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PART I

THE LINGUA IGNOTA AND
ITS PLACE WITHIN A HISTORY
OF LANGUAGE INVENTION
INTRODUCTION

HILDEGARD’S LANGUAGE AS
VINEYARD AND EDIFICE

In a golden reliquary at Rüdesheim on the Rhine lie the only remains of the famous German mystic Hildegard of Bingen (1098–1179): her heart and, most significantly for this study, her tongue. The word Lingua is prominently displayed at the bottom of folio 461v of Wiesbaden’s Riesencodex as a lemma for her fifty-ninth invented word—*Ranzgia*, either “tongue” or “language”—in a curious text referred to as the *Lingua Ignota*.

This book edits, translates, and contextualizes Hildegard’s glossary of beautiful, unknown words for praise of Church and for expression of the things of her world. It interrogates what she was doing in her “Unknown Language” and why, and how she compares with and/or differs from similar inventions throughout time. Hildegard’s speaking has been held in awe since her day; the legends of her prophesying and her healing attended her throughout the centuries whereas the facts of her prolific writing and her music have been rediscovered. How much more curious it is, then, that she should have left behind a record of words “never before heard.” In addressing this under-examined, under-translated text, I will return repeatedly to one of her most potent metaphors—*viriditas*, “greenness”—with which she describes not only God’s natural world, but all that is spiritually creative and filled with the sap, the *sudor* of divine life, as opposed to the aridity of human sin. Another motif, however, that is equally Hildegard’s is the “Edifice of Salvation,” a metaphor that dominates the third book of her *Scivias* and ultimately counsels obedience to God’s Law, here conceived of as the structure of the universe and the cement that holds human virtue together in the world.

Besides green, then, we have the crimson head of a jealous God, His wings formed from the crenellated walls of a fortress, and the Tower of Church, flames of virtue streaming from her ramparts. Hildegard’s language
demonstrates a unique linguistic development of both this *viriditas* and this *aedificium* in finding new, verdant words within a hierarchical and artificial structure meant to redeem speech that has fallen from another tower. This new verbal edifice assigns over a thousand gorgeous names not only to the offices and architecture of Holy Church and to the herbs and trees of her monastery garden, but also to the crypt and the winding staircase, the fornicator and the prostitute, the giant and the dwarf, the scalp and the pudendum, the king, the servant, the cake, and the cricket—put in order of importance and category. It is found in two extant manuscripts in its entirety: the Wiesbaden or Riesencodex and the Berliner Handschrift, both of them supplying Latin and German translations, but no complete English translation has been made of it.

Though it is more often called the *Lingua Ignota*, I use the term with its reversed syntax found in the Riesencodex, the manuscript version on which I concentrate, which introduces this glossary with a rubric: *Ignota Lingua per simplicem hominem Hildegardem prolata*, “An unknown language brought forward by the simple human being Hildegard” (see figure 6.1). Since the manuscript is early (late twelfth century), and despite Joseph L. Baird and Radd K. Ehrman’s remark that it is “unreliable,” I agree with Michael Embach’s suggestion that Hildegard may have had more of a hand in its arrangement than has been thought. This rubric is an important indicator of her authority and identity. Elsewhere, Hildegard’s references to her language put the adjective first, a reminder of her native German and its structure. The better-known title follows the tradition established in the *Acta Inquisitiones*: “linguam ignotam cum suis litteris.”

While euphonious and grammatically correct, it is a refinement of Hildegard’s alleged use of it and obeisant to the authorities who wrote about her posthumously. In reversing the word order—*Ignota Lingua*—I pay homage to the phrase used in the rubric, although I will shorten it in most instances to “Lingua.”

**The Controversies Surrounding Authorship**

The genesis of the *Ignota Lingua* is not without controversy. Bertha Widmer has this to say of it:

But since neither the Vita nor the letter [to Pope Anastasius] can be counted as absolutely valid, so may such vague formulations provide no evidence for the authenticity of a text that in its pointlessness offers grounds for doubt . . . The meaning and purpose of such a mysterious glossary and the
unknown alphabet contained therein (Wilhelm Grimm calls it an “arbitrary, groundless invention”) are hardly clear.4

Widmer and other scholars invoke the troubling issues of context, power, and authenticity. There has always been something about Hildegard’s Lingua that defies analysis: its purpose seems “unclear,” “groundless,” and its audacity, no matter how divinely granted, is immodest for a virgin and an abbess. Hildegard’s repeated declarations of her lowliness and poor grasp of Latin have contributed to a popular picture of her as simple, humble, stumbling, requiring help from her male advisors in recording what she saw and heard—a possibility that cannot be ignored, but which masks the determined ambition, passion, temper, and literary production of this woman. Further, Hildegard is best known as one gifted with mystical vision that transcended her humble abilities: so the common nature of most of her invented words belies the cherished portrait we have of her in the Rupertsburg manuscript, the flames of the Living Light streaming down upon her head as she writes on her wax tablet for her astonished scribe. This concept of Hildegard as fitting in with other female mystics is challengeable, but because it has adhered to her the Lingua seems crassly non-divine. The glossary renames quotidian objects, things one can touch, eat, wear, build, or cure, whereas the glossed words in her antiphon “O Orzchis Ecclesia” (the only text that utilizes her words outside of the list) bear more resemblance to ecstatic neologisms in praise of Holy Church. A disputed assumption is that the thousand-word list was doctored or even created by an interpolator. Widmer dismisses it as “a false attribution” (“Unterschiebung”),5 and not even Hildegard’s own testimonials, in her letter of 1153 to Pope Anastasius and in her 1163 Preface to the Liber vite meritorum can be trusted.

In this book I assume, along with more recent scholars, that the Ignota Lingua belongs to Hildegard of Bingen and that she authorized its publication. In addition to the sources mentioned earlier, her biography by Gottfried and Theodoric refer to it, her provost Volmar speaks of it in a letter to her, and it is listed, as noted earlier, with her other miracles in the Acta Inquisitiones. The phonetic similarity of the words in her list to the words in her antiphon “O Orzchis Ecclesia” is marked; the focus she gives to her trees and herbs appears as well in her Physica; the list of jewelry and female adornment reflects her alleged practice of dressing her nuns on Feast Days in the garments of Heaven’s virgins; and the taxonomy repeats a tendency toward order, explication, and list-making that we find in her three important prophetic works. Whether she had help in recording it or not, Hildegard’s Lingua should be seen in context with her other bold achievements (founding and managing monasteries, writing books and letters,
preaching, traveling, advising, and composing music) that shook off the professional restrictions medieval women suffered.

The right to author a text, much less a new language, is traditionally given to men. Umberto Eco applies the term “nomothete” to Adam (who named the animals and thereby gave laws to language).6 He draws this term, of course, from Plato’s Cratylus, which is an argument in favor of the prescriptive rules of language and a counterargument to Hermogenes’ suggestion that language is merely a social construction to which anyone can introduce neologisms and changes. In brief, Socrates asserts that the “name giver” (onomatothete) can only really become an authoritative word creator (onomaturge) if he is a lawgiver (nomothete).7 Hence, Adam was the first inventor of language, not Eve, and Plato’s “lawgiver” is also a man, aner, andros, not anthropos: ὂνομα θέσθαι....

“It is not for every man, Hermogenes, to give names...”8 It is significant, then, that Hildegard speaks of herself as homo: God addresses her thus in her Scivias—O Human!—and so does she also refer to herself in the Riesencodex rubric. In inventing a language and presenting it as if it were a summarium, or encyclopedia of Latin terms and their translations, Hildegard subsumes her gender in humanity, and in this way navigates conventionally masculine territory. She does so, though, understanding that it is as a paupercula feminea forma, “poor little womanly shape,”9 that her achievements are all the greater, and that God gives the greatest gifts and burdens to the lowliest of his servants.

If proper language use is to be laid down by law, then those who name the world must come from a divine and usually male authority or from a committee of scholars like the eighteenth-century English prescriptive grammarians. Such institutions decry the less obviously ordered dominance of actual language use wherein society and its social changes establish agreed-upon signs that constantly evolve as men, women, and children employ them. This fact of language and lived reality brings us to the fascinating and troubling reception of personal language creation, and what it is or does. The problem raised by Augustine in De Magistro (“The Teacher”) about the status of the sign as secondary to the signified—and how it is we can know, speak, and teach—is relevant not only to Hildegard’s Lingua but to all language invention and its perceived “reification” of the word.10 It is thus difficult to talk about Hildegard’s Lingua without putting it in a larger context than has been done. Early on, as I will show in Chapter Two, it has been seen as a form of glossolalia, or as an ecstatic language associated with “hysterics” such as Elisabeth of Schönau and other female visionaries, models of a female spirituality that were to replace the difficult and unique mentality of a Hildegard. It
has been called a Geheimsprache accompanied by its Geheimschrift by those who found merit in it only by regarding it as a secret project. Others have seen it as an attempt to reproduce an UR-speech untainted by Babel, or a source for the development of macaronic verse. None of these adequately see the Lingua in three dimensions, or conceive of Language invention in all its varieties.

**Contextualizing the *Ignota Lingua***

I will approach the topic of context more broadly. Besides discussing the Lingua and its status in the Riesencodex, my study provides a history of imaginary language-making over the past fifteen hundred years. “Angelic languages” in the Apocrypha, the Irish *Tenga Bithmu*a, the magic languages of the Renaissance magi, and the fictional, secretive, philosophical, faked, “channeled” and digitally displayed languages from the seventeenth to the twenty-first century shed important light on Hildegard’s achievement. Alessandro Bausani’s splendid book on language invention is an inspiration for me, but while it was published in German and Italian, it has never been translated into English, nor does it include the most contemporary inventions.\(^1\) It does devote several pages to Hildegard’s Lingua, but my book makes it a fulcrum. Marina Yaguello’s book on invented languages is spotty in its quality and tone: while providing excellent and exhaustive research on the philosophical language movement and its offshoots, it is too narrow in its discussion of fictional language inventions, omitting the most obvious and famous inventors of the twentieth century, while assigning all imaginary language to the same utopian myth.\(^2\) Jeffrey Schnapp’s article in *Exemplaria* on Hildegard’s “Virgin Words” attempts an examination of imaginary languages “ancient to modern” by putting Hildegard front and center, but it, too, neglects discussion of the most appropriate medieval, modern, and postmodern analogues.\(^3\) In almost all the studies I have ever read about Hildegard’s Lingua, including those that try to explain or contextualize it, I am struck by the pervasive ignorance shown by scholars of individual, contemporary language invention. While much attention has been given to political language invention (such as Volapük, Esperanto, and other attempts at a universal *lingua franca*), this study centers on the private invention—this term “private” having a range of meanings—and will include along with other medieval and renaissance inventions the prolific contemporary Internet explorations of imaginary languages as a final touchstone for contextualizing Hildegard’s project.

Language creation has been demonized and divinized in the Middle Ages where it is most often seen as a charisma or a curse; it has been occulted in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; feminized, politicized, and fictionalized
in the seventeenth through the twentieth centuries, and reclaimed recently by a group of people who have discovered each other online. These people, who have been largely overlooked by academia, are producing artistic languages (a bit like Hildegard’s), many with their own scripts (like Hildegard’s *Ignotae Litterae*), exuberantly displaying grammars and glossaries on the Internet (much as Hildegard displayed her taxonomy in manuscript form), but with a different set of purposes that are useful to understanding something of the Lingua. Importantly, these are not creators of international auxiliary languages with their political advocacy, but inventors of personal projects shared within a community of like-minded inventors—a venue unavailable to the solitary Hildegard. More importantly, many of the older members started work on their inventions in isolation, like Hildegard, thinking they were doing something unique, only to discover fellow inventors on a university Listserv. Their efforts inspire some of the same prejudices and puzzlement that have surrounded reception of the Lingua. For this reason I try to avoid the rigid binaries into which inventing language has been thrust: the analytical versus the expressive, the rational versus the hysterical or pathological, the man’s invention versus the woman’s. Language invention has much blurrier boundaries. Indeed, the contemporary inventors are considerably removed from the ethos of a twelfth-century monastic environment and at odds with Hildegard’s claim to be a vehicle of God, but ultimately they present a more accessible comparison than other ones by revealing something universal and identifiable in Hildegard that has, until now, been ignored.

### When a Woman Invents Language

When a woman invents language, antennas are raised. It is usually scholarly men who have risen and fallen in this pursuit: Johannes Trithemius, Thomas More, John Dee, François Rabelais, John Wilkins, Jonathan Swift, George Psalmanazar, Albert Le Baron, Johann Martin Schleyer, Ledger Zamenhoff, and J.R.R. Tolkien, our most famous inventor of fictional languages in the twentieth century. And yet Tolkien’s omission from scholarly studies of language experiment reveals a persistent attitude that regards Quenya as being without linguistic or academic capital because of its overexposure by fandom and its underdevelopment of insanity. Hence it can bear no comparison to the more exotic “clang associations” and “word salads” of schizophrenics, speaking in tongues, angelic speech, elaborate hoaxes, and poetic neologisms that dominate the pages of Jed Rasula and Steve McCaffery’s *Imagining Language*. Tolkien himself put the real accomplishments behind his Elvish languages in a closet, leaving behind a disordered series of notes that linguists have been sorting through for decades. His essay “A Secret Vice,” one of the best and most sensitive commentaries written on the topic of private
language invention, emphasizes the intensely personal nature of this pursuit, and explains his projects in cautious terms of shyness, intimacy, and inutility. He perspicuously examines invented language in light of poetic language, and a passion that is private, obsessive, and slightly embarrassing—a secret vice.17 Compare this attitude to Hildegard’s brazen announcement of her Lingua to Pope Anastasius, proof of her right to counsel him.18

Besides Hildegard, the famous female inventors of language are recent: notably the “channeled” Martian language of the Swiss medium Hélène Smith and the unrecorded imaginary language of Mary Baker in the nineteenth century, and in the twentieth the fictional and linguistic experiments by Ursula K. Le Guin, Suzette Haden Elgin, and notable languages displayed online by contemporary women. I will give special attention to these projects in chapters four and five. Although they are worthy of study, I exclude men and women writers who poetically distort natural language such as Lewis Carroll, James Joyce, Antonin Artaud, Gertrude Stein, or Aleksei Kruchenykh and the Zaum movement; and length prevents me from examining invented phrases exhibited in myriad voyage and science fiction novels. My focus is on sustained lexical and grammatical replacements. Elgin’s work is particularly important in that her Láadan is a feminist and utopian language meant to repair linguistic essentialisms, and is the most prominent modern invention that targets women users.

It must be made clear, however, that no line of female linguistic creation started by Hildegard can be established. While Barbara Newman eloquently describes Hildegard’s Christian symbolism as a “theology of the feminine,” wherein female imagery for Church, Spirit, and Creation are favored among the theologians with whom she best fits,19 Hildegard cannot be said to have created a “linguistics of the feminine” in her Ignota Lingua. Intellectually difficult and off-putting, she founded no school of female spirituality, much less a school of imaginary languages. Her Lingua was discovered late by the modern world, and expresses the hierarchies of the patriarchic era she lived in. Furthermore, no particularly feminine aesthetic or grammar can be ascertained in any language created by a woman. Euphony, open syllables, liquids, front consonants, verb–object structures, preferences for “z” or “sh” or “l” or any other sound are useless for detecting a woman’s invention, or even for detecting artificiality of language. Phonic and structural preferences are idiosyncratic, and unique to every invention, and to every natural language. My diachronic study, then, must be based on similitude and difference rather than on descent, for language invention is constantly reinventing itself, inspired by various schools of thought in various times and eras. Personal language invention, whether by men or by women, often develops independently and privately. It may have done so for who knows how long or in what unrecorded circumstances, so it is only the published ones that we know of that can be compared to the Ignota Lingua. The technology of
the Internet is changing all that by democratizing publication and opening up closed circles to the world at large.

