many of them, it is the schoolmasters themselves to whom the serious revisions of the texts must certainly be attributed.<sup>13</sup> In regard to the extant treatises, the variants exhibited by any one individual manuscript or printed version must be explained by its provenance and history.

After printed grammars had become available they replaced the manuscripts in the course of time. This must have resulted in a decline in the production of grammatical manuscripts, though they still continued to be written. For example, a version of the *Comparacio* (MS Q) which was written at the end of text A of the *LA*, printed in about 1495, gives evidence of this continuing tradition and also illustrates the physical proximity between manuscripts and printed texts.<sup>14</sup> Each of the three extant printed versions survives in a differing number of editions. At present we know of nine editions of the *LA*, of which the first edition is dated c. 1495;<sup>15</sup> four editions of the *SA*, whose first edition, text I, can also be dated to about this year; and thirty-five editions of the *Accidence*, with its first edition dating from about 1505. In most cases only one copy of each edition of the three versions survives in complete or fragmentary form. Only the *Accidence* itself is clearly connected through its title with John Stanbridge (c. 1463-1510), who was a Winchester pupil and a New College scholar before becoming Master of Magdalen College School, Oxford, from 1488-94, and later of Banbury School from 1501-10.<sup>16</sup> This however does not mean that the *Accidence* originated with Stanbridge, but only that he revised and adapted material which was already available. Though the *LA* and *SA* versions do not display internal evidence of attribution to him, from the fact that he revised material for his teaching it seems likely that he was also responsible for the way in which these texts are presented to us. In this way he was just another in the series of grammar masters reworking and adapting material which was not novel in itself. That Stanbridge was doubtless a distinctive master may only in part explain his reputation. It was rather the fact that the grammars attributed to him could easily be multiplied and made public by the printing press, thus enabling them to exert great influence in other local schools and make his teaching well-known. This is for example reflected by the 1515 and 1525 statutes of Manchester Free Grammar

School which say that the master 'should "teche childeryn gramyer after the scole use, maner and forme of the scole of Banbury in Oxfordshire . . . which is called Stanbridge grammar"'.<sup>17</sup>

Returning to the texts themselves in order to show that it was traditional material which gained such influence, extracts from the grammatical manuscripts of the *Accedence* and the printed versions of the *LA* and *SA* are arranged below in roughly chronological order for ease of comparison and to illustrate their characteristics. It is only possible here to set out some particularly striking examples to show how subject matter is presented and arranged in the individual versions.<sup>18</sup>

Concerning the method of teaching, the use of a general question-and-answer format is typical of this group of grammars, as was common in Latin grammatical teaching, following the model given in Donatus' *Ars Minor*.<sup>19</sup> Compare for example the following items in Donatus 'Genera verborum quot sunt? Quinque. Quae? Activa passiva neutra deponentia communia' (Keil iv 359, 33-35) with the manuscripts and the printed versions:

How many gendres haste of verbes? Fyue: actyf, passyf, neutre, comyn and deponent (MS D327-28; MS A198-99, MS B160-62, MS C358-60, MS F146-47, and MS K116-18).<sup>20</sup>

How many gendris of verbis ben there (v) whiche .v. actif/ passif/ neuter/ comyn/ and deponent (*LA* A414-15).

How many gener of verbe be there .v. whiche .v. actyue passyue neutre/ deponent/ and common (*SA* K71-73).

Apart from the request by the teacher for the pupils to enumerate items, definitions are required from them in all these tracts. We may compare the definition of the imperative mood as the second of the five moods in the inflection of Latin verbs. The passage is based on Donatus 'Modi qui sunt? Indicativus, ut lego, imperativus, ut lege . . .' (Keil iv 359, 7-8):

How knowyste imperatyf moode? That at byddyth or commaundeth, as 'Go hens', *Vade hinc* (MS D300-01).

How knos þu þe imperatiue mod? For he byddus or

comawyndys (MS A172-73, MS B181-82, MS F130-31).

Qwerby knowyst imperatyf mood? For it preyith, byddyth, or comawndyth (MS C401-02).

How knowest þe Imperatif mode for he byddeth or commaundeth (LA A384).

[The] imperatyf mode for he byddeth or commaundeth (SA K58-59).

The printed versions show exactly the same pattern as manuscripts A, B, and F in defining the imperative mood, though the actual definitions show small variants. A third kind of question asks for the rules governing word-formation, of which only a few examples are found. Donatus' *Ars Minor* was not drawn on in these cases. The passages for the formation of the past participle are as follows:

Wherof schall the participle endyng in *-tus* or *-sus* be formed? Of the laste supyn, as *amatu*, set ther-to an *-s* and thenne hit is *amatus* (MS D483-85).