Even so, modern language inventions, especially those by women and those that exist independently from written fiction, have been subtly encumbered by the pervasive connection with the nineteenth-century medium Smith and her “somnambulism” or “dissociative identity disorder,” or the “unfeminine” acts of female charlatans such as Mary Baker and her pretended identity as “Princess Caraboo.” This connection exposes a mindset that has looked upon woman and her linguistic experiments as exotic, mysterious, transgressive, glossolalic, or childlike. It is a topic that continues to inspire curiosity and sensationalism and has minutely colored reception of Hildegard’s Lingua. We are still moved by the thrills of the female trance, the mystical paroxysms and speaking in tongues, the automatic writing, the regressive dreamworld of linguistic distortion, and the delicious speculation of girlish seccries and ciphers. Contemporary fascination with the medieval is often rooted in feminine mystery, what Karma Lochrie calls “covert operations” in her book by the same name, a study not only of the nature of secrecy and otherness, but its application to medieval women in their dangerous gossip. Nor have we disentangled our speculations about language innovation from our fascination with mental illness. Consider the books by scholars on the pathology and infantilism of verbal play. Gilles Deleuze devotes considerable space in The Logic of Sense to Lewis Carroll’s portmanteau words and other “nonsense” as these delighted children. In his thirteenth chapter on the “Schizophrenic and the Little Girl” he expresses his “horror” inspired by the intersection of childish games and schizophrenia. Both authors are fascinated by Louis Wolfson and his autobiography Le Schizo et les langues, wherein he describes his revulsion of English, his “mother tongue,” and his attempts to forget it. English invaded him in the way the speech of his despised mother did, and he sought to replace it by foreign languages. While I cannot ignore the darker aspects of language experiment and I will examine demonic, magic, and faked languages, my book ultimately aims to situate Hildegard’s Lingua among a tradition of “sane” inventions and unsecretive ones. In this respect it emulates Lochrie’s comparative strategy of juxtaposing “cultural operations and media” within both the medieval and the modern.

The online inventors are decidedly invested in the “logic of sense” and uninterested in keeping their signifiers secret. They are nonetheless overshadowed by Tolkien in the eyes of the public. No matter how much more ingenious or inventive their work, they are to the general critic as Carroll’s “Jabberwocky” was to the poet Artaud: “I never liked this poem . . . I do
not like poems or languages of the surface which smell of happy leisures and of intellectual success . . . One may invent one’s language, and make pure language speak with an extra-grammatical or a-grammatical meaning, but this meaning must have value in itself, that is, it must issue from torment.”25 In short, insane inventions are interesting because they are tormented and/or secret, and sane inventions are not. Perhaps in response to this attitude by people who more readily connect language invention with schizophrenia (or Asberger’s syndrome lately), Tolkien defended the art in his essay: “The instinct for ‘linguistic invention’—the fitting of notion to oral symbol, and pleasure in contemplating the new relation established, is rational, and not perverted . . . We see it in an alloyed form in the peculiar keenness of the delight scholars have in poetry or fine prose in a foreign language, almost before they have mastered that language.”26

In Hildegard’s day there was no rival, no sense of vision as pathology or language creation as child’s play, and no paradigm against which she and her invention could be set except Adam naming the animals, the Apostles at Pentecost, and the summaria of Latin terms that she may have contemplated. The one danger was that it could be considered demonic, but Hildegard’s Lingua with its ordered sequence and translations escaped that identification. In studying Hildegard and her work, then, I provide a female model that predates Tolkien by eight hundred years. A woman wracked with pain all her life—and who examined disease and its cures—reinvented language for spiritual, philosophical, and aesthetic purposes wherein illness takes up only twenty-two entries in her thousand-word list. She thereby gives us a means to examine her unique project within a long tradition of the rational, open, and especially the “keen delight” of a personal language. Such a study may make the Lingua seem less unique, but the advantages outweigh that threat. Hildegard’s Lingua exhibits the delight she took in the renewal, the “greening power,” of God’s creation, her vivid interest in beautiful sounds and music, and it shows her involvement in a uniquely human intellectual and creative endeavor that has spanned centuries. If nomothete or even onomatourage do not suit as terms, I propose a newer neologism already in use, glossopoeist, a “maker of language.”

This book, then, makes Hildegard the center of a study of language invention over the ages. With the help of the Latin and German glosses, it edits and translates in full the Riesencodex recension of her Ignota Lingua (assisted by the extra translations provided by the Berlin MS). Despite the often random quality of her imaginary words, it focuses on the ordered nature of her prefixes, compounds, and gendered endings. Most importantly, it investigates the appeal of such a project to a talented, visionary, and verbally gifted woman by scrutinizing the imaginative experiments of like-minded inventors.
Hildegard of Bingen (1098–1179), twelfth-century anchoress, nun, and magistra from Germany’s Rhineland region, hardly needs an introduction to the popular and scholarly world, although her “Unknown Language” might. Born the tenth child to the nobleman Hildebert and his wife Mechtild in Bermersheim, she was given when eight years old into the keeping of Jutta of Sponheim, her mentor, with whom she was enclosed five years later in the Benedictine monastery at Disibodenberg. Dead to worldly life, she was to live the rest of her days as an anchoress, until at the age of forty-three a divine voice told her to write and say what she saw and heard in the visions she had kept secret until then. The extraordinary achievements of this woman who began her career in this way have captured the imagination of learned and laity alike: despite illness, legal and political obstacles, and the burden of being female in a medieval monastic world, she became the manager of the convent at Disibodenberg when her mentor Jutta died in 1136, the founder of two other convents (at the Rupertsberg near Bingen and across the river Rhine at Eibingen), a writer, teacher, preacher, advisor, composer of music, healer, visionary, prophet, letter-writer, and language inventor.

**Herbalist, Visionary, Composer, Correspondent**

The more recent and global notice taken of Hildegard in general is due to a confluence of popular and scholarly developments in the twentieth century: the discovery of her music and our ability to record it has made her famous to the public at large, and the growing interest in homeopathy and natural healing have produced translations of Hildegard’s *Physica*. For
auditors and musicologists, Hildegard is best known as a composer of unusually rich plainchant, her lyrics alone scrutinized as powerful poetry, the most prominent English edition and translation being that by Barbara J. Newman. Her *Symphonia* boasts a splendid discography: five CDs by Sequentia—*Ordo Virtutem* (1982), *Symphoniae oder Geistliche Gesänge* (1985), *Canticum of Ecstacy* (1994), *Voice of the Blood* (1995), and *O Jerusalem* (1997); along with *A Feather on the Breath of God: Sequences and Hymns* by Gothic Voices (1981) and many others. If popular sales speak, she is most recently known to the reading public as a healer, and for translations and excerpts of her *Physica* and *Causae et Curae*, combined at one time in a text she called *Subtilitates diversarum naturarum creaturarum*. Priscilla Throop published a complete translation of *The Physica*; Bruce Hozeski’s translation of just the section on plants appeals today to fans of herbal medicine, and Margret Berger translated her *Caus[a]e et Cura[e].*

In the nineteenth century and most of the twentieth, editions of her writings were to be found almost exclusively in the *Patrologia Latina* (1855, 1965, vol. 197); however, the series published by the Belgian publishing house Brepols, *Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio Medievales*, includes all three books of the *Scivias*, the *Epistles*, the *Liber vite meritorum*, the *Liber divinorum operum*, with the *Symphonia* and *Ordo virtutum* in preparation. Meanwhile, interest in women and spirituality has brought Hildegard out of her scholastic sanctuary: led by the writings of Peter Dronke and Barbara Newman, numerous English translations and discussions of Hildegard’s works were produced, along with analyses of her accomplishments during a century she herself called a *tempus muliebris*, “an effeminate time,” wherein male monarchs and men of the Church who sanctioned violence and war were failing in the virtues associated with Christ’s peace. Mankind, then, needed to be taught by a woman who took on the duties of a man. Dronke puts Hildegard in context with other female visionaries, but more importantly he was one of the first to bring such writings into the literary canon; Newman situates Hildegard within a long history of theology and gender, reminding us that Hildegard herself, “with her frequent use of cross-sexual imagery and inversion, instinctively avoided the peril of associating the feminine exclusively with women. At the same time, she recognized that both masculine and feminine traits, as her culture taught her to define them, were equally though differently symbolic of Christ.”

Meanwhile, the illuminations that accompanied her most famous book, *Scivias* (“know the ways”), which describes and interprets her powerful visions, are given beautiful illustration to a popular readership by Matthew Fox’s reproductions of the Rupertsberg facsimiles published in 1985 and again in 2002. Fox includes as well some of the illuminations from her next most famous book *Liber divinorum operum* (Book of Divine
Works—also known as *De operatione Dei*), which explicates the relationship of humanity to God’s cosmos. Mother Columba Hart and Jane Bishop published the definitive English translation of *Scivias*, introduced by Newman and prefaced by Carolyn Walker Bynum.15 *Scivias* reveals Hildegard’s poetic language and penchant for neologism. Both Newman and Hart note the three major metaphors Hildegard uses throughout: *pigmentarii* or “perfumers,” that is, “chrism makers,” for “bishops and priests”; and *vivens odor* or “living fragrance” for the “monk” who is *vovens iter secretae regenerationes*: “vowing the way of secret regeneration,” in other words, “making monastic profession.”16

Hildegard is also known to scholars for her prolific and passionate correspondence. She wrote letters of advice and admonishment to kings and ecclesiasts, translated into English by Joseph L. Baird and Radd K. Ehrman.17 Sabina Flanagan’s biography of Hildegard sets out her curriculum vitae, and expands on a thesis developed by the neurologist Oliver Sacks—that Hildegard’s migraine auras contributed to her visions and are suggested in the mandala structures of her illuminations, the crenellations of her architectural images, her frequent references to shimmering optical effects, and her identification of her visions as something she saw constantly in the form of a “living light.”18 There is even a fictional journal19 and a novel.20 No other medieval religious woman save Joan of Arc has enjoyed such popular press today, even though her great contemporary Elisabeth of Schönau was more widely accessible in her time, her writings more voluminously copied, but she does not present us, as Anne L. Clark notes, with the strength of personality and individuality that Hildegard does, and that is so admired today.21 The “Sybil of the Rhine” has her own multinational organization: Die Hildegard-Gesellschaft, or “Hildegard Society.” She has become something of a cult figure and, while she is beatified elsewhere, Germany has long referred to her as “heilige Hildegard.” It is no wonder that scholars are cautious about sources and attributions. Comparatively little has been written on the *Lingua*, partly because it has been so difficult to translate given the dialectical idiosyncrasies of the glosses in medieval Low German and Latin and their highly specialized nature; partly because the text, extant in two manuscripts, is so perplexingly worldly; and partly because we are unsure of its purpose.

**A Select Bibliography of Scholarship on the Unknown Language**

While her fame as both prophet and miracle worker spread throughout medieval Europe,22 study of Hildegard’s *Ignota Lingua* begins in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Johannes Trithemius, author of *Steganographia* (1499)
or “covered writing,” and himself an inventor of mysterious languages and scripts, was responsible for publicizing Hildegard’s “Unknown Letters” in his *Polygraphia* (1508), but as Michael Embach has noted, he makes no mention of the Lingua that accompanies them. The controversial discussion of Hildegard’s “Unknown Language” began in earnest in the nineteenth century with Wilhelm Grimm’s 1848 examination of the Wiesbaden or Riesencodex, written mainly for perusal of the Lingua’s German glosses. Friedrich Wilhelm Emil Roth published a full edition (with no modern translation) of the Wiesbaden version of the *Ignota Lingua* in 1880, which Elias Steinmeyer revised in 1895 by including the newly discovered version in the Berlin MS—a.k.a. the “Codex Cheltenhamensis”—along with its variant spellings and arrangements. Both Grimm and Roth were disturbed by the frankness of the list of body parts (Körperteil) in the Lingua, both of them focusing on Hildegard’s gender and calling. Grimm declares that the parts of the body enumerated “seem indelicate [‘nicht ziemlich’] in the mind or in the mouth of a virgin, much less a religious.” Roth was more outraged: “Indeed, the production of utterly obscene items in this Lingua by a saint remains unclear, the knowledge of which, in any case, does not befit the virgins consecrated for God” (by “obscene” he meant the words for genitalia and excrement). Here he indicates that an opinion about the purpose of the Lingua as a divine language to be used in her nunnery was already in circulation. In his *Sanctae Hildegardis abbatissae Opera omnia* of 1882, Cardinal Joannes Baptista Pitra announced his examination of *The Physica* (included in J.P. Migne’s *Patrologia Latina*), which confirmed his conviction, contra Grimm, that the *Ignota Lingua* belonged to Hildegard. Pitra gives the first and last thirteen words from the Riesencodex (skipping over the sensitive problem of the Körperteil) and an alphabetized category of the “herbarium” section, which he compares to the “plants” section in the *Physica*, printing a copy of her *litterae ignotae* from the Wiesbaden and Vienna manuscripts. While Grimm seemed unaware of the *Physica* (mainly because it is not included in the Riesencodex), he acknowledges that “elsewhere she depicts the lusts of men and women in an equally unexpected manner.” In 1877 Antonius von der Linde described the Riesencodex and its contents, identifying the Lingua as a Geheimsprache, a “secret language,” paving the way for Johannes May’s identification of Hildegard’s Lingua as such in 1911, something that oddly returns to the late medieval conceptions of Hildegard as prophet—but sentimentalized. Newman identifies the Lingua as a “secret language,” which clearly it is not.

In 1931, Paul Alphandéry tentatively refutes the mainstream assumption that Hildegard’s Lingua is a manifestation of glossolalia. In 1955, Widmer voices her doubt, following Grimm, that Hildegard was its author. As we
have seen, she looks with suspicion upon the Riesencodex preface to the
*Liber vite meritorum* in which Hildegard announces her accomplishments
(including her musical and linguistic gifts), and argues that her penchant is
for circumlocution: she would never expose herself so baldly in an enu-
merated list of her writings. In a subsequent examination of the *Echtheit*
of Hildegard’s writings, Marianna Schrader and Adelgundis Fürhkötter
defend the Lingua’s authenticity in 1956. They treat the preface to the *Liber
vite meritorum*, whether authored by her or not, as a truthful account of her
accomplishments, and after examining the textual evidence they conclude
that “the Lingua and Litterae Ignota(e) are proven authentic by these pre-
sentations, even if the Unknown Language up to this day is philologically
unclear.” In his examination of the Old High German Glossaries, Herbert
Thoma suggested in 1958 that Hildegard’s “Geheimsprache” was influ-
enced by the *Summarium Heinrici* by which she attempted to make the
meanings of her “factually ordered dictionary” with its glosses known to
her nuns. In 1970 Alessandro Bausani wrote in *Le Lingue Inventate* that it
was unfairly described as a type of glossolalia.

The only twentieth-century edition we have at present is that made
by the Baseler Hildegard-Gesellschaft in 1987, which conflates the two
manuscript versions and offers a tentative and extremely flawed German
translation of them. In 1990 and 1991, Jeffrey T. Schnapp published two
related essays on Hildegard and language invention in which he introduces
us to his “expressive” and “analytical” language categories; in the latter
essay he includes fuller discussion of glossolalia and its features, and
attempts to see the Lingua in connection with the Philosophical Language
Movement of the seventeenth century and the later International
Auxiliary Languages. It is one of the first serious attempts to discuss the
Lingua in a larger context than it has been seen, but Schnapp leans too
heavily on the flawed Basel edition of the *Wörterbuch* instead of that by
Steinmeyer, reproducing some serious mistakes, and he borrows his
gives Hildegard scant mention, remarking that she demonstrates a resur-
gence of glossolalia in the Middle Ages after the ecstatic languages of the
Montanists were shunned. Her book critiques the Philosophical and
International Language movements and by extension all inventors of
“uglossias” (utopian languages) who attempt, consciously or unconsciously,
playfully, functionally, or utopically, to “take over language,” when lan-
guage in fact is social. In 1996, Reiner Hildebrandt provides a detailed
analysis of the glosses and categories Hildegard took from the *Summarium
Heinrici* noting how few scholars, besides Grimm and Thoma, have recog-
nized this source for the Lingua, and demonstrating the possibility that the
Trierer version provided most of the German translations. It is a pity that
after so much research in such a large book (*Imagining Language*, 1998) Jed Rasula and Steve McCaffery have not uncovered Hildegard’s *Ignota Lingua*, nor have Tim Conley and Stephen Cain in their *Encyclopedia of Fictional and Fantastic Languages* (2006), omissions that speak to the Lingua’s obscurity.\(^44\)

One of the most sympathetic essays addressing the Lingua is that by Peter Dronke published in 2000, which connects Hildegard’s invention with her rich penchant for metaphor.\(^45\) In the same year, Volker Mertens wrote “Die ‘evanische’ Sprache und die Ordnung der Dinge,” in which he suggests that Adam’s language in Paradise was one incentive for the production of the Lingua, but that Hildegard’s sense of linguistic inferiority in the face of her growing verbal authority prompted her to invent something to replace Latin.\(^46\) The Lingua, thus, provides her with the ability to imitate German/Latin macaronic poetry in her antiphon “O Orzchis Ecclesia.” In 2001, Fiona Maddocks is still calling the Lingua “an enigmatic code” and declaring it to be nine hundred words in length—a misconception often repeated.\(^47\) Embach’s formidable 2003 study of Hildegard’s work provides a long, detailed chapter on the “Sprachschriften,” corrects the myth about the secret language, notes Hildegard’s Adamic project, and laments in his summary remarks that her invented words—which speak so clearly to the connections she saw between music, language, spirit, and creation—have been sadly neglected.\(^48\) Jonathan Green’s comprehensive 2005 essay provides a summary of and challenge to much of this criticism and discussion, rejecting the Adamic explanation and its association with glossolalia or secrecy, and agreeing with Mertens that the Lingua was “a compensatory response to Hildegard’s lack of formal education.”\(^49\) Instead of Latin, though, he suggests that she imitates macaronic verse that employs Greek, given her invented alphabet, but as she knew no Greek she made up her own hieratic language “to demonstrate her unique access to the heavens.”\(^50\)

Green’s final suggestion does not entirely convince me, but his initial query is an excellent one: “To what question, asked by Hildegard, was the *Lingua Ignota* an answer?”\(^51\) To what question, I respond, asked of any language inventor, is an invented language an answer? For what are language inventors compensating, if anything? What questions are raised about sign theory by language invention, then and now? Far too often Hildegard’s Lingua has been narrowly seen within her own era. The questions and the answers vary over the centuries, but all of the inventions/examine employ a peculiarly personal power that resides in writing new words—better yet, one’s own words—for old things; and this pursuit is fundamentally different from writing new things in old words. With that in mind, I return to Hildegard’s metaphor of “greenness.”
**Viriditas as Metaphor**

Hildegard’s metaphor is scattered throughout her writings: *viriditas*, “greenness” or “greening power,” or even “vitality,” is associated with all that partakes of God’s living presence, including blossoming nature, the very sap (*sudor*, “sweat”) that fills out leaves and shoots. It is a “profound, immense, dynamically energized term,” write Baird and Ehrman, and closely associated with *humiditas*, moisture. Hildegard writes to Adam the Abbot that “the grace of God glitters like the sun and sends forth its gifts variously: one way in wisdom (*sapientia*), another in viridity (*uiriditate*), a third in moisture (*humiditate*).” In her letter to Tenxwind she compares the virginal beauty of woman to the earth, which exudes (*sudat*) the greenness or vitality of the grass. The Virgin Mary, of course, is *viridissima virga*, “greenest branch,” in Hildegard’s *Symphonia*, and Hildegard wrote this responsorium of Saint Disibode:

\[
\text{O viriditas digitii Dei,} \\
\text{in qua Deus constituit plantationem} \\
\text{que in excelso resplendent} \\
\text{ut statuta columna:} \\
\text{tu gloriosa in praeparatione Dei.}
\]

[Green / finger of God: / the vineyard you planted / glistens in heaven / like a pillar of light. / In preparing for God is your glory.]

Aridity, on the other hand, represents the faithless, the unspiritual, the abandonment of virtues in their greenness: that which withers and is burned up at Judgment. “Watch with caution,” she writes again to the Abbot, “lest your greenness (*uiriditas*), given to you by God, should dry up (*arescat*) through the fickleness of your thought.”

Inventing a language, then, which can reinject new sap into known language, even more so than the revered Latin or Greek, is definitely something Hildegard would do or “discover” through the grace of God, since *L. inventio* has the dual meaning of “authoring” and “finding.” In this discussion of the Lingua, I use the term “green” not only to suggest an ongoing and ever-changing tradition of linguistic creativity to be found in language experiments old and new, but also a reinvigoration of creative philology. Our linguistic “aridity” in American academia reveals itself in its recent assumptions that philology—once considered an exciting and even romantic topic—is anachronistic, irrelevant, and dry, at the same time contemporary scholars are fascinated by postmodern investigations of language philosophy. Language invention is a new way to approach linguistic concerns, but also to investigate the matter of writing and thinking; I hope to
show, too, how language becomes green through reinvention, and how inventors are making it green again through a process of defamiliarization, using new technology for a very old art.

Green evokes the sense of “new” in English: to green language is to strip it of its withered bark, the overly familiar associations we normally give to words. This is doubtless the idea behind Schnapp’s term “virginal” as he applies it in his title to Hildegard’s project. A green language is a sapling: new, in a process of growth. There is something divine, as Hildegard understood it, about renaming the physical world and our spiritual concepts in unique, euphonious words, giving a new body to humanity and nature. Viriditas thus calls to mind the visions Hildegard explicates in her Liber divinorum operum wherein she compares the microcosm of human physiology to the macrocosm of God’s creation, beautifully illustrated by the mandala structure surrounding the figure of Man who is also embraced by the figure of Love (Rupertsburg MS at Lucca, fol. 9r). Part III vision 5:8, as Derolez and Dronke note, replicates the final chorus in her Ordo virtutem: “In principio omnes creature viruerunt . . .” (in the beginning all creation “greened”). Part I vision 4:105, a long section explicating the opening of the Gospel of John, shows how God’s Word contains and creates all creatures, and how the heat of God’s Word, sent by the prophet John, made the aridity of human flesh green again.

Green in English, however, evokes a sense of naiveté, a lack of experience or sophistication. Both Hildegard and the Internet language inventors have been accused of such in their inventions. But besides the pleasure taken in an unusual personal artform, the pursuits of contemporary inventors reveal a fascination with structure, system, and technology that coheres with that shown by Hildegard. Their term for their constructed languages, “conlangs,” may seem “corny” to the outsider, but it exhibits the succinctness and lack of sentimentality that mark neologisms in the scientific and linguistic world today (“artlang,” “auxlang,” “loglang,” and “natlang”—for artistic, auxilliary, logical, and natural languages, respectively). Many of these modern creators are busy building countries of language to fit their verdant foreign cultures. These artists show innovation and many of them, being linguists, create with a sound knowledge of linguistics, understanding fully that language is “social,” and what they are doing is different. Given Hildegard’s similar interest in structure and taxonomy, her Lingua has little if anything to do with glossolalia, which I discuss in chapter two. Glossolalia has a different and complicated background: it is the spontaneous utterance of vocables that has no semantic content, hence none of the components by which language, natural or otherwise, produces reference and meaning. “Glossopoeia,” on the other hand, is the conscious creation of a coherent language, just as “mythopoeia” is the invention of a
coherent mythos, a story about an invented world. It is crucial to understand that distinction in a scrutiny of Hildegard’s Unknown Language, which contains within it the seeds of her philosophy about divine rationality. In greening her language, Hildegard nevertheless models it upon the authority associated in her day with ecclesiastical linguistic knowledge—the teaching, ordering, and translation of Latin as it was borrowed in the Summaria from Isidore of Seville. This tendency to rely on linguistic authority is characteristic of personal language inventions today. So what Hildegard did in her published Lingua—making a list of new words for ordinary concepts and arranging them in a translated taxonomy—was way ahead of her time. There was nothing else like it that we know of in the Middle Ages.

What is the Ignota Lingua?

“Vbi tunc uox inaudite melodie?” wrote Volmarus around 1173 to Hildegard in his concern about her eventual death, “et uox inaudite lingue?” Where, then, will the voice of your unheard music [be], and the voice of your unheard language?

This unheard language is intriguing, because it seems to offer something separate from the published list. It promises something more private, perhaps the “language” Hildegard had in her head and had not yet recorded. The published one is a rudimentary dictionary of 1011 “unknown” nouns. In both manuscripts there are medieval German and Latin glosses written above the strange words, the Berlin MS adding more German and a few Latin glosses to those missing in the Riesencodex. Here is an example of the Riesencodex and the Berlin MS layout, respectively, showing the first six words:

goth engel heilich healere duivel geist
dues angelus scs salvator diabolus spiritus

The Berlin scribe has clearly found it expedient to add a second layer of German glosses above the Latin ones. An “unknown script,” litterae ignotae, comprising twenty-three invented letters, appears at the end of the list in the Riesencodex (see plate 2), and at the beginning of the list in the Berlin MS.

The Lingua poses two questions to its critics, as the Basel editors put it: “Is this Unknown Language [a production of the] actual Hildegard, and
what is its significance?" The first question is easier to base an opinion upon, especially since it has become outdated to think otherwise. Embach suggests that Hildegard had control over the contents and ordering of the Riesencodex. If we adhere to this notion, though, are we to make a distinction between the record of a thousand words and the “unheard” language Volmar urged her to record before she died? Are the claims Hildegard made earlier to having “brought forth” an unknown language a reference to the publication of the list of words—or just part of it? The mention of it, along with her musical compositions in the preface to the Riesencodex recension of the Liber vite meritorum, is provocative. If, as Embach has suggested, Hildegard had some hand in the arrangement of the Riesencodex, its association with one of her three weightiest works of vision authorizes its inclusion with them as a prophetic or visionary text. The first three works are listed in the order in which she wrote them, so the preface may purposefully give us a date for the first appearance of the Lingua; we can surmise that she conceived it at least before 1158, because she mentions it (and suggests its publication) at the beginning of the Liber vite meritorum, along with a list of her other accomplishments. The preface states that she is the author of Subtilitates diversarum naturarum creaturarum; the writer of letters to persons major and minor, meaning her encouragements and admonishments of greater and lesser nobles and ecclesiasts; the composer of Symphoniam harmonie celestium revelationum; and the inventor of ignotamque linguam et litteras, along with certain other publications (cum quibusdam aliis expositionibus). Her 1153 letter to Pope Anastasius reminds him of her gifts through the agency of God, further dating the Lingua:

Sed ille qui sine defectione magnus est, modo paruum habitatculum tetigit ut illud miracula uideret, et ignotas litteras formaret, ac ignotam linguam sonaret, atque ut multimodam sed sibi consonantem melodiam sonaret. [But He without defect, who is great, has just now touched a lowly dwelling, so that it might see a miracle, and might form unknown letters, and might utter an unknown language, and also that by itself it might sound forth multitudinous, harmonious melodies.]

These mentionings, along with Volmar’s letter to her, the antiphon, and posthumous statements made by her biographers Gottfried and Theodoric and the Acta Inquisitiones clearly indicate the creation of an ignota lingua that took eight years in the making, probably written between 1150 and 1158 along with her Symphonia and Physica. But they do not completely answer the mystery of the taxonomy. They do not prove how involved a scribe may have been in making suggestions for the glosses for her words or
in grouping them in categories. Nor does the list show the stages this project may have gone through, or what prior written lists there were. It is counterproductive, however, to dismiss the list on the basis of this mystery. If this list is indeed Hildegard’s creation—and her immense productivity and imagination speak for its being so—then one wonders to what lengths Hildegard took her language beyond its record in the manuscripts, how she experienced its inspiration, how well she had it memorized, and whether anyone else learned it. The *Ignota Lingua* may have been a hasty effort to put in one place something that was perhaps extensive.

On the other hand, it is also unclear how much of the list was invented spontaneously at the time that it was set to manuscript. The Lingua is a strange mix of compounds with an apparently haphazard application of syllables that would suggest an on-the-spot creation with its several repeats of words assigned different meanings. Schnapp suggests that she is going down a list of words pulled from a glossary and spontaneously inventing her replacements. This explains some of his remarks about “obsessive leitmotifs” wherein he writes “that it is hard not to conclude that Hildegard composed her language in linear fashion, or, in other words, according to the sequence of the existing manuscripts.” Some of her morphological repetitiousness is indeed perplexing. One looks at her list of clerical garments in II.B.2.d: Zizzion, Olzimia, Tunchzial, Scolmiz (“vestment,” “liturgical garb”); then one looks at her list of plow and wagon parts in II.E.2: Ischiazin, Furanz, Ranchil, Scolmiz (“plow handle”). There is a sameness here with the obvious preference for the letter “z,” but it is the repeat of Scolmiz that jars. Both “vestment” and “plow handle”? And why must Hildegard find a new word for “flame” (glossing L. *flama*) in *Flagur* when she already has one in Scurinz (also glossing L. *flama*, but also homonymous with her word for “exorcist”)? A reasonable assumption is that she has simply forgotten when she gets to the plow and wagon parts that Scolmiz has already been used in the section on clerical vestments, or that a distracted scribe has miswritten it. Scurinz and Flagur may represent different kinds of flame: one for the church and another for the kitchen. Even so, it is probably no wonder that the repetitions increase in the latter part of the list, especially in the sections describing tools, herbs, and birds: witness Scalimiz (“shepherd”) and Scalimiz (“sage”); Sculiz (“awl”) and Sculiz (“sheaf”); Galschia (“germander”) and Galschia (“dove”); Luschia (“lovage”) and Luschia (“duck”). These may indicate a wearying glossopoeist. Especially annoying is Scantido (“February”) and Scandidoz (“September”). However, the compounds she produces, much better proof of memory and system, are far more numerous as I will show in chapter six. None of these speculations adequately addresses the other question: what is it? And eventually, what is its significance?
Hildegard’s Use of the Summaria

The Lingua in its full form is a list of nouns made in imitation of numerous medieval German glossaries, or *summaria* as they were called, that provided Latin words and their vernacular meanings arranged under subject headers. Her Lingua, in imitation of such *summaria*, is a taxonomy of the things of her spiritual, human, and natural world—her Savior and His servants, her convent and its buildings, her village, her herb garden and the birds and insects that inhabit it or contribute to her medicines. Starting with God, *Aigonz*, and other spiritual entities, it puts under *Inimois* (“human being”) the names for members of the family, then sick people, then parts of the body listed from the head down; after that we get skin disorders, then the structures and offices of a church, then names for lesser members of the community and so on through descending categories of the human world to end with the natural world. It concludes with a long list of trees, medicinal plants, and flying creatures—ending with *Cauiz, cicado*, “cricket.”