Of whom schall he be fowrmyt? Of þe latyr supyn be putyng to þis letter *S* as *amatum*, *-tu*, put to þis letter *S* and hyt wyll be *amatus*, *-ta*, *-tum*; *doctum*, *-tu*, put to þis letter *S* and hyt wyll be *doctus*, *-ta*, *tum* (MS A262-65).

Of whom is a participill of þe pretertens i-formed? Of þe latter suppyne of þe verbe bye puttyng to *-s*, as *lectu*, put to *-s*, it is *lectus* (MS F207-09).

Whereof schall he be formyd? Of the later suppyne, as *lectu*, sett ther-to *-s* and make *lectus*, *-a*, *-um* (MS K186-87).

Of whom shal the participle of the pretertens be fourmed. Of the latter supine by puttinge to this lettre *.s*. as (lectu) put therto *.s*. and it wol be (lectus) (LA A552-54).

Of whom is the particyple of the pretertens formed/ of the later  
suppyne by the puttyng to an s (SA I65-67).

The different steps in the teaching procedure become evident: the question about the formation of a word is followed by an answer which is illustrated here only by Latin examples. The printed version of the *LA* is very close to MS F, whereas the other manuscripts and the *SA* version show variants, especially in elaborating on or omitting examples.

As to the content of these treatises and its arrangement, the following variations among the manuscripts are striking, and it is interesting to compare them with the printed versions. In general, neither manuscripts nor prints reveal a balanced structure. However, the basic structural elements – the parts of speech and their order – give to each version its essential form and remain constant. The space which each part of speech occupies within the text can differ significantly, and the versions again differ from each other. The manuscripts of the *Accedence* all begin with the question based on Donatus 'Partes orationis quot sunt?' (Keil iv 355, 2): 'How many partys of spech byn þer?' (MS A1, MS L1, MS K1). Small variations in vocabulary occur in this *incipit*, such as 'maners' for 'partys' (MS B1, MS M1), 'reson' for 'spech' (MS C1, MS F1, MS E1), and including the expression 'maner partyes of reson' (MS D1); there are also slight changes in word order. The parts of speech themselves, however, do not reveal a consistent set of definitions and rules of formation, and the texts again are not uniform in following a consistent pattern. Compare, for example, the following definitions of the first part of speech, the noun, in the manuscripts and the printed versions:

How knowyste a noun substanyf? A party of reson that betokenyth substaunce wyth qualite and is declined wyth case and article; and so the name of euery thyng in the world is a noun substanyf (MS D8-11).

How knos þu a nowne? For all þat I may fele, here or se þat berys þe name of a thyng, þe name þerof ys a nowne (MS A11-12; similar are MS C11-12, MS L27-29, MS F11-12, and MS K12-14).



How knowe ze a noun? For þe Laten of eny þyng ys a noun (MS B10).

How know ze a noun? For all þat I may see or fele or know þat beryth þe name of a thyng is a noun, as *homo* for 'a man', *corpus* for 'a body', *anima* for 'a sowle' and all so lyke (MS E11-14).

How knowest a nowne? Of euery thing that is in this world or out of this world the name is a nowne, as 'man', 'angel', 'vertue', etcetera (MS M13-15).

How knowest a noun for al maner thyng þat a man may see fele. Here. or vnderstonde þat berith þe name of a thyng is a nowne (LA A11-13).

How knowe ye a nowne/ for al þat I may fele see here or vnderstand þat bereth þe name of a thyng is a nowne (SA I11-13).

This example shows how the definitions of the parts of speech vary considerably in the different versions. The treatises do not necessarily draw on Donatus' *Ars Minor*, which defines the noun as 'Pars orationis cum casu corpus aut rem proprie communiterve significans' (Keil iv 355, 5-6). They also use phrases and ideas from Priscian's *Institutiones Grammaticae*, where the noun is defined as 'pars orationis, quae unicuique subiectorum corporum seu rerum communem vel propriam qualitatem distribuit' (Keil ii 56, 29-57, 1).<sup>21</sup> This source, however, was probably used only indirectly. Other medieval Latin grammars may also have been important antecedents of these fifteenth century treatises, for example Thomas of Hanney's *Memoriale Iuniorum*, an extensive work on the four parts of grammar, which was finished in 1313.<sup>22</sup> The definitions given in the English treatises transform, add and omit material from some of the preceding versions and possibly from other grammatical sources. The definitions given in the printed versions agree with the procedures illustrated by the manuscripts. An examination of the definitions of the other parts of speech in both the manuscripts and the printed texts produces similar results.