For comparison with the books that circulated in medieval Germany, see the lists that have been compiled by Elias Steinmeyer and Eduard Sievers in the five volumes of their *Althochdeutschen Glossen*, and more recently by Hildebrandt in his edition of the *Summarium Heinrici*, the most famous glossary.69 This text was based on Isidore’s *Etymologiae*, of which so many copies including the Trierer Handschrift were made (*Codex Trevirensis*, from Trèves, located on the Moselle River, not terribly far from Hildegard’s area). Its books are divided into the already familiar subject matters with headings: family members (*de cognatione et affinitate*); the parts of the human body (*de homine et eius membris*); sacred buildings (*de sacris aedificis*); ecclesiastical garments (*de sacratis vestibus*); official, military, and other peoples (*de principatibus et miliciis aliisque personis*), and on and on at a length much greater than the Lingua, and both Thoma and Hildebrandt have suggested that Hildegard had access to one of its recensions.70

While there are no rubrics in the Lingua, sections have been indicated by capitals in both manuscripts. These lists, besides serving as dictionaries for Latin scholars, were like Isidore’s *Etymologies*, little encyclopedias that discussed, named, and glossed the significant things of the world and put them in categories. There is evidence that Hildegard used an alphabetized list of trees (see her items 752–791). The scribe of the Berlin MS, then, may have been able to assign German supplements to the earlier scribe’s Latin by utilizing another such *summarium*, probably the one from Trier (where it is housed to this day). These texts teach us what was considered important to read and write about in Latin in the eleventh century, along with the medieval Latin and German terms for everyday items; and if nothing else the Lingua gives us a fascinating glimpse into Hildegard’s personal and
social world, including her sense of hierarchy, privilege, and class status—something that has yet to be explored in the Lingua. A good portion of the vocabulary lists the secular offices from most to least important (see the entries under II.C.1 in my edition, starting with 342, Pereziliuz, “emperor”). Another section (II.E.7) gives names to military weapons, reflecting her acknowledgment of the bloody events in her time. Another catalogues the items in her scriptorium, and the implements used for making clothing and jewelry (II.E.4–6).

Ultimately, the Lingua is a glossary for which Hildegard or her redactor proclaims her involvement and authorship in the Riesencodex. In the rubric, however, Hildegard identifies herself not as an authority, but as an untutored person who has “proffered, brought forth” an unknown tongue. This word prolatus is as ambiguous as inventus, “authored/discovered.” Something proffered does not necessarily mean created: it can mean “extended, carried forward,” or even just “made public.” What it suggests is that the Lingua has moved from the unknown to the known by being published, and Hildegard authorized this move. She has put her name to this project and agreed to its revelation in writing. In the rest of her letter to Anastasius she likewise applies this verb proffero to her language, but suggests, interestingly, that it is meant for some kind of use:

Et dictum est illi: Hoc quod in lingua de super tibi ostensa, non secundum formam humane consuetudinis protuleris, quoniam consuetudo hec tibi data non est, ille qui limam habet, ad aptum sonum hominum expolire non negligat.71

[And it was said to that one: you have brought this forth (protuleris) in a language shown to you from above, not following that of human custom, for it was not given to you in a customary way. He who has the file does not neglect to polish (it) into a fit sound for men.]

This last statement is an enigmatic metaphor concluding a letter that enjoins the pope to stop supporting the emperor and pay more attention to justice. It may mean that the one who is gifted with divine talents is in a position to ask the pope to “polish” his Church, or that the pope ought to polish his authority. Limam and nominative ille are ambiguous here (as is my supplied pronoun “it”), referring either to God polishing Hildegard, Hildegard polishing her language, or the language polishing either Hildegard or the pope into a fit sound for men (to hear and use). In either case, she hints that she had every intention of providing humanity with a redeemed form of speaking, one associated with sound, authority, and music.

While it is Hildegard’s habit to speak of herself as an instrument through which God has wrought her accomplishments, the German summarium
provided her with the project of publishing her language. The Lingua is copied in the way that some of the glossaries may have been: the word to be translated is written on the main line with a superscripted gloss above it, as I have shown. This arrangement suggests that a great deal of planning went into it. For the contemporary invented languages with which I am familiar, “translation” works the other way around: one writes down the word in one’s native language and finds an invented word for it, at least in the early stages of invention, especially if it is to be ordered in some kind of list, taxonomical, grammatical, or alphabetical. It is a fascinating and hopeless endeavor to imagine how Hildegard arranged for the record of her Lingua—how she decided what to include and exclude, and whether she had someone read to her from a glossary while she wrote her invented words on a wax tablet to be committed later on to manuscript. There is reason to believe that both Latin and German words inspired the invented word and its variants as she consulted the summarium.

**Phonology and Structure of the Ignota Lingua**

Chapter six in this volume is devoted to a technical study of Hildegard’s Lingua, but a few comments are worth making now. Many of Hildegard’s words were influenced by the phonology and structure of the German or Latin words for which she found new ones: Luzpomphia for “ougappel/eyeball” shows splendid parallel compounding—her root word for “eye” seems taken from Latin lux and added to a word that resembles Latin pomum, “fruit.” Many scholars eager to find etymologies of her words, though, run the risk of over-reading her. The remark that circulates among so many references to the Lingua that she employs Hebrew words seems to be generated in the same way that legends are (so many scholars repeat it as fact without giving citations or examples drawn from her text). Finding etymons or proof of exposure to other languages in Hildegard reflects more of the interpreter’s creativity than the inventor’s. Even so, there are some obvious borrowings: Diuveliz hardly disguises its origins in German duivel and Latin diabolus; Jur is an anagram of uir, “man.” Likewise, it is not too speculative to note that Hildegard’s tendency is to reflect the first syllable of her lemma; hence, Karinz for cardinalis, Prouerz for prepositus/probost, and then the German word by implication: Dariz, glossed by L. intestina with its echo of MHG darna. This is a motif that dominates the Lingua, and yet there are plenty of words that seem entirely reinvented.

For a telling example of her strategy, see how Hildegard gives five different words for hair: Latin crinis (a woman’s dressed hair) is merely har in
middle High German (as the B text provides it and the rest), but *Ornalz* in the Lingua; Latin *coma* (head hair) is German *uasch*, and *Milischa* in the Lingua; Latin *cinginus* ("curled hair") is *crispar* in German and *Ornalziriz* reflects that compound structure⁷³; Latin *capillus* (a strand or a lock of hair) is *loche* in the B text’s German and *Lasinz* in the Lingua; Latin *caesaries* (long, flowing hair) developed into *scara* in German and is *Criberanz* in the Lingua. So one of the things that the Lingua does is relexify the Latin–German word-lists. The *Codex Oxoniensis* has the following list:

- Coma, uash [head hair]
- Capillus, har [hair]
- Cesaries, jungenmannes [a male youth’s hair]
- Crines, wineshar [woman’s hair]⁷⁴

The Lingua is just as interesting for what it leaves out. Given infinite room, energy, materials, and time, Hildegard could have provided a complete dictionary, so obviously many things had to be omitted. Some items, however, seem to be gone over with scrupulous devotion to their various parts and purposes, like the tiresome wagon, hoe, and plow, while other important nouns are ignored. There is an abundance of winged creatures (including the gryphon), but no beasts of burden (only their drivers) or any other mammals (despite a number of glossaries that provide lists of them): no forest animals, no foxes to harry the hens, no mice to eat the spelt, no cats to chase the mice, no sheep although there is a shepherd (*opilio*), and no wolf to worry him. There are no fish, although there is a fish hook. These are strange omissions given that from items 753 to the end Hildegard reproduces items mentioned in Books I, III, and VI of the *Physica*, but not of any of the other chapters devoted to beasts, fish, reptiles, stones, elements, and metals. So there is no air or earth, no cloud or sun; no emerald with its cherished *viriditas*, no onyx, jacinth, or beryl, no dragon, toad, frog, or spider, and of the metals only three (gold, silver, lead) are mentioned, but as parts of various tools. The Lingua has interested scholars of her medical texts for its inclusion of the body parts, certain illnesses, and especially the list of medicinal herbs, but its omissions suggest a rather hasty close to the thousand-word project, signaling perhaps flagging interest, time, and health. The absence of “daughter” is particularly vexing.

Another intriguing omission is that there are no abstract nouns, which may be due to the fact that most of the other Latin taxonomies primarily list tangibles. Book IX of the *Summarium Heinrici*, however, exhibits long lists of abstractions (*Anathema, Controversia uel altercatio, Deuotatio, Dolo, Fascinvm, Gesticulatio*, etc, all alphabetized), but except for the opening six words, the *Ignota Lingua* remains a material record, as Dronke writes, of
“the sublunary world, and with it the humanly manufactured one.”

For all her interest in music as a divine language, Hildegard gives new words for “song” and “choir,” but none for “music” in the abstract, and no mention, outside of “bell” and “eucharistic reed,” of musical instruments, or even the human voice. *Inimois*, “human being,” could be looked upon as “humanity,” and *Ranzgia*, scripted out of context with other body parts in the Riesencodex, could be “language” instead of merely “tongue,” but it was not so perceived by the scribe who situates it in the Berlin Manuscript between the words for “throat” and “saliva.” Both manuscripts are divided into categories (the Riesencodex into seven, the Berlin MS into fifteen) signaled by a capital letter in rubric (or a space), but we have no identifying headers. And finally, while Hildegard produces over a thousand unknown words, there is no word for “word,” with all its connotations of divine creation, divine speaking, the Word made flesh. One wonders then, how this list represents the “file” by which her language will redeem speech, especially if all the abstractions by which men can be saved—*justitia, pietas, veritas, fides, redemptio*, and especially *caritas*, this last one beautifully illustrated in the first vision of *Liber divinorum operum*—are missing. I tend to agree with Dronke who opines that “Hildegard’s compilation remained unfinished—or at least that the extant collection of words represents only a fraction of what she had in view.”

Addressing the question of “what is it,” Newman remarks that Hildegard seems to have “created [it] as a kind of secret language to instill a sense of mystical solidarity among her nuns,” an interpretation that, if we read Roth’s offended remarks correctly, was in the air long before Grimm dismissed it; but there is no proof that she taught these words to her women, and there is strong evidence, as we have seen, that it was never meant to be secret. The contents of the Lingua—all the references to mundane things of the world, the forty-nine words for herbs that she takes from her *Physica* verbatim, and especially the list of jewelry and female garments—hint that she intended to publish this text for some kind of use within her abbey if not the entire monastic world. The “secrecy” of the Lingua and Litterae is likewise challenged by Hildegard’s announcements and her letter to the Zwiefaltener monks written in her characters. These are only secret in that they exist within the rarefied world of monastic learning. Sabina Flanagan repeats a common notion that the Lingua was meant “to approximate the virgin throng in heaven”; but if this is so, what are we to do with the equally long list of mundane things of the village, and especially its worst and most frivolous inhabitants in items 410–427? The trickster, the joker, the fornicator, the prostitute, the magician, the glutton, the drunkard, the thief, the robber, the dwarf, and the giant are the sinners, carnival workers, and monsters whom it is the duty of
the church to save, but it stretches credibility that names for these, along with “excrement” and “privy cleaner,” would be needed by the virgin throng in heaven.

Rather, I believe that the Lingua is a linguistic distillation of the philosophy expressed in her three prophetic books: it represents the cosmos of divine and human creation and the sins that flesh is heir to. The absence of abstractions need not concern us: the first nine words establish the process of God’s creation and humanity’s fall and redemption. I was initially troubled by the order of its terms, wherein it puts saluator after sanctus; I expected a more conventional beginning with the Trinity—God, Savior, Spirit—and a more recognizable hierarchy. I propose, rather, that these entities are grouped in threes and twos: God (Aigonz), Angel (Aieganz), and Saint (Ziuienz) go together as part of the divine inhabitants of heaven—note the almost identical spelling of the first two entities—ordered from highest to lowest; Savior and Devil (Diueliz) come next as good and evil emissaries between the spiritual and human worlds that affect the Spirit (Ispariz) breathed into humanity (Inimois), which in turn is divided into Man (Jur) and Woman (Vanix), that is, Adam and Eve. The long list of body parts and diseases may find their analogues in Hildegard’s discussions in the Liber divinorum operum wherein limbs, organs, and illnesses have spiritual counterparts, and the final list of plants, trees, and birds emphasizes the cosmic union of God’s nature and humanity’s care of it. The Lingua, in short, is a summation of Hildegard’s philosophies and her sense of category and status.

The earthiness, the sudor, of the Lingua appeals to a Hildegard that is every bit a part of this world as she is of the next, and a judgmental one at that, whose words suited her immediate spiritual and vocational needs and were intended for use by others. In fact, the subcategory of evil speakers in items 417–421—Ranschil (“chatterbox”), Malzispianz (“detractor”), Scorinzin (“whisperer”), Scholdamiz (“flatterer”), and, my favorite, Fugizlo (“privy-cleaner” or possibly “filth-talker”)—suggests an interest taken in false and fallen uses of language of which her Ignota Lingua is a correction and perhaps a “supplement,” in the Derridian sense: both an “accretion” and a “substitution” to natural language. Embach writes that the Lingua is an attempt (Versuch) at a paradisal “Ursprache,” a language that seeks to correct the errors of post-Babelian speech and recreate the harmonious language of Adam as he heard it, before his transgression, from the angel-choir in Eden. His is a statement that provokes, again, the question about the Lingua’s coarser elements, but which also inspires examination of the one text in which Hildegard’s invented words appear outside of the list: her famous and rigorously scrutinized song in dedication to a church (what she calls a Spancriz, 282)—“O Orzchis Ecclesia.”
Music and Language: “O Orzchis Ecclesia”

It is customary to find among the antiphon’s five foreign words only one reproduced in Hildegard’s glossary—Loiffol, “people,” declined as though it were a Latin noun. I offer, however, that two others appear in altered form from the list: Crizia, “church,” here turned into a participle meaning “annointed” (so glossed in the older version contained in the Theologische Sammelhandschrift codex theol. et phil. 4º 253 of Stuttgart); and Orschibuz, “oak tree,” the first element of which, orschi(s)—or orzchi(s), may mean “great.” The text occurs twice in the Riesencodex: once in the section devoted to her notated music (fol. 472v, see plate 5), and then in a section of her Epistolae devoted to the words of her music (fol. 405v). In the latter, the five words are glossed superlinearly:

O orzchis Ecclesia (immensa)
amris divinis precincta
et iazinto ornata
tu es caldemia (aroma)
stigmatum loifolum (populum)
et urbs scientiarum.
O, o, tu es etiam crizanta (ornata, uncta?)
in alto sono et es chorzta gemma. (choruscans)

[O immense Church
girded by divine arms
and ornamented in jacinth!
Thou art the fragrance/fumigation?
of the wounds of peoples
and the city of knowledge.
O, O, thou art also anointed/adorned
in sounds on high and art a glittering gem.]

These variations along with the remaining adjective chorzta and the noun caldemia (which do not appear in the Lingua) raise the possibility that Hildegard’s invented language was larger than her list implies and could include adjectives—or that it was subject to spontaneous alterations that she drew from a wide collection of memorized words.