The manuscript versions also differ from each other and, by including examples of a word and a phrase, sometimes in Latin alone, sometimes in English alone, to illustrate a rule, are not internally consistent. Sometimes both the Latin and its English translation are given. Compare, for example, the definition of the present tense:

For hyt synfytt de tyme þat ys nuw (MS G14-15 and MS A217).

For hit spekyth of tyme þat ys nowe, as 'y loue' (MS B212-13).

For he spekyth of tyme þat is now, as *amo*: 'I loue' (MS C422-23, MS F165-66, and MS K157-58).

MS D reveals a particular tendency shared at times by MS C to elaborate on a special point. Compare the version given here with the above definitions:

How many tymes hastow in the verbe? Thre to make Latyn by: the tyme that is now, the tyme that is a-goo, the tyme that is to come. For hem in Englysh: 'I loue' for the tyme that is now, 'I haue louyd' for the tyme that is a-goo, 'I schall loue' for the tyme that is to com (MS D352-56).

The other manuscripts have only the bare definition of the present tense, and vary to only a small extent. The printed version *LA* A478-79 follows MS B, whereas the printed version *SA* K89-90 reflects the definition given by MSS C, F, and K.

Also typical of MS D is the inclusion of *Latinitates*, that is Latin model sentences on their own or pairs of sentences in the two languages to illustrate a rule. In this manuscript the English is usually followed by its Latin translation, which probably reflects the process of learning to translate English into Latin.<sup>23</sup> Compare the definition of the nominative case:

A word that comyth byfore the verbe and the dede of the verbe passyth oute of hym, that schall be nominatyf case. On another maner a word that bytokenyth doying or suffryng, the word that doth or suffreth schall be nominatyf case, as 'The maister syttheth

on the benche', *Magister sedet super scamnum* (MS D106-10).

As a further means of reinforcing learning, *Accedence* manuscripts D, A, B, C and M contain Latin verses, with some variation from text to text. Extensive borrowing, either directly or indirectly, took place from the then common Latin verse grammars: to a greater degree from the *Doctrinale*, written by Alexander de Villa-Dei around the end of the twelfth century, and to a lesser degree from the *Graecismus*, written by Evrard de Béthune about 1210.<sup>24</sup> Some verses given in the manuscripts and the printed version of the *LA* can also be found in Thomas of Hanney's *Memoriale Iuniorum* and a few are contained in John of Garland's *Compendium Gramaticae*.<sup>25</sup> The verses are generally used to illustrate or to sum up a point made in English in a short, easily memorized form. Those given here follow the definition of the common verb and provide a list of examples which goes back to *Doctrinale* 980-82:

How many verbes commyn bu ther? V, et cetera.

*Largior, experior, veneror, moror, osculor, ortor,*

*Criminor, amplector tibi sunt communia, lector;*

Si bene connumereres, *interpretor* addere debes

(MS D340-44).

These verses are used in the same passage in MS A209-13, MS B171-74 (both manuscripts contain smaller variants) and MS C384-88, and also in the printed version *LA* A471-73. The *SA* version (lines K80-83) agrees with MS F155-58 and MS K127-29, where only the definition of this grammatical point is given, and where verses in general are omitted. A second example, which again shows the illustrative purpose of the Latin verses, in addition indicates to what extent and in what arrangement verses could be used. The following verse listing collective nouns occurs after the passage dealing with the cases taken by superlatives:

How many nown collectiuis be þer? It is schewyd be þe verse.

Vnde versus:

Sunt collectiua *populus, gens, plebs* quoque *turba*

(MS C43-45).

The verse is *Graecismus* XXV.15. MS D47-50 does not use it, but explains this grammatical point in English. In the *LA* version, however, this verse is followed by a second found in manuscripts dealing with comparison and syntax:

Sunt collectiua populus gens plebs quoque turba  
Turma phallanx legio cuneus sociare memento  
(*LA* A165-66).

The same mnemonic verses can be interspersed in different grammatical treatises wherever they help illustrate the point in question. Their number and their arrangement within a group, however, could vary. In a third example, rules for the second declension, the o-declension, which have already been explained in English, are summarized in Latin in the following verses:

Vs mutabis in e/ per cetera cuncta secunde  
Filius excipitur (quod in e vel in i reperitur)  
(*LA* A269-70).

They are not found in any of the *Accedence* manuscripts or the other extant grammatical manuscripts. Verse 269, however, is given in Thomas of Hanney's *Memoriale Iuniorum*, p. 248b. In general, there is no consistency of usage among the manuscripts and the *LA* version concerning which passages are provided with verses. Pedagogical necessity and access to grammatical material were probably the key factors leading to their inclusion. Of the two printed versions each reflects one of the two practices illustrated by the manuscripts.

Another striking feature of the presentation of the subject matter, which is at the same time an interesting teaching device typical of the manuscripts of the *Accedence*, is the references to Donatus' lists of prepositions and conjunctions which are given in the discussion of the parts of speech. The 'Donet', as this grammar is referred to in the English treatises, departs from the version of the *Ars Minor* which St Jerome would have used in Rome in the middle of the fourth century in that it introduces more examples and further modifications, and lists five declensions and four conjugations. Donatus, on the other hand, treats only of the first three in each case, and also appends the conjugations of the verbs *amare*, *docere*, *legere* and *audire* with their passives at the end. The versions which were circulating in England in the fifteenth century could differ from each other in the

treatment of this material. The references in the English treatises suggest that a version of the Latin text was available in the classroom and used when the English versions were learnt.<sup>26</sup> For example, the imperative 'Da preposiciones casus accusatiui, . . .' (MS A316-17) not only indicates a different teaching method from the usual catechetical form, a change in method which is already found in Donatus, but the direct address to the pupil, introduced by 'Da . . .', shows that part of the supplementary Latin text was used particularly for memorization. The manuscripts differ from each other in their length of reference to the Latin text. The passage in MS A refers to the 'Donet' only in the treatment of the preposition:

How many casus wyl he serue to? II. Wech ij? Þe accusatiue and þe ablatiue. Wych byn þe preposicions þat wyl serue to þe accusatiue case? All þat byn contenyt in þis leson of þe 'Donet': 'Da preposiciones casus accusatiui, vt *ad, apud, et cetera*'. Wych by þe preposicions þat wyl serue to ablatiue case? All þat byn contenyt in þis leson of þe 'Donet': 'Da preposiciones casus ablatiui, vt *a, ab, abs, et cetera*'. Wych byn þe preposicions þat wyl serue to boþe? All þat byn contenet in þis leson of þe 'Donet': 'Da vtriusque casus preposiciones, et cetera' (MS A313-23).

Manuscript C591-611 contains this passage in more detail, especially by including extensive lists of examples from the Latin text. References to Donatus are already found in the treatment of the conjunction (lines 573-89). Apart from displaying variants which particularly affect the enumeration of the different commands in the discussion of the conjunction, MSS D and F are similar in referring to this source as follows:

How many spyces hath the power of coniunccion? Fyue, by the 'Donet': copulatyf, disiunctyf, expletyf, racionel, and causell (MS D495-97; MS F219-26).

How many case? Tweyne: accusatyf and ablatyf. Wheche beth the preposicion that seruyth to accusatyf case? As many as be conteynyd in thys demaunde of the 'Donet': 'Da preposiciones casus accusatiui'. Wheche beth hy that seruyth to the ablatyf

case? As many as beth conteynynd in 'Da preposiciones casus ablatiui, et cetera'. How many seruyth to bothe case? Foure: *in, sub, super, subter* (MS D523-29; MS F230-37).

The printed version *LA* A605-11 resembles the passage on prepositions given in MS A and has no reference to Donatus in the treatment of the conjunction, whereas the discussion of the two parts of speech in the 'short' version (*SA* I73-81 and 85-91) reflects MS F.

MS C again differs from all other *Accedence* manuscripts and also from the two printed versions by including three longer passages in Latin, that is the series of declensions of Latin nouns (lines 144-97), of pronouns (257-355) and of participles (538-70), after the manner of a version of the 'Donet' then available. This indicates a revision of the English text which did not need the support of the Latin text in this passage.<sup>27</sup> Finally, the section on concord, which varies in length among the various manuscripts, is placed after the discussion of the parts of speech, except in MS G, which seems to consist of a set of excerpts from the *Accedence*.<sup>28</sup> This section, also not found in MSS D and K, is however included in the printed versions *LA* A659-75 and *SA* I94-107. In the *LA*, after the section on concord, there is added a discussion on the formation of tenses of the perfect stem of Latin verbs (lines A676-93), which is also found in some *Informacio* and *Formula* manuscripts.

That English and Latin examples could be arranged in tabular form is strikingly illustrated by the fragmentary MS H which was written late in the fifteenth or early in the sixteenth century, whereas in all other manuscript versions the text runs line after line. We may compare the following examples of the arrangement of text:

How mony nowmbyrs byn þer? II. Wech ij? Þe singular and þe plurell. How knos þu þe singular nowmbyr? For he spekys but of on thyng as 'mayster'. How knos þu þe plurell nowmbyr? For he spekys of mo thyngus þe of on as 'maysters' (MS A53-56; MS D95-97, MS C69-72, MS F46-49, MS K22-26, and also the printed versions *LA* A209-13 and *SA* I43-47).