There is some remarkable wordplay going on here. The Codex theologische gloss for crizanta, “annointed,” is much more appropriate than the Riesencodex gloss, “adorned,” which looks like an unintended repeat of ornata in the antiphon itself. Uncta, rather, suggests the reach of Hildegard’s unusual associations. If my surmise is right, crizanta means both “en-churched” and “anointed” in Hildegard’s wordplay since her word Crizia,
“church,” is a probable borrowing from “chrism.” A church is “that which anoints” and is anointed by the music sung in it and dedicated to it. Furthermore, either aroma is infelicitously applied to caldemia and muddles the translation or we have been muddled by the genitives in stigmatum loifolum. I have offered as a gloss the “fumigation” of the wounds of peoples since we have seen that Hildegard’s tendency is to repeat the first syllable of a Latin or German word that she has rendered into her language. L. calor, “warmth, heat, glow,” and caldus, calidus (“warm, hot”) suggest the warm, healing unguents, fumigations, and poultices that were applied to wounds in her day. However, the gloss makes little sense in English, perhaps because English is not very good at distinguishing genitive valency, especially in sensory terms. To a modern sensibility, it is the Church, surely, that is the warm, healing aroma for the wounds of the people, and not the aroma of the people’s wounds, which in English sounds ghastly. Mertens rejects “aroma” entirely, suggesting a derivative from L. calix, “chalice” and supplying “remedy” as a gloss. If we introduce a hypothetical participle (healing aroma) we create an objective genitive that lends the passage more logic: thou art the people’s wounds’ healing aroma/poultice/fumigation: an aroma that acts upon the wounds instead of emanating from or belonging to them, expressed genitivaly.

Dronke and Newman, however, support the “fragrance of wounds,” the first arguing that these wounds represent the flores martyrum “in allusion to the wounds inflicted on Ecclesia in the persecutions of the early Christian centuries,” and the latter arguing that Church is here displayed as a woman warrior (“girded by divine arms”) bearing the wounds of battles. Wounds, too, are symbols of sin that Church has anointed through Christ and turned into fragrance. In Ordo virtutem, Newman reminds us, Christ asks that his wounds be converted to gems. Whatever its meaning, caldemia uncovers an astonishing metaphor that fits Hildegard’s sensibilities: Church as unguent, Church as healing application for the sins that wound us, sins as unguents or fragrances, and Church as martyr and the embodiment of Christ’s people in a song that celebrates her and the anointing power of richly melodious language.

Embach identifies an analogy made by Hildegard between language and music by selecting passages from the Liber vite meritorum and Scivias and viewing them together. The former speaks of the light and the angelic music Adam saw and heard in heaven and the latter compares the Trinity to the sound, meaning, and utterance of words. The Liber vite meritorum tells us that God, like a bellows that tests the fire, sets the human soul on the right course through good works in order that it may return to the eternal joys of heaven, so that it “will see the purest light and hear the songs
of angels as Adam saw and heard them before he committed his mortal transgression”:

purissimum lumen uidebit et angelicum carmen audiet, quod Adam uidit et audiuit, antequam transgressionem mortalitatis adiret.88

In Scivias we find The Father as the “sonus” that we hear in the word, the Son the “meaning” that we take from the words, and the Spirit is the breath that creates the utterance:

In uerbo sonus, uirtus et flatus est. Sed sonum habet ut audiatu, uirtutem ut intellegatur, flatum ut compleatur. In sono autem nota Patrem qui inenarrabili potestate omnia propalat; in uirtute Filium qui mirabiliter ex Patre genitus est; in flatu uero Spiritum sanctum qui suauiter ardet in ipsis.89

[In a word there is sound, meaning (uirtus), and breath. It has sound for it to be heard, meaning for it to be understood, and breath for it to be uttered. In the sound, then, recognize the Father, Who with indescribable power manifests all things; in the meaning the Son, Who has been marvelously begotten of the Father; and in the breath the Holy Spirit, Who sweetly burns in Them.]

It is easy to understand why the invented words in the antiphon seem so much more authentic to some than the dry taxonomy. The musical context gives them the feel of something produced in an ecstatic state, and the melody itself seems a more important signifier of Church than the words themselves, which are only glossed in another part of the manuscript. The sung phrase “in alto sono” literally performs its own meaning with notes that soar in crescendo. Likewise, we need not wonder whether crizanta is “adorned,” “enchurched,” or “anointed”: its first syllable hits the high note and brings us down from Ecclesia’s tallest pinnacle to meet the upward rush of “sounds on high.” It is in this dedication to Holy Church where comparison of music and Adamic language, imitated by the Lingua, best resonates: “according to Hildegard,” writes Embach, “the language Adam spoke was also music that Adam heard, one that was paradisal—it was the song of the angel choir, and it follows that if he hears it, music produces in man a wistful memory of his heavenly home.”90

More importantly, Embach addresses the rationality of the Lingua: “Humanity, on its part, is made a ‘rationalis creatura’ in the image of the ‘rationalis divina,’” and that the Ignota Lingua, far from being irrational, was an attempt to provide a post-Edenic equivalent of rational and deific language.91 This concept brings me to Augustine’s argument in De Magistro that we speak, know, and teach not through our own agency but through the
power most able to reveal truth: Christ. Our thoughts and words derive from Him if we are to speak truthfully. It is unclear how much Hildegard knew of Augustine (AD 354–430), but all her speech, as she claims, including her Unknown Language, are words given to her from above. Further, Augustine rigorously scrutinized what we now call “sign theory” and “semiotics”—his De doctrina Christiana is filled with remarks about signification, interpretation, signum and res—and he famously proposes in De Magistro that “the things signified should be valued more than their signs.” This notion provides a crucial axis for contemplating the Lingua, language philosophy, and all language invention: Adeodatus, whom Augustine instructs, objects to this argument when it comes to the word for “filth,” insisting that the reference (caenum) should be valued over its referent since it differs in only one letter from the word for heaven (caelum). We are moved to ask what relationship invented words bear to the things of the world if they have no circulation in the world. Does the new sign transcend the thing it signifies—if it is translated but never used? Does it render the signifier innocuous?

Hildegard found language wanting, especially in its expression of negative or “fallen” concepts, and provided supplements for diseases and sinners along with ennobling words for the male and female genitals. This concept did not work for the Berlin scribe. He or she recorded Uirlaiz but left out even its Latin gloss, suggesting that it was the gloss (testiculi) that was unwriteable. More curiously, the scribe completely omitted Creueniz and Fragizlanz (leaving reverent spaces, nonetheless); not only the glosses offended—uerebrum, uirile membrum (male member) and locus uerecundie mulieris (a euphemism for “female genitals”)—but so did Hildegard’s replacements for them. For the Berlin redactor, then, Hildegard’s signs could not ennable their abject signifieds, perhaps because they were translated. It is largely on account of this bold transfiguration of forbidden terms, I believe, that publication and discussion of the list was suppressed by those who had formed an opinion of the proper decorum of a female religious. Perhaps in efforts to establish the Lingua in a visionary or religious setting, the term “glossolalia” was so often applied to it, and Hildegard has been compared to (and contrasted with) her great contemporary Elisabeth, who reputedly spoke in her trance-states a Latin she had never learned. It is to the subject of glossolalia that I now turn.
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CHAPTER TWO

GLOSSOLALIA AND GLOSSOGRAPHIA

Assumptions about Hildegard’s glossolalic tendencies were an early reaction to the discovery of the Lingua, but they are curiously tenacious. In his 1931 article, Paul Alphandéry attempts to put Hildegard’s Lingua in the category of the glossolalic, but notes that it poses some problems. He begins with a discussion of the Montanists of the second century, a group of mystics known for their cultivation of ecstatic and trance states, who were eventually looked upon with suspicion by the early Church.

Alienatio Mentis

Religious ecstasy, Alphandéry notes, requires an “alienatio mentis” of the seer, who loses self in vision, and whose obscure utterances need interpreting by the prophet. He writes that Hildegard, however, is her own “explanatrix Scripturarum,” especially of her own language. “How then do we reconcile these glossolalic phenomena,” he asks, “with controlled inspiration, or the appearance of glossolalia which one thinks one encounters in Hildegard?” He misinterprets her announcement of her achievements to the pope (the Lingua, the litterae, and the Symphoniae) as the three forms of glossolalia “in their largest sense: ecstatic unknown language, writing and chanting” (langue inconnue, écriture et chant extatiques), and looks for further hints of this état d’extase in her letter to Guibert de Gembloux. In these remarks she gives a rare description of her personal visions on a daily basis, declaring that *uerba que in visione ista uideo et audio, non sunt sicut uerba que ab ore hominis sonant, sed sicut flamma coruscans...* “those words that I see and hear in vision are not like words that a human mouth utters, but like a glittering flame,” a description that confirmed for Alphandéry a tendency in Hildegard toward divine ecstasy. As one can see, “vision” is a difficult state to identify, and the source of much controversy.
In this letter to Guibert, Hildegard makes it clear that she does not lose conscious control during her visions:

I do not hear them with my outer ears or perceive them by the thoughts of my heart or by any combination of my five senses, but only in my soul, with my eyes open. So I never suffer that defect of ecstasy, but I see them day and night, wide awake.7

If we compare this description to that by Elisabeth of Schönau, Hildegard’s contemporary and correspondent, we see that Elisabeth’s “trance-states” differ strikingly from Hildegard’s waking reveries:

By chance it occurred to me to think about the words of the Apostle [2 Cor 12:2] about which I had questioned the angel. I began to pray to the Lord in my heart saying, “Lord, if any benefit could come from this, I ask you to deign to make manifest to me that divine understanding which I have begun to seek.” While I was turning this over in my heart, I suddenly conceived in my mind the whole understanding of the thing I had been seeking and I pondered within myself many words which I had previously not known. While I was greatly marveling at this to myself, I went into a trance and collapsed. And behold the angel of the Lord stood in my sight and said to me, “What you were seeking, I spoke to your heart.”8

Elisabeth’s visions were often preceded by pain, feelings of strangulation, and fainting: “And I was taking such delight in the vision that I forgot to think about the distress of my whole body. . . . I remained in that bodily torment until about the sixth hour of the following day” until “I finally went into ecstasy and thus found rest.”9 Hildegard’s Scivias shows none of this engagement with such divinities as the apostles Peter and Paul, who ask Elisabeth whether it is more pleasing to her “to be tormented thus and enjoy our vision, or to be free from vision as well as torment?”10 Barbara Newman identifies Hildegard not with the female mystics of the later Middle Ages, but rather with the male prophets of old:

In the rare texts where she portrays herself as a partner in dialogue with God, she is not the enamored bride longing for divine union, as in St. Bernard’s Sermons on the Song of Songs, but the fragile and woefully inadequate mortal—“ashes to ashes, and filth of filth”—trembling before the great commission she has received. Like Moses “stuttering and slow of speech,” and like Isaiah “of unclean lips,” she offers the prophet’s classic response to a calling she has not chosen, yet cannot do other than obey.11

That Hildegard never speaks “in phrenesi,” writes Alphandéry at last, “makes it difficult to admit the existence in Hildegard of habitual glossolalic
manifestations,”12 and he admits that “the strongest argument against any kind of glossolalia with respect to Hildegard—at the very least spoken glossolalia, (written glossolalia being impossible to verify)—is that neither the saint herself when describing the circumstances of her visions, nor her biographers, nor the Acta Inquisitionis in her canonization mention glossolalic feats, and this silence could not be explained if she had really been ‘speaking in tongues.’”13 Bertha Widmer voices another concern: “If this mysterious language should now consist of amateurish and haphazardly varied German and Latin, then it is an exceedingly grotesque degeneration of the original idea, such that it cannot be imposed upon a truly gifted mystic, particularly not if she is normally characterized by rational sobriety (rationale Nüchternheit) and freedom from conspicuous ecstatic and glossolalic phenomena.”14 Widmer’s insistence on Hildegard’s rationality shows her objection to the seemingly irrational, because useless, invention of a list of glossed words. More importantly, she objects to putting Hildegard in a camp with hysterics and the later tradition of female mystics with whom we associate Elisabeth. This understanding of “speaking in tongues” is made more blatantly by Marina Yaguello, who consigns contemporary glossolalia to the “féminine,” disenfranchised, and passive branch of language use—a notion that comes right out of nineteenth-century fascination with the female medium: “The typical glossolalist is a black woman, economically disadvantaged.”15 What Widmer does not seem to consider is the logos of Hildegard’s list, which indeed reveals a “rationale Nüchternheit.” It seems to be the secular, non-spiritual nature of the Lingua and its conflicting translations that offend scholars. Alessandro Bausani, in his book on invented languages, writes that the term “glossolalia” has been wrongfully (a torto) applied to Hildegard’s invented language.16 Nonetheless, the term and the concept stick to her: Umberto Eco puts Hildegard’s language-making in the category of the “oneiric,” that is, that composed in a dream or trance state.17 Yaguello refers to Hildegard’s invention as speaking in tongues (parler en langue) and identifies it incorrectly as a resurgence of Montanist practices,18 but Alphandéry declares that “en apparence tout au moins, elle est aussi glossolale.”19 What does this mean, then, to be glossolalic?

**Pentecostal Glossolalia**

Glossolalia is most often described as “free vocalization,” that is, utterance that is empty of the semiotic and semantic requirements of workable language, but spiritually full. Speaking in tongues in Christian tradition is associated most often with Pentecost and Pentecostalism, a branch of
Christianity that rose to power at the end of the nineteenth century and which imitates the verbal miracle of Christ’s disciples described in *Acts* 2:1–8, RSV:

> When the day of Pentecost had come, they were all together in one place. 2) And suddenly a sound came from heaven like the rush of a mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. 3) And there appeared to them tongues as of fire, distributed and resting on each one of them. 4) And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. 5) Now there were dwelling in Jerusalem Jews, devout men from every nation under heaven. 6) And at this sound the multitude came together, and they were bewildered, because each one heard them speaking in his own language. 7) And they were amazed and wondered, saying “Are these not all these who are speaking Galileans? 8) And how is it that we hear, each of us in his own language?”

Note that speaking in tongues, here, is not free vocalization, but rather the utterance of a natural language known to the listener as his own, but foreign to the utterer—*lalein heterais glôssais*. This phenomenon is referred to as “xenoglossia,” to distinguish it from the unintelligibility of glossolalia. In *Mark* 16:17–18, Christ tells his disciples that “these signs will accompany those who believe; in my name they will cast out demons; they will speak in new tongues; they will pick up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it will not hurt them; they will lay their hands on the sick, and they will recover.” After the decline of the Montanists and the rational emphases of Christianity were established, especially under the influence of Augustine, speaking in tongues was no longer considered a requirement for baptism by the spirit. Verbal ecstasy and its dissociation from things signified began to acquire demonic connotations, and the great fifth-century semiotician expresses doubt, along with St. Paul, about its relevance to evangelism. In his tractate on the *Gospel of John*, Augustine writes that while the apostles were given this gift, no one speaks anymore in the “tongues of all nations,” because the Church already does so (presumably in Latin) and so do its faithful members.

Practitioners of modern glossolalia refer to the altered languages they speak as “glossas,” which are considered a gift or “charisma” bestowed on them by the Holy Spirit—hence our term “charismatic” in reference to certain Christian practices that emphasize religious ecstasy. The tradition as it is practiced in certain Pentecostal churches today is for the speaker of tongues to utter his prayer and an interpreter to “translate” it for the congregation—in a union of speaker and translator that imitates the amazed hearers in Acts. In its efforts to give linguistic meaning to the charisma, this process replicates what Alphandéry says is a time-honored tradition from...
the Delphic oracle on up: the role of the seer to enounce, and the role of
the prophet to interpret.21

Free vocalization, it is assumed, is difficult for the average person to
perform because it presumably severs the relationship of vocal utterance
from meaning in everyday language, although it may sound like language.
It involves, as John P. Kildahl has termed it, a loss of “ego control” and
therefore a manifestation of regression.22 The difference between speaking
in tongues and inventing a language is this: the essentially oral, performa-
tive, and spontaneous nature of glossolalia is not replicated in the written
and thought-out nature of glossopoeia where meanings can be rationally
applied to words and parts of words. In his book *The Psychology of Speaking
in Tongues* (1972), Kildahl gives an example of a tongues speaker’s first
experience:

“Aish nay gum nay tayo . . . aish nay gum . . . aish nay . . . anna gayna . . .
ayna ganna keena . . . kayna geen anna gaymanna naymanna . . .” Bill had
begun to speak in tongues. The utterances were faltering at first, with hesi-
tations after almost every word, and they were so quiet that his wife next to
him at the altar rail could not understand what he was saying. He simply
uttered the strange sounds as they came to him without knowing how they
came . . . [a]nd as his fluency increased he experienced the strange sensation
of uttering syllables and words and phrases that he had never heard before
and certainly did not understand. He spoke for two or three minutes, then
put his head down on the altar rail and cried silent, joyous tears.23

If this utterance is an accurate transcript of Bill’s glossolalia (mechani-
cally recorded, perhaps), then it yields itself to some interesting analyses. (It
does so even if it is Kildahl’s approximation.) Linguist William Samarin
points out that glossas differ fundamentally from natural languages in lack-
ing the complex rules of semantic demand: “In normal speech it is content,
and not merely manner of delivery, that changes constantly in response
to topic, person, setting, time, and so forth.”24 Glossas focus on manner
instead of content (they are often chanted), and while they seem to have
the elements of a language, with repetitions of words, pauses, refrains, and
so forth, they are far freer to vary their components, so that we do not find
the same ordered distribution of function words, case-endings, and affixes
that we find in a natural language, nor do we hear much phonic variety.25
In “Glossolalia as Regressive Speech,” Samarin notes two major features of
glossolalic utterances: “echoism,” the tendency to repeat syllables or syllable
clusters in succession, and “primitivism,” the reduction or simplification of
the phonic variety in one’s native language.26 Essentially, the number of dif-
ferent sounds, Samarin writes, is statistically lower than in most European
languages.27 Witness Bill’s “anna gayna . . . ayna ganna keena . . . kayna
geena anna” as an example of “echoism”; note, too, the predominance of “k” and “g” as initial consonants, and “n” as the repeated medial consonant (prompted, it seems, by the leader’s suggested phrase: “Aish nay gum nay tayo"). Syllables tend to be reduced to [a], [i], [u], and [o] among English speakers; thus we have Bill’s “a,” “ay,” and “oh.” In primitivism, syllables also tend to be open (consonant vowel, or CV), and to lack consonant clusters—Bill’s “naymanna, naymanna.”

However, one can make this claim of a number of consciously invented and even natural languages that have a characterizing semantic structure and morphology. Bertil Malmberg writes that the open syllable “represents the most primitive, and without doubt historically the oldest, of all syllabic types, the only one which is general in all languages.” Another fact is that the phonology of any glossa is idiosyncratic to individual tongue speakers, but also dependent on their native language and what they know of other languages. Exoticism is often a goal, with a repetition of certain vowels or consonants that have a foreign flavoring, especially if the speaker is familiar with other languages. I know nothing of Kildahl’s “Bill,” and the sample given is too short for real analysis; but a quick assessment may suggest that he has had no formal training in a foreign language. Hildegard did, however, and this fact will be important, as will the fact that Hildegard’s Lingua is written.

Looser Definitions of Glossolalia

How later scholars could look upon Hildegard’s invented language as “oneiric” or glossolalic is worth investigation, and we must exclude those scholars who have not scrutinized it closely. For those who have, the nature of the words and the list with its repeated endings and beginnings, the seemingly naïve repetition of the first syllable of the words it glosses, and the graphic preference for the letter “z” may suggest that Hildegard is randomly producing sounds in a state of dreamlike suggestiveness. Jeffrey T. Schnapp invokes this term glossolalia in his 1991 article devoted to Hildegard. His point is to outline a history of imaginary languages from medieval to contemporary times, but also to discuss the language experiments and neologisms popular in the Middle Ages. He focuses on the repetitive and simplistic qualities “typical of glossolalias” that the Lingua apparently exhibits, and which he derives from linguistic studies of glossolalia, particularly, it seems, those by Samarin: the echoism, open syllables, and “degeneration” or simplification of the speaker’s native phonology. But these features are exhibited in glossopoeias, as well, wherein meaning is assigned to individual words. Schnapp is using the term glossolalia very loosely to refer to any kind of language invention, such as Hildegard’s, that
is unsophisticated and produced in some kind of special mental state. As
does Yaguello, he follows a school of thought that was started with discus-
sion of the late-nineteenth-century medium Hélène Smith who channel-
ed “Hindo/Sanskrit” and “Martian” in her trances.

This matter of Smith’s “Martian,” which I take up in chapter four, has
been misleadingly referred to as glossolalia from Roman Jakobson32 to
Michel de Certeau.33 Smith’s Martian has a structure that Pentecostal glos-
solalia does not—and so does Hildegard’s Lingua with its compounds, gen-
dered endings, and its translations. Théodore Flournoy notes that there are
“different types of glossolalia,” and he even employs the term “glosso-
poesy”: of a “complete fabrication, including all the parts of a new language
by a subconscious activity.”34 Thus we see how difficult it is for the psychoan-
alyt or the critic to separate glossopoeia from its most interesting, because
essentially abnormal or pathological, developments, as in the case of Smith
and her trance-states, or the case of Edward Kelley and his scrying activi-
ties for John Dee. Yaguello remarks that Smith, glossolalists, and religious
prophets have one characteristic in common: what distinguishes them from
those who speak a native language is that they are “not the one who
speaks; there is no relationship of person, of ego, to utterance; there is no I
who takes charge of the enunciation and thereby situates itself in a spatial/
temporal context.” Smith, she continues, “speaks at the dictation of spirits
and extra-terrestrials,” as does the religious glossolalist by means of God
and the angels. “Nor is the prophet an I.”35

This statement is intriguing. But even though Yaguello discusses glosso-
lalia’s non-semiosis36 and its status as a direct emanation from the individual
“unmediated by social constraints,”37 she permits a structured pseudo-
language to be included under its rubric by identifying Smith’s Martian as
“glossolalic,” essentially collapsing, in my opinion, two different phenom-
ena under the same heading. Conscious control, for her, is the determining
factor. For me it is Benveniste’s “semiotic” and “semantic” categories,
since “conscious control” is impossible to determine: (i) the conventional
systemization of signs, and (ii) their capacity to refer and be understood.38
Smith’s Martian, no matter how naively or in what mental state it was con-
ceived or what claims she made for it, organizes her meaningful words into
a grammatical system that is coherent, that could conceivably give rise to
social discourse if another learned it. These features distinguish her lan-
guage from that of the free-vocalization characteristic of glossolalia. If one
follows Yaguello, we must assume that for Hildegard there was no “I” in
her invention, and therefore no “ego control,” whatever we conceive that
to be; that she is merely channeling a new semiotic given to her by the
Deity. Note, however, that God tells her directly (in her letter to
Anastasius): “you have brought forward”; and indirectly: God has touched
her so that she might “see,” “form,” “produce,” and “sound forth” by herself (sibi) a miracle, letters, language, and music. Hildegard’s I is disguised in the second and third person, but it is there nonetheless. If one follows Benveniste, one sees that Hildegard’s list is semiotic only in that her words refer, but not semantic in that she has no grammatical system, nor any verbs even, to make her language function as language.

Schnapp invokes two categories—the “expressive” and the “analytic”—roughly grouping glossolalas among “expressive” languages by which he means a private, imaginative fit of sound and sense with very little of the analysis (construction by accretion of parts) exhibited by the Language Philosophers and other inventors of International Languages. I am troubled by this binary, and believe there is good reason to dispense with this word glossolalia in reference to Hildegard’s *Ignota Lingua*, no matter how loosely bestowed. Besides the fact that language invention shows a great deal more variety, this grouping is too sophistically applied in its attempts to locate semiotically meaningful language invention in a spiritual (or hysterical/delirious/oneiric) environment. It lumps language invention that is linguistically naive, or invented “off the cuff” (going down the list as Schnapp suggests); or produced in an altered state of mind in one large category, obscuring the differences between the ordered prophecy of Hildegard and some of the later female mystics who actually did relinquish ego control. It derives from the cherished image of Hildegard as a “simple person” and humble dwelling place for God’s will—which I am sure she felt that she was—at the same time that she predates very similar behavior in people who distinctly feel they are not.

I have no doubt that Hildegard was familiar with the xenoglossia of *Acts* and considered what she was exercising a charisma, offering a “new” language, in fact an “unknown language” inspired in her by God, which she then translated in the list. A passage from the *Liber vite meritorum* expounds upon 2 Corinthians 12:4, wherein Paul talks of the man caught up into Paradise who heard “unspeakable words.” Mark Atherton suggests, then, that Hildegard’s Unknown Language is a “sacred language,” as demonstrated in “O Orzchis Ecclesia.” There is something of the “ecstatic” that is suggested in Hildegard’s antiphon “O Orzchis Ecclesia”: it is printed twice in the Riesencodex; I have shown the translated version in chapter one (including the one in the Theologische Sammelhandschrift). The untranslated version occurs with the other notated music (fol. 472v) where I assume that the song was meant to be heard without being interpreted. If she authorized the translation, she is indeed the *explanatrix* of her own “scripture,” but I think the easier, more practical answer is that she already had specific meanings for these words, and for parts of words. In *The Genesis of Secrecy*, Frank Kermode observes that “texts upon which a high
value has been placed become especially susceptible to the transformations wrought by those who seek spiritual senses behind the carnal,” reminding us that the term “hermeneutics” comes from the trickster god of messages and secrecy—Hermes. The Lingua is either divine or dismissed by those who see behind all of the products of this religious woman some kind of mystical energy.

Despite her prodigious ability with the metaphoric language of vision, demonstrated time and again in Scivias and in her other devotional works along with her Symphonia, which mark her as a person who looked upon the act of creation—even decision-making—as a spiritual experience, and despite her enigmatic claims for it, the recorded Ignota Lingua shares in common with her medical work a kind of down-to-earth dispensary of knowledge and matter organized as a list. My preference, then, is to return the term glossolalia to its more conventional meaning—free vocalization inspired by an alienatio mentis—and to substitute the word “glossopoeia” for what Hildegard is doing: inventing a glossary of nouns copied from a German summarium with meaningful elements in them that she translates. I find no better way to make my point than to contrast Hildegard’s Lingua with the more obviously glossolalic nature of the language recorded in the Tenga Bithnua, a perhaps contemporary if not earlier writing. Its method is by far the more common kind to be found in early Christian and later medieval imaginary languages that I examine in my next chapter.

Tenga Bithnua and the Language of Angels

The imaginary language exhibited in the Tenga Bithnua has been underdiscussed, but it offers an important contrast to Hildegard’s Lingua at the same time that it makes us aware of the prevalence of imaginary, divine languages in her era. In 1905, Whitley Stokes published in Ériu an edition and translation of the First Recension of an Irish text called “The Evernew Tongue.” It survives in the fifteenth-century Book of Lismore, ff. 46a–52a, but the Irish is older, he observes, suggesting a tenth- or eleventh-century origin, which can be deduced “from the survival of the neuter gender, and from the deponential and other ancient verbal forms.” This fact would put its original earlier even than Hildegard’s Ignota Lingua, but we have no way of knowing whether that original included the celestial language from which the fifteenth-century version copies. The fifteenth-century version serves, however, as a splendid counterexample to Hildegard’s list of invented nouns given specific meanings. There is no known exemplar, but six abridgments have been made of it in Irish. It is essentially an Apocryphon of Philip, who in the Acts of Philip speaks an esoteric language to Jesus and his disciples,
sometimes identified as Hebrew. It also seems to conflate Philip with Enoch who according to the *Pistis Sophia* held discourse with God in the original language of Eden.\(^{47}\) It is a “dialogue between the Hebrew sages, assembled on Mount Zion on Easter-Eve, and the spirit of the apostle Philip,” who is called “The Evernew Tongue” (in *Tenga Bithnua*) because when he preached to the heathens, nine times they cut out his tongue and nine times it was regenerated. On the Eve of Easter, “somewhat was heard, the clear voice that spake in the language of angels: *Hæli habia felebe fe niteia temnibisse salis sal,*” that is, “Hear ye this story, O sons of men! I have been sent by God to hold speech with you.” Philip tells the story of his ever-renewed tongue, and explains that “the language which I speak . . . is that of all the ranks of heaven. As to beasts of the sea and reptiles and quadrupeds and birds and demons, they know it, and this is the language which all will speak at the Judgment.”\(^{48}\)

The language of angels has been a subject of contemplation from early medieval times on up, perhaps induced by Paul’s famous remark in 1 Corinthians 13:1: “If I speak in the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal.” In the following chapter he declares this “language of angels” to be unequal to the task of proselytizing. In late medieval and Renaissance times, though, angelic language was as vigorously contemplated as the originary language of Adam, thought to be Hebrew. The myth of the lost Book of Enoch fueled a number of esoteric linguistic inventions in the Renaissance, and in his book *De Occultis Philosophiae*, or *Of Occult Philosophy* (1533; translated into English in 1651), Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa had Paul in mind when he described the “Tongue of Angels and of their speaking amongst themselves, and with us”:

> We might doubt whether Angels, or Demons, since they be pure spirits, use any vocal speech, or tongue amongst themselves, or to us; but that Paul in some place saith, If I speak with the tongue of men, or angels: but what their speech or tongue is, is much doubted by many. For many think that if they use any Idiome, it is Hebrew, because that was the first of all, and came from heaven, and was before the confusion of languages in *Babylon* . . . But now how Angels speak it is hid from us, as they themselves are. Now to us that we may speak, a tongue is necessary with other instruments, as are the jaws, palate, lips, teeth, throat, lungs, the aspera arteria, and muscles of the breast, which have the beginning of motion from the soul. But if any speak at a distance to another, he must use a louder voice; but if neer, he whispers in his ear; and if he could be coupled to the hearer, a softer breath would suffice; for he would slide into the hearer without any noise, as an image in the eye, or glass. So souls going out of the body, so Angels, so Demons speak: and what man doth with a sensible voice, they do by impressing the conception
of the speech in those to whom they speak, after a better manner than if they
should express it by an audible voice.49

A century later, the visionary Emanuelis Swedenborg describes in his
Heaven and its Wonders and Hell (1768) the language of angels from what he
had “heard and seen”—in heaven the angels, which he separates into “celes-
tial” and “spiritual,” communicate directly from their emotion (affectio), thus
inspiring their vocal articulations:

the speech of the celestial angels is like that of a gentle stream, soft, and
continuous, but the speech of the spiritual angels is rather vibrating and dis-
crete. The speech of celestial angels greatly resounds with the vowels u and o;
while the speech of spiritual angels with that of e and i; for vowels are sounds,
and in sounds there is emotion . . . The speech of celestial angels also lacks
harsh consonants, and it rarely passes from consonant to consonant without
the interposition of a word beginning with a vowel.50

According to both men, angelic language has properties that natural lan-
guages do not, being better able to communicate directly with the soul.
Like Swedenborg, the fifteenth-century redactor of the First Recension of
the Tenga Bithnua is concerned with the phonic beauty and “softness” of his
redeemed speech—the language that will be used by all creatures after
Judgment Day—and he pays little heed to the relationship of his celestial
language to his gloss. He gives fourteen examples of it in his text.
Curiously, the Second Recension, housed in the fourteenth-century Yellow
Book of Lecan and edited and translated in 1971 by Una Nic Enri and
G. Mac Niocaill,51 omits the language and merely gives the translation:
“And a bright voice was heard that spoke in an angelic language: ‘To speak
to you have I been sent to earth,’ it said.”52 For one redactor, then, it was
important to give visual and aural shape to the foreign language of God and
the redeemed world. For another, it was irreverent, or it was an abridg-
ment, or it was not in his exemplar.