A word yn Englysch ys synglar numbre whan he spekyth but of one thyng, as 'a man/chyld', 'a beest/boke'. A word in Englysch ys plurall numbre whan he spekyth of many thyngys, as 'men/childurn', 'beestis/bookys' (MS H1-4).

Compare also:

How knos þu þe masculyn gendyr? For hyt ys declynyt w<sup>t</sup> *hyc* as *hyc maijster* (MS A40-41; MS D76, MS C48-50, MS F34-35, MS K45-46, and also *LA* A185-87 and *SA* I33-34).

All wordys declyned only w<sup>t</sup> thys artykyll *hic* be masculyn gendur, as nominatiuo *hic* magister/dignus. *Hic* ys artykyll of the masculyn gendre (MS H12-14).<sup>29</sup>

The fact that there are no examples of this arrangement in the two printed versions indicates that *Accedence* manuscripts were continued to be written at the time when printed versions of these grammars were already available. Versions in both mediums went in parallel for some time.

The fluidity of the manuscripts was such that even versions of different treatises or parts of them were combined to form a longer, composite work. For example, the complete *Accedence* manuscript D is part of a longer, composite treatise designated EE.<sup>30</sup> On the other hand, each of the *Accedence* manuscripts MS B and MS M themselves contain a version of the *Comparacio* in the noun section where all other manuscripts have instead a shorter section on the three degrees of comparison. MS O is contained in MS B and MS S in MS M. The combined version consisting of MS B and MS O is finally followed without a break by a version of the *Informacio*, MS V, a combination which was probably intended to form a course on accidence, comparison and syntax.<sup>31</sup> The printed *LA* in the same way reflects the combination of different versions by including a detailed discussion of comparison in the noun section (lines A37-182) without any break in the text. Only the preliminary discussion of the nature of comparison starting with 'Qwhat is a comparison? A liknes of diuerse thyngis in a certeyn accidens, . . .' (MS P1-14, MS 01-12, MS N1-9, and MS Q1-8) is omitted in the printed version. Instead it starts immediately by asking for the three grades of comparison (*LA* A29) in the same way as MS R1 and MS S1. The embedding of a *Comparacio* text gives this printed version a very unbalanced structure in that the discussion of the noun, the first of the parts of speech, takes up almost half of the whole treatise. The *SA* displays a more proportionate text in that it only asks for the three grades of comparison and their identification (*SA* I24-31). This version shows a more balanced structure in the length given to each part of speech.<sup>32</sup>

The few examples of variation given here are enough to indicate that the possibilities for adapting material in these elementary grammars were manifold. They reflect varying degrees of revision and adaptation at different institutions and localities, made for different purposes and at different dates throughout the fifteenth century. Each manuscript marks one individual stage in this process and could probably have been further revised and used as the occasion demanded. For other elementary treatises the same state of affairs must be assumed.

The working copies which belonged to individual schoolmasters or institutions were used and revised by successive teachers. Therefore copies tended to take a different direction in different localities and represent more or less idiosyncratic and local adaptations, as found with MS D and MS G. On the other hand, treatises used at more famous foundations such as Winchester were more influential because other schools would adopt their standard, which practice again invited successive masters to modify the treatises for their own purposes, different teaching conditions and local requirements. Therefore the manuscript versions of the *Accedence*, in the same way as those of the other elementary English grammatical treatises, represent separate stages of development, their characteristic feature being an unstable text, subject to further variation.

The two printed versions, the *LA* and the *SA*, consist of the same blend of material as the *Accedence* manuscripts. They also share with them the same characteristics of variation of subject matter and arrangement, as well as of teaching method. In this respect they resemble the manuscript versions, except that they were printed at one particular stage of usage and revision.<sup>33</sup> The choice of versions to print was probably determined by their availability. That *Accedence* manuscripts continued to be written after printed versions had become available is illustrated by MS H with its use of tabular arrangement. The production of manuscript versions therefore carried on in parallel with the production of printed versions at the end of the fifteenth and at the beginning of the sixteenth centuries. When printed versions became available they probably did not exert much influence initially because of the localized nature of teaching. The permanent form of print, however, made their easy multiplication possible because printers found it easier to reprint a text which was already set up in type. This is the reason why these versions became dominant and could exert influence. It was therefore through printed versions that the tradition of these elementary grammars was continued. The latest extant edition of the *LA* dates from 1519, and that of the *SA* from about 1515.