What are its associations with written glossolalia? A written glossolalia
differs philosophically and structurally from a spoken one, as Alphandéry has
already noted, for it is removed from the voice of the speaker, and is there-
fore unverifiable. Samarin has a term for written examples of glossolalia—
“glossographia”—but he admits that it is seldom found in Pentecostal
worship.53 Written down, its authenticity as a spontaneous production is
put in question unless we observe the writer writing it. It remains on the
page, claiming literary status, and challenging the reader to find in it some
linguistic connection with its translation. In the case of Philip’s language, this
capacity eludes us if we examine it rationally, and the author, functioning as
explanator, has conveniently supplied a decipherment to aid us. Glossographia
can resemble some of the features of spoken glossolalia, but if it is contemplated and composed, it takes us in another direction entirely. It could be argued that the *Tenga Bithnua* is no more glossolalic than Hildegard’s *Lingua*, precisely because it is written, but its author’s intention is quite different from hers. Hildegard is doing nothing at all like what we have in the *Tenga*.

**The Structure of the Angelic Language in Tenga Bithnua**

In “Virgin Words,” Schnapp notes of the “expressive” form of imaginary language “the pulsional, repetitive, and incantatory semiosis characteristic of infantile babble . . . a language reduced [my emphasis] to a limited set of open vowels [sic], prone to syllabic reduplication and to excessive syntactical parallelisms and symmetries.”

Granted, he speaks here of “glossolalias and other prophetic tongues” (never mind the fact that Hawaiian, Japanese, and Spanish use limited phonology and open syllables), but he further says that “all” imaginary languages are “regressive”; they “disfigur[e],” he writes, “the materials which they appropriate from natural languages” and of which they are “impoverishments.” I understand by this final word that he means “simplifications,” which is fair enough: no invented language, no matter how developed, can match a natural language for complexity and history. However, “disfigurement,” “appropriation,” and “impoverishment” weirdly suggest damage done to natural language, reinforcing Yaguello’s cynical sense that language invention is not only hopelessly utopic, but a threat to linguistics. I am convinced that the language in *Tenga Bithnua* bears no linguistic relationship to its “translations,” but it can be examined without emphasizing its delicious dangers. Here are the relevant paragraphs of the First Recension with Philip’s angelic language followed by the interpretation in Irish (and occasionally in Latin):

7 _Hæli habia felebe fæ niteia temnibisse salis sal._

cluinidsi a scel-sa, a maccu doine, domroidesa o Dhia do far n-acallaimh.

“Hear ye this story, O sons of men! I have been sent by God to hold a speech with you.”

9 _Nathire uimbæ o lebieæ ua un nimbisse tiron tibia am biase sau fimblia febe ab le febia fuan._

Ba la tuatha talm _em, ar se, genarsa 7 do coimpert thir 7 mna cotamaipred._

“Among the tribes of earth in sooth I was born; and of the conception of man and woman I have been conceived.”
15a  *Le vide fodea tabo abelia albe fab*
   in principio fecit Deus caelum et terram
   “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.”

15b  *Ambile bane bea fabne fa libera salese inbila tibon ale siboma fuan*
   Mall uile a thuiremhes tesan Ebrair a n-asniter amn.
   “Slow it were to recount through the Hebrew all that is there uttered.”

24  *Artibilon alma sea sabne e beloia flules elbie limba lasfania lire*
   Fecit quoque Deus firmamentum inter aquas, et diuisit aquas quae erant super firmamentum ab his quae erant sub firmamento.
   “God also made the firmament between the waters, and divided the waters which were above the firmament from those that were below the firmament.”

31  *Aibne fisen asbæ fribe flanis ha sieth*
   Doroine Dia isin tress lau linde 7 ilmuire 7 ilcenela usce 7 ildealba salmuire, *ocus* cuairt in talman *cona* redib 7 a shleibhbih 7 a fidbadhaib 7 a lecaib logmaraib 7 a ilcenelaib erand.
   “On the third day God made lakes and many seas, and many kinds of water, and many forms of salt seas, and the circuit of the earth with its plains, and its mountains, and its forests, and its precious stones, and its many kinds of trees.”

56  *Abia feble abia alitrian afen alpula nistien erolmea leam*
   Aimmetach ret, ol se, cride co rad rig nime innach dortai in domair ar mod cacha huairi i fudomnuibh pian iar neoch dia ecnuch 7 aithisi 7 ecraitib dolleici tenga caich inna gnuis.
   “A patient thing, quoth he, is the gracious heart of the King of Heaven in that He doth not spill the earth for the deed of every hour into the depths of torments, after all the blasphemy of Him, and the insults and hostilities which everyone’s tongue lets forth before Him.”

61  *Eui falia faste. eui falia faste. eui falia faste maria fablea nelise nam*
   Del chatach amirseach atamcomnaic; et dixit: Andsa piana ardomthaat ardomnet.
   “I am a rod, twisted, faithless. And he said: Hard are the torments that are before me and that await me.”

63  *Na itho ad nacul lenisteia tibon talifi aia asfa biho limbia flanne*
   A failti-si do coibdelchaib, eitir macu 7 ingina ocus maithire 7 aithre, ce et agtha fo claideb 7 ce et agtha fo fulochtu iarum *conus*-esta ina carnu . i. ba ussa fa sheacht a dilgud sein oldaas beim n-ecnaih for Dia 7 amirsi fair for a duile 7 a mirboile.
   “If all your relatives, both sons and daughters, mothers and fathers, were put to the sword, and then placed on cooking hearths that you
might eat their flesh, it were seven times easier to forgive that (crime) than any blasphemy of God and unfaith as to His elements and His miracles.”

64 *Alea fas uide uala nistien alme ama faus elobi reba*
Doroine Dia isin cethramadh lau da chenël .lxx. inna rind tairindredach nime la tenedchuairt inna grêne guires in mbith, co lluaithe goithe, co ceill 7 etracta aingel.
“God created, on the fourth day, the two and seventy kinds of the wandering stars of heaven, with the fiery circuit of the sun, which warms the world, with the swiftness of wind, with the sense and splendour of angels.”

89 *Alimbea fones arife aste. boia fiten salmibia libe lib ebile nab lea fabe*
Doroine Dia isin coicrth la da cenël .lxx. do i allaib en 7 da cenël secht mogat do milaib mara.
“On the fifth day God created two and seventy kinds of flocks of birds and two and seventy kinds of beasts of the sea.”

96 *Et diresir alba sibe alea alib me lis*
sil n-Adam dia cloitis ceol inna n-enlaihth sin ni ba i failti na mellchait dia ro scardais fria cloissin, act suamuth 7 sirrect 7 toirrsi con-epeltais la cai.
“Adam’s race, if they should hear the music of those birds, would not be in gladness or gratitude if they were severed from hearing it, but . . . [sic] and longing and grief till they die in wailing.”

97 *E fi lia lasien ferosa filera leus dissia nimbile nue bua faune intoria tebnae*
Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et ad similitudinem nostram, et præsit piscibus mariss et uolatilibus celi et bestis uniuersae terrae.
“Let us make man in our own image and likeness and let him rule over the fishes of the sea and the birds of heaven . . .”

The celestial language is written in rubricated letters that are slightly larger than the regular Irish, giving it prominence on the folio. In this “softness” of celestial discourse we indeed observe a focus on front consonants, notably labials and alveolars: *abia, ama, bea, beloia, fablea, feble, fodea, maria,* and so on, along with a penchant for open syllables with final vowels ending in “a.” Here, at last, is the model that Schnapp needed for the use of his terms. The “incantatory,” “pulsional” quality of this uglossia approaches a kind of singing or poetry. Consider the alliteration, the
consonant and vowel rhyme characteristic of much Celtic poetry: \textit{libe lib ebile nab lea fabe; febe ab le febia fuan}. Meanwhile, this redactor has cleverly imitated the patterns of sentences in a real language with words that vary in length, and which, unlike Bill’s glossolalia, do not repeat themselves for the most part—another telling feature of artificiality. What shows me that this is a kind of glossographia—besides the fact that the gloss is frequently much longer than the celestial language—is this very absence of repetition, especially among the imitated function words. In its creative variation, the celestial language exhibits the other end of the glossolalic spectrum from that exhibited by Pentecostal glossolalia, made possible by its being written instead of uttered. There are a few single syllable words in the text: \textit{me, e, o, ua, un}, that at first sight give the look of a real language (the word divisions Stokes gives are depicted as well in the facsimile I consulted—a fact that is at variance with some of the other “divine” languages we see in some Apocrypha). But none of these except for \textit{e} and \textit{lia} are repeated. Other words of the text have a few repetitions: \textit{fuan} is repeated three times, and always ends a “sentence”—suggesting that we have a formulaic process here that shows phonetic but not semantic significance. Other repeated words are \textit{alea}, \textit{tibon}, and \textit{uide}, and of course \textit{Eui falia faste!} thrice repeated in sixty-one to express “I am a rod, twisted, faithless.” In a natural language, there is a ratio of repeated and non-repeated verbal elements in a given passage: one should expect a fairly low occurrence of repetition in nouns and verbs, and a higher occurrence of repeated function words (pronouns, conjunctions, etc.). As a control, I made a list of the Irish words used in the translations and indexed them without regard to mutation, declension, or affixation. Irish along with other Celtic languages fuses its prepositions and pronouns. Even so, there is a fair amount of repetition as is natural. Of the function words, and I mention only a few of them, we have four occurrences of \textit{inna} (“the/of the”); two occurrences of \textit{dia} (“if/when”); twelve occurrences of \textit{a} (“his”); twenty occurrences of \textit{ocus} (“and”); and of the verb \textit{doroine} (“made”) four occurrences used with \textit{Dia} “God” (itself used five times). Further examination of the Irish shows closed syllables and compounding. There is some imitation of compounding in \textit{lasfania}, \textit{salmibia}, and so forth, but none of the words correspond in syntax or repetition to the translations given, not even to the primary word for the Deity. These vocables seem chosen for their beauty and ease of articulation; they were meant to suggest a language of the angels with the emphasis on liquids, open syllables, and front consonants that are the marks, to some people, of a language superior to their vernaculars. The imitation of certain Latin words—\textit{et, ad, alma, abia} (from \textit{absum}), \textit{nam, bibo, limbia, uide, alba, cui}, and \textit{ito}—also add to the rarified quality of an elite language as do the poetic ornamentations valued by the Celtic peoples. The absence of linguistic correspondence to the translations did not concern this redactor, and may reflect the sense expressed by later writers.
that angelic language does not ultimately function like real language: divinities do not speak as humans do. There is nothing infantile, regressive, or deforming about this celestial language. For the author of the first recension, if he generated these words, he gave us a glimpse of his conception of heaven through linguistic discovery, calling upon a rich tradition of speaking in tongues.

It is entirely possible that the author of the *Tenga Bithnua* made a garbled copy of a more recognizable imitation of Hebrew, Greek, or Latin—or even a distorted and “improved” Irish: note imitations in “fua,” “ua,” “o,” “na,” and so forth. My point, though, is that he was working within a well-established genre that I discuss in the next chapter—the written gibberish of the apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, and gnostic texts where saints speak angelic languages or a pretend Hebrew that is then translated by an “ambassador,” something that has a darker side to it, and so can easily slip into the “abracadabra,” of conjuration. And even though this author offers an “interpretation” of the angelic language, it is entirely different from the *verbum pro verbo* explication of Hildegard’s taxonomy and antiphon, along with her meaningful affixes. Moreover, he does not claim to have discovered it himself, putting it instead in the mouth of Philip who acts more like Yaguello’s ego-less prophet. Hildegard’s Lingua has much more in common, then, with the private and fictional invention of languages that we see in succeeding centuries.
CHAPTER THREE

MEDIEVAL LANGUAGE PHILOSOPHY

Before I discuss the private and fictional projects of succeeding centuries, I will briefly describe Hildegard’s spiritual and historical environment and the mystical notions of language to which she may have been exposed.

Language and Change

Hildegard lived in a fertile time and she dwelled in an especially fertile area of Germany, near the borders of present-day France, in a part of the Rhine that had enjoyed a rich Celtic influence. But the twelfth century in particular was a challenging and changing period. It was during the twelfth century that we find the great flowering of Christian theology and mystical thought, the reformations and writings of Bernard of Clairvaux, the growth of the University of Paris, the second wave of the Crusades, the bloody political conflicts within Hildegard’s own region, the love affair of Abelard and Heloise, the building of the first great Gothic Cathedrals, and the developing notion of self, individuality, and spiritual growth. The twelfth century was also undergoing an epistemological metamorphosis whereby the notion of God’s unchanging creation was under scrutiny. In Metamorphosis and Identity Caroline Walker Bynum notes that whereas the old scholastic teachings early in the century insisted that God’s creations were immutable, a new philosophy emerged toward the end of the century that was willing to entertain the possibility that nature’s structures could indeed undergo natural or even artificial metamorphosis:

In a quite stunning shift of intellectual paradigms, people were increasingly fascinated by . . . radical change, where an entity is replaced by something completely different. Concerning topics such as digestion and nutrition, for example, theologians now asserted that growth occurs because food really
changes into blood and bile in our stomachs and rejected older notions that
growth must be a mysterious expansion of a given physical stuff because basic
particles and atoms cannot change their natures. Concomitantly, natural
philosophers began to study alchemy—a science learned from the Arab
world that promised to change one metal into another (especially, of course,
base metals into gold). In eucharistic theology, some theorists proposed that
the previous substance, bread, was annihilated or dissolved into a sort of
prime matter and the body of Christ then introduced into the same place.
And, to give a fourth example: metamorphosis stories, popular in Antiquity
but not in the early Middle Ages, revived. The proliferation of tales of
vampires, fairies, and werewolves testifies not merely to an enthusiasm for
alterity and escapism but also to a fascination with, and horror at, the possi-
bilities that persons might, actually or symbolically, become beasts or angels,
suddenly possessed by demons or inspired by prophecy.²

So while Burchard of Worms reflected the mindset of the late tenth
century in chiding a penitent for believing that witches could change
God’s Divine Image (i.e., humankind) into a werewolf,³ Bernard of
Clairvaux (1090–1153), with whom Hildegard enjoyed a brief corre-
spondence, wrote in the late twelfth century to the Carthusian Prior of
Pontes that he was “a chimaera of his age,” a hybrid creature who involved
himself hypocritically in worldly and spiritual matters: “May my mon-
strous life, my bitter conscience, move you to pity. I am a sort of modern
chimaera, neither cleric nor layman. I have kept the habit of a monk, but
I have long ago abandoned the life.”⁴ To be able to invoke such a
metaphor of oneself, to compare oneself essentially to a monster—part
lion, goat, and serpent—characterizes the colorful, hybrid nature of the
century. To what extent Hildegard was exposed to these developments in
literature, philosophy, and science is hard to say, but like Bernard, she is
a kind of chimaera, too, though she does not speak of herself thus;
instead, she is a vehicle of various charismas or spiritual gifts that put her
at odds with her original calling as an anchoress, that caused conflicts with
her monastic superiors and even her nuns, and that made her ill. Her
charismas led her out of the cell to found other abbeys, and put her in
touch with secular authorities; she traveled, she preached, she healed—
and in doing so may have picked up some of the radical ideas of her time.
She looked into herself and her visions and attempted to make them
known to the world. And she endured some of the world’s criticisms: in
an outstandingly sarcastic and jealous letter written to Hildegard congrat-
ulating her on her spiritual success, Tenxwind, magistra to the Sisters of
Andernach, attacks her unorthodox practice of allowing her nuns to
attend mass on feast days dressed as the brides of Christ with white silk
veils and golden crowns.⁵
This letter is important in documenting something of Hildegard’s bold and baffling personality traits; Tenxwind also accuses Hildegard of admitting only noblewomen into her convent. Rank was of great concern to Hildegard, and divine rank even more so if she allowed her nuns to dress like the virgin throng of highest standing in heaven, singing the songs that Adam heard. It is easy to see why the *Ignota Lingua* may seem to have been devised for such privileged choirs, or suspect for its politics of social hierarchy. Hildegard’s hybridity—her modesty and pride; the lowly habitation and the outspoken polymath, the poor little woman, and the aristocrat—has caused much of the controversy surrounding her invented language from Wilhelm Grimm to Bertha Widmer.