The manuscript versions, also, were not written up and finished as balanced,



coherent and complete treatises, but rather represent the masters' personal versions compiled for their own use. It was printing which made a difference to the nature of these schoolmasters' notes: material could no longer be easily shifted around, the notes became fixed in content and arrangement, and they became independent of those who compiled or copied them – the masters, pupils or scribes. In this form they became available from booksellers in an increasing number of copies and exerted authority in local schools in the course of time.<sup>34</sup> That the printed versions of these basic grammatical texts themselves show a number of quite different kinds of changes from edition to edition is a widespread phenomenon in formal instruction in the first decades of the sixteenth century.<sup>35</sup>

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> For John of Trevisa's report of this change see Churchill Babington, ed., *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden . . . together with the English Translations of John Trevisa and of an unknown Writer . . .* Rolls Series xli, 9 vols (London, 1865-1886) II, 158-61. John of Cornwall's *Speculum gramaticale* survives in Oxford, Bodl. Lib., MS Auct. F. 3. 9, pp. 1-180. It was written at Oxford in 1346 and, though chiefly in Latin, includes a number of English glosses and translations. It is the first grammatical treatise which gives evidence of the reintroduction of English into the teaching of Latin.

<sup>2</sup> David Thomson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Middle English Grammatical Texts* (New York and London, 1979); David Thomson, ed., *An Edition of the Middle English Grammatical Texts* (New York and London, 1984). These manuscripts and the printed versions related to them are listed in chronological order in R. E. Lewis, N. F. Blake and A. S. G. Edwards, *Index of Printed Middle English Prose* (New York and London, 1985), pp. 59, 73, 106-09, 123-24, 274-75, 278, and 280.

<sup>3</sup> On Leylond and his connection with these treatises see R. W. Hunt, 'Oxford Grammar Masters in the Middle Ages', in *Oxford Studies Presented to Daniel Callus*, Oxford Historical Society, ns xvi (Oxford, 1964), pp. 169-70, 181-87; reprinted in R. W. Hunt, *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages: Collected Papers*, edited by G. L. Bursill-Hall, *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science*, ser. 3, vol. 5 (Amsterdam, 1980), pp. 173-74, 185-91; also David Thomson, 'The Oxford Grammar Masters Revisited', *Mediaeval Studies*, 45 (1983), 298-310; and J. N. Miner, *The Grammar Schools of Medieval England* (Montreal and Kingston, 1990), pp. 146-47.

<sup>4</sup> For editions of the *LA* and *SA*, see Hedwig Gwosdek, ed., *Early Printed Editions of the Long Accidence and Short Accidence Grammars* (Heidelberg, 1991). The different editions of the *LA* are designated by the sigils A-H, those of the *SA* by the sigils I-M. Editions of the *Accidence*, the third version, are listed in W. A. Jackson, F. S. Ferguson and K. F. Pantzer, *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1475-1640*, 3 vols, second edition, revised and enlarged (London, 1976-91), II, nos 23139.5 to 23153.2; see also the additions and corrections to all three versions in III, 309, sub 'Stanbridge'. This catalogue is abbreviated hereafter as *STC*<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> See also Lewis, Blake and Edwards, *Index of Printed Middle English Prose*, p. xxv.

<sup>6</sup> In each of the two versions the first text in type set the standard for the reprints that followed. See the lists of subject matter in my *Early Printed Editions*, pp. 57-73. For *LA*, text A, attributed to John Stanbridge, *Wynkyn de Worde*, [1495.] (*STC*<sup>2</sup> 23153.4), see *Ibid.*, pp. 152-64. For *SA*, text I, attributed to John Stanbridge, *Wynkyn de Worde*, [1495?] (*STC*<sup>2</sup> 23154.5), and K,

Another Edition, [*William Faques*, c. 1505.] (STC<sup>2</sup> 23154.7), see *Ibid.*, pp. 226-28 and 229-31. The editions available of the third version, the *Accedence*, need to be examined before detailed conclusions can be drawn. This version may at least be divided into two sections: those editions which were printed in Stanbridge's lifetime (STC<sup>2</sup> 23139.5 to 23142), and those which were published posthumously (nos 23143 to 23153.2). The first category embraces the *Accedence*, the latter the *Accidentia ex Stanbrigiana Editione*. For a kindred text see also STC<sup>2</sup>, I, no. 7018.5; also the *Informatio Puerorum*, STC<sup>2</sup>, II, nos 14078 and 14079. Editions of this version are also listed in Lewis, Blake and Edwards, *Index of Printed Middle English Prose*, p. 108.

<sup>7</sup> N. I. Orme, *English Schools in the Middle Ages* (London, 1973), pp. 96-97. See also the research report in my *Early Printed Editions*, pp. 4-8.

<sup>8</sup> See A. F. Leach, *A History of Winchester College* (London, 1899), p. 225; *Ibid.*, *The Schools of Medieval England* (London, 1915), pp. 300-01. Foster Watson, *The English Grammar Schools to 1660: their Curriculum and Practice* (Cambridge, 1908), pp. 232-33 and 235-37.

<sup>9</sup> See S. B. Meech, 'An Early Treatise in English concerning Latin Grammar', *Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature, University of Michigan Publications, Language and Literature* xiii (1935), p. 82.

<sup>10</sup> On John Stanbridge see above, pp. 136-37. Manuscripts which precede the printed treatises were also ignored by J. P. Tuck, 'The Use of English in Latin Teaching in England in the Sixteenth Century', *Durham Research Review*, 1 (1950), 22-24; and also by Kenneth Charlton, *Education in Renaissance England* (London, 1965), pp. 106-07. But see also Charlton's reference to manuscript grammars independent of the printed versions on p. 121 because of their use of English.

<sup>11</sup> See Miner, *The Grammar Schools of Medieval England*, p. 147, where examples of the procedures of revision and adaptation of grammatical treatises are given.

<sup>12</sup> For essential manuals schoolmasters may have had access to, see Orme, *English Schools in the Middle Ages*, pp. 125-26.

<sup>13</sup> For the scribes of individual manuscripts see Thomson, *Catalogue*, pp. 12-13; also *Ibid.*, 'The Oxford Grammar Masters Revisited', pp. 302-03.

<sup>14</sup> The manuscript sigils are taken from Thomson, *Catalogue*, where manuscripts of the *Accedence* are designated A-M, of the *Comparacio* N-S, of the *Informatio* T-Y, of the *Formula Z-CC*, and of the *Other Texts* DD-LL. For references to manuscript passages see Thomson, *Edition*. The bibliographical references for the *Accedence* manuscripts arranged in chronological order are as follows:

MS J, Thomson, p. 55 (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 26, fols 63r, 63v, 5v, 62v).

MS D, Thomson, pp. 32-43 (Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O. 5. 4, fols 4v-6v).

MS G, Thomson, pp. 51-52 (London, Public Record Office, MS C.47/34/13, fols 22r-23r).

MS A, Thomson, pp. 1-8 (Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS Peniarth 356B, fols 54v-

57v and 48r).

MS B, Thomson, pp. 9-16 (Aberystwyth, NLW, MS Peniarth 356B, fols 163r, 165r-67v).

MS C, Thomson, pp. 17-31 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS F. 26 (163), fols 1r-12r).

MS L, Thomson, pp. 61-62 (Oxford, Bodl. Lib., MS Rawl. D. 328, fols 119r, 120r, 121r, 122r, 123r, 124r-125r, 126r).

MS F, Thomson, pp. 45-50 (London, British Library, MS Add. 37,075, fols 1r-6v).

MS E, Thomson, pp. 44 (London, BL, MS Add. 12,195, fol. 66r).

MS M, Thomson, pp. 63-64 (Worcester Cathedral, MS F. 123, fol. 99v).

MS K, Thomson, pp. 56-60 (Oxford, Bodl. Lib., MS Douce 103, fols 53r-57ar).

MS H, Thomson, pp. 53-54 (Norwich, Norfolk Record Office, Colman MS 111 (fol. 1v of medieval MS A)).

The bibliographical details for the *Comparacio* texts (in chronological order), the *Informacio*, text V, and *Formula*, text EE, mentioned are as follows:

MS P, Thomson, pp. 70-74 (Cambridge, Univ. Lib., MS Add. 2830, fols 54v-56v).

MS O, Thomson, pp. 66-69 (Aberystwyth, NLW, MS Peniarth 356B, fols 163r-64v).

MS R, Thomson, pp. 76-80 (Oxford, Bodl. Lib., MS Rawl. D 328, fols 80r-83r).

MS N, Thomson, p. 65 (Aberystwyth, NLW, MS Peniarth 356B, fol. 9v).

MS S, Thomson, p. 81 (Worcester Cathedral, MS F. 123, fols 99vb-100ra).

MS Q, Thomson, p. 75 (Oxford, Bodl. Lib., Printed Book Douce D 238 (2), [= LA A], fols B5v-B6r. (See my *Early Printed Editions*, p. 37)).

MS V, Thomson, p. 104 (Aberystwyth, NLW, MS Peniarth 356B, fols 167v-68r).

MS EE, Thomson, pp. 178-85 (Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O. 5. 4, fols 4r and 6v-7v).

<sup>15</sup> A new fragment of the LA version is listed in *STC*<sup>2</sup>, III, no. 23153.8, p. 309.

<sup>16</sup> For biographical details of Stanbridge and works attributed to him, see my *Early Printed Editions*, pp. 10-14.

<sup>17</sup> See M. D. Lobel, 'Schools', in L. F. Salzman, ed., *The Victoria History of the Counties of England. Vol. 29: The Victoria History of the County of Oxford* (London, 1939), reprinted (Folkestone and London, 1970), I, 461.

<sup>18</sup> Changes in spelling, punctuation, vocabulary, word order, and smaller changes in construction, e.g. 'How many gendyrz of verbys byn þer?' (MS A198) for 'How many gendres haste of verbes' (MS D327), are not taken into consideration in the discussion of subject matter and its arrangement in the different versions.

<sup>19</sup> For Donatus, *Ars Minor* see Heinrich Keil, ed., *Grammatici Latini*, vol. IV (Leipzig, 1864; reprinted Hildesheim, 1961), pp. 355-66.

<sup>20</sup> The spelling of the English manuscript examples is that of the manuscript immediately quoted afterwards. Punctuation of the manuscripts is to Thomson, *Edition*; from the printed

versions is to my *Early Printed Editions*.

<sup>21</sup> For Priscian's *Institutiones Grammaticae* see Heinrich Keil, ed., *Grammatici Latini*, vols II-III (Leipzig, 1855-59; reprinted Hildesheim, 1961).

<sup>22</sup> Thomas of Hanney's *Memoriale Iuniorum* survives in Oxford, Bodl. Lib., MS Auct. F. 3. 9, pp. 181a-340b.

<sup>23</sup> For individual characteristics of this manuscript see Thomson, *Catalogue*, pp. 57-58. For the terminology of Latin and English sentences, see N. I. Orme, 'Early School Note-Books', in *Education and Society in Medieval and Renaissance England* (London and Ronceverte, 1989), chapter 5, pp. 73-82. (This is a revised version of the author's former article 'Latin and English Sentences in Fifteenth-Century Schoolbooks', *The Yale University Library Gazette*, 60 (1985), 47-53).

<sup>24</sup> See Dietrich Reichling, ed., *Das Doctrinale des Alexander de Villa-Dei, Monumenta Germaniae paedagogica* xii (Berlin, 1893; reprinted New York, 1974). Johann Wrobel, ed., *Eberhardi Bethuniensis Graecismus. Corpus grammaticorum medii aevi I* (Breslau, 1887).

<sup>25</sup> John of Garland's *Compendium Grammatice* survives in Bruges, Bibliothèque publique, MS 546, fols 89r-145v.

<sup>26</sup> See my *Early Printed Editions*, pp. 21-22; also Thomson, *Catalogue*, p. 56.

<sup>27</sup> Thomson, *Catalogue*, pp. 56-57.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 60-61.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 61. In the original, e.g. the words 'man/chyld' (MS H2) and 'magister/dignus' (MS H13) are written below each other to arrange them in tabular form. This arrangement could not be reproduced in this article.

<sup>30</sup> There are four examples of the combination of versions of different treatises; see *Ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 55-56, 66-67, and 75-76.

<sup>32</sup> See my *Early Printed Editions*, pp. 14-15; compare also the lists of subject matter of the two versions on pp. 57-73.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 23-25.

<sup>34</sup> For booksellers' accounts see E. G. Duff, 'A Bookseller's Account, c. 1510', *The Library*, second series, 8 (1907), 256-66; and Falconer Madan, 'The Daily Ledger of John Dorne, 1520', *Collectanea* I, ed. C. R. L. Fletcher (Oxford Historical Society, v, 1885), pp. 71-177. See also my *Early Printed Editions*, pp. 29-32.

<sup>35</sup> The paper was completed before the publication of C. R. Bland's book, *The Teaching of Grammar in Late Medieval England. An Edition, with Commentary, of Oxford, Lincoln College MS Lat. 130* (East Lansing, Mich., 1991), in which a new manuscript of the *Accedence* is described and edited (MS 130, fols 7r-9v). This provides one or two additional examples of variation in subject matter but does not affect the main conclusions arrived at.

*Subject Matter in Accedence Manuscripts and in Early Printed Grammars*

I am grateful to Dr O. S. Pickering, Brotherton Library, University of Leeds, for reading an earlier draft of this article.