It may have seemed to Hildegard, however, that if nature can change or be changed, if base metals can be made into gold, could not virgins anticipate their glory in heaven and language be made green again—so that it can assert a purer authority in a vicious age? These were dangerous concepts, because they could be seen by the conservative Inquisition to flirt with heresy and magic. Hildegard had the mantle of her office and her reputation to protect her, along with divine inspiration. Tenxwind lost the fight in Hildegard’s spirited response defending caste as natural and godly. But distortions of language—especially distortions of Scriptural language—may have been regarded with a similar alarm, especially as they appeared in spells considered pagan. Hildegard’s greatest strength, then, lay in her lack of secrecy. The Lingua, and all of Hildegard’s writings, exposed rather than hid her ideas.

**Language and Incantation**

The following is Old English charm number 25 in the *Lacnunga Manuscript*, which if sung nine times over the sufferer’s “black blains” will cure them. It announces itself as a kind of Paternoster—“Tigað tigað tigað calicet aclu cluel sedes adcloles acre carcre arnem nonabiuth ær ærnem nithren arcum cunath arcum arcta fìgara uflen binchi cutern nicuparam raf afth egal uflen arta arta arta trauncula trauncula”—and ends with a Latin injunction “by the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit” to “grow no larger but dry up.” It mingles Old English words (tigað, ær, etc.) with semi-Latinate words and nonsense. Such gibberish appears throughout the *Lacnunga*. Number 168 instructs the healer to cure dysentery by writing the following charm on vellum and wrapping it around the patient’s head, chanting:

Ranmigan adonai eltheos mur O ineffabile Omiginana midanmian misane dimas mode mida memgarthém Orta min sigmone beronice irritas uenas quasi dulað feroor fruxantis sanguinis siccatur ña fracta frigul mirqui etsihdon
Here we find Hebrew and Greek words mixed in with Latin, English, and gibberish. Other instances of “magic language” appear in numbers 26 (“Gonomil, orgomil marbumil marbsai,” etc.), 63 (“acre arcre arnem nona,” etc.), and numbers 146, 163, 172, and 176.

These charms are intriguingly ambiguous in calling upon both pre-Christian magic and Christian religion, but they also offer insights into primitive language creation that exhibit some of the features of glossographia and even glossolalia (the repetition is noticeable). Latin, Greek, and Hebrew were hieratical languages known only to the cognoscenti, and therefore imbued with magic or curative powers for the layman. The unintelligibility of these charms was a powerful ingredient of their success as potions, divorcing language from everyday meaning and thus increasing the sufferer’s faith in them. But they shared a perilous threshold with incantation. Compare these with the conjurations of Johannes Trithemius, Bishop of Sponheim, three hundred years later. In his *Steganographia* (1499) we find the much more frightening gibberish used to summon the spirits of Pamersiel, Padiel, Camuel, and so forth in a book that was considered too dangerous to circulate except secretly. In this book, Trithemius purportedly found a way to transmit occult messages through the agency of spirits. The messenger writes an innocuous message on a piece of paper or “cover letter,” over which he presumably “thinks” his message; then he invokes a spirit such as Padiel by uttering the following: “Padiel aporsy mesarpon omeus peludyn malpreaxo. Condusen, vlearo thersephi bayl merphon, paroys gebuly mailthomyon ilthear tamarson acrimy lon peatha Casmy Chertiel, medony reabdo, lasonti iaciel mal arsi bulomeon abry pathulmon theoma pathormyn.” The spirit takes the message to the recipient who utters a similar incantation: instantly he can deduce the true meaning of the sender’s letter.

These various spells are a far cry from what Hildegard was doing with her borrowings from German, Latin, and Greek in both the antiphon and the taxonomy, especially given that she translates her words for us. Nonetheless, we are back to the chimaera: whereas the invented words in the antiphon bespeak a mystical use of language, the taxonomy seems decidedly nonmystical. The learned Middle Ages took a keen interest in questioning the spiritual purposes (and failures) of speech in a time-honored tradition of ancient and medieval linguistic theory. While we do not know if Plato’s “nomothete” was human or divine, it was a human being who named the animals in Genesis. Human language suffered a fall, then,
just as humankind did through disobedience, when the Tower of Babel was destroyed, subjecting the pure, Adamic language to fragmentation, corruption, and deceit. In seeing herself as the receptacle for the gifts of God, Hildegard claims to have been a divinely appointed “onomaturge,” finding a new language out of the rubble of the Tower’s fall. Nevertheless, a substantial amount of language distortion in medieval writing is connected to the Devil.

Dante illustrates the damnation of language and its departure from divine reason in the gibberish of the *Inferno*: in Canto 7.1, Pluto exclaims “Pape Satàn, pape Satàn aleppe!” wherein *pape* could either be a distortion of the Greek *papa*, an exclamation of pain or surprise in classical Greek, or a distortion of Late Latin *papa*, “pope, father.” *Aleppe* is harder to identify. Likewise, Nimrod the giant exclaims in Canto 31.67: “Raphèl mai amècce zabi almì”—an indecipherable phrase, perhaps the fake Hebrew of falsely applied Kabbalah. Jeffrey Schnapp describes Dante’s Hell as a “realm of linguistic ruin” and necromantic conjuration. In *Le Miracle de Théophile*, the thirteenth-century French poet Rutebeuf makes his Jewish sorcerer Salatin conjure the devil in fake Hebrew: *Bagahi laca bacha hé / lamac cahi achabahé / Karelyos.* Peter Dronke notes that in the *Comomamnia*, or “Feast of the Ass” celebrated in Rome on the Saturday after Easter, a horned sacristan chants in an imaginary language: *Iaritan, Iaritan, Iarariasti, Raphayn, Iercoyn, Iarariasti.* While Dronke suggests that much of this medieval blather was intended for comic use, it is hard not to notice its gross anti-Semitism. Ruth Mellinkoff devotes a chapter in her book *Outcasts* (1993) to the anti-Semitic depictions of Hebrew and pseudo-Hebrew writing in late medieval paintings. The *Tenga Bithnua* and its apocryphal forerunners offer a different, more positive picture of alien and especially Hebrew language as we will see later.

**Language and Mysticism**

Secrecy and devilry were not always allies. “Mysticism stands in a paradoxical relation to language,” writes Ewert H. Cousins, noting that the origin of the word “mystic” derives from the Indo-European root *μυ*, which in turn gives us our Greek *muien*, “close the eyes or lips,” and also our word “mute.” A mystic is an “initiated one”: those initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries were sworn to an oath that keeps the lips closed. Pseudo-Dionysius or “The Areopagite”—a Syrian monk and mystic of the fifth and sixth centuries—introduced an anti-linguistic philosophy that shaped some developments of medieval Christianity in the movement known as *via negativa* or the negative path. It was not until the ninth century, when the *Corpus Dionysii* was finally translated into Latin by John Scottus Eriugena,
that his writings became known to the west. Dionysius’s book *Mystical Theology* invokes the notion of the *apophatic*, a “turning away from” (*apo*) “speaking” (*phasis*)—and from all material aspects of the world—as one approaches oneness with the Divine Darkness.\(^\text{18}\)

This tradition is famously taken up by the German philosopher and Dominican priest Meister Eckhart of Thuringia (1260–1327) who in his “German Sermons” proposed, as Denys Turner writes, “a daring, thoroughly original and often startling paradoxical transposition of the dialectics of apophatic theology onto the sphere of ascetical practice . . .” where “not the least startling effect of this transposition is the emergence of a new theme . . . that of the nothingness of the self” and its unknowability and ineffability.\(^\text{19}\) God exists apart from His creation and is therefore unnameable, not subject to language and its system of symbols and referents within the fallen world. The soul, too, was similarly “nothing” in that it participated in the divine spark initiated in God’s realm. How, then, can we speak of God—or the soul—if language is fallen and can only refer to the things within a fallen world? This “absence” of God—and language as a presence of an absence—has its origins in a long-held and manifold philosophy of “skepticism,” which dictates that reality cannot be known but is filtered through our sensory perceptions, and our signs for things; for the neo-Platonists, such as Augustine, mysticism and faith were the answers; for the negative theologians, the renunciation of the senses was the answer. From the Sophists to John Locke it has ultimately inspired many scholars of deconstruction. Jacques Derrida examines Ekhart and the negative theologians, if only to differentiate his philosophy from theirs.\(^\text{20}\) Western philosophy, especially that which addresses ontology and linguistic theory, owes much to medieval philosophy, and there is a strong tradition of German contribution to it, from Hildegard to Eckhart, to Wittgenstein, and Heidegger.\(^\text{21}\)

On the other hand, writes Cousins, mystical writings abound as well with the *cataphatic*, that which moves “in accordance with” (*cata*) “language” (*phasis*): “in mystical discourse,” he writes,

> language runs riot: it leaps, it vaults, it sings. It speaks in prose and poetry; it gives objective descriptions of experience and flies on the wings of ecstasy; it guides neophytes with gentle care and cuts through illusion with razor-sharp arguments. Mystical language can be kataphatic [*sic*] in the extreme, chanting the ninety-nine beautiful names of Allah, evoking the images of the “three-million” gods and goddesses of the Hindu pantheon.\(^\text{22}\)

I find little apophaticism in the Lingua, or elsewhere. The leaping, vaulting, singing quality of Hildegard’s visionary writing is dependent on
language and makes excellent use of it, as we have seen from her neologisms, and as we can readily see in her descriptions and analyses of her visions in Scivias and Liber divinorum operum. In her opening testament, or “Declaration,” to the Scivias she writes that in the year 1141, when she was forty-two years old, the Heavens suddenly opened to her and “a fiery light of great brilliance” suffused her brain, heart, and breast, and she understood the “meaning of the exposition of the Holy Books.” The terms “exposition” and “Books” are important here: Hildegard’s visionary knowledge is of explaining and writing. She heard a voice tell her to rise above her timidity and ignorance, and “speak and write what she saw and heard” in her visions: “Explain them such that the hearer, hearing the words of his instructor, manifests them in those words, following that very will, revelation, and instruction.”

Scivias is an exposition in and of itself of her visions and their meanings. Her descriptions are followed by her interpretations. This is not a woman who has little faith in the clarifying qualities of language, sound, and vision. Her penchant runs toward explication and cataphaticism, and so does her Lingua with its translations.

Pseudo-Hebrew in Gnostic and Apocryphal Texts

We find a kind of cataphatic joy taken too in some of the gnostic texts and the writings of the Ante-Nicene fathers. Here, Hebrew is angelic, not demonic: both the Pistis Sophia and the various recensions of the Acts of Philip feature an imitation Hebrew or deific language, written out and “translated,” rather like that in the Tenga Bithma. The Acts of Philip, which may have inspired the Irish text, is believed to have been generated circa AD 500, and it has numerous recensions in Greek, Latin, Coptic, Ethiopian, Syriac, and Arabic. The oldest manuscript is a palimpsest dated to the late eighth or early ninth century, although the earliest mention of it is dated around 500 CE. Throughout its versions, we find a number of passages exhibiting a pseudo-Hebrew, which the authors write and translate in several places: Philip conjures Jesus in a mysterious language—“Zavarthan, savathavat, vramanoukh, come quickly!” In a version translated by M.R. James, Philip’s sister Miriamne speaks to the wife of the Proconsul who is healed by her faith: “Alikaman, ikasame, marmari, iachaman, mastranan, achaman,” which is translated as “O daughter of the father, my lady, who wast given as a pledge to the serpent; Christ has come to thee (and much more).” Editions of the different recensions offer variations in spelling and punctuation. Some of them capitalize the words; most of them put commas between them such that they resemble a list of names rather than a sentence, calling to mind the old tradition of naming divinities upon
which the Notary Art of Solomon drew, including Trithemius. None of them attempt the combination of long and short words in imitation of actual discourse as does the Tenga Bithnua. Here is the Syriac version of Miriamne’s speech from the “Addition,” edited by Bouvier and Bovon: “When she came to the door of the house, Marianne began to speak to her in the Syriac language: Elikomâi kasma hitaa mariakha khamastâi kali-nakhhaa.” Another recension identifies it as Hebrew. Further on, Philip curses his tormentors; M.R. James gives: “Abalo, arimouni, douthael, tharseleen, nachaoth, aeidounaph, teleteloen, which is (after many invocations descriptive of God), let the deep open and swallow these men.” Observe how James suggests above in his parenthesis that the utterance resembles the tradition of naming divinities. Compare these samples to the Pistis Sophia wherein the Glorified Christ appears to his disciples and interprets, at length, five mysterious words: Zama, Zama, Ozza, Rachama, Özai.

What exposure Hildegard may have had to such texts is unknown. The use here of a semi-divine language resembles the Mene, Tekel, and Parsin written on the wall of King Belshazzar’s palace in Daniel 5:25 and in need of interpretation: three nouns indicating weights—a mina, a shekel, and a half-mina—or three verbs—“number,” “weigh,” “divide.” As in the gnostic texts and the apocryphon, the meaning of the words is explicated by Daniel in 5:26–28 [RSV]: “Mene, God has numbered the days of your kingdom and brought it to an end; Tekel, you have been weighed in the balances and found wanting; Peres, your kingdom is divided and given to the Medes and Persians.” This technique of interpretation may have provided the later texts and their pseudo-languages with a formula—a series of discrete, suggestive words that are allowed to have stichic, complex translations. It is also possible that they were corrupt copies of a series of words that were once meaningful in the same ambiguous way, or they may merely be a list of deities. The Tenga Bithnua, then, is curious in departing from this formula to reproduce the sense of actual discourse. In this respect, it more resembles Trithemius’s conjurations and their appearance of actual speech—without, of course, being conjurations.

Hildegard was more likely familiar with Daniel than she was with the gnostic writings, and her biographers Gottfried and Theodoric attribute a similar story of interpretation to her—this time of five mysterious letters. In book three of the Vita it is told how a priest at Rudesheim entered the church one evening and found two candles burning on the altar. He asked his assistant why he had neglected to extinguish them. When the assistant swore that he had, the priest went to the altar and found a cloth unrolled as if for the divine service. When he touched it, his servant fell to the floor, shouting the words of Jeremiah 12:12: “Gladius Domini occidit nos! (The sword of the Lord has struck us down!).” The student told the priest that
neither of them would die if they read the writing on the altar cloth where five letters, written by no human agency, were inscribed—and in the Riesencodex Vita the letters are written out minutely in the right-hand margin of folio 325r thus, replicating other texts that depict these letters as a cross:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
K \\
A \\
P \\
H \\
D
\end{array}
\]

Sixteen years later, the priest heard that Hildegard had traveled the world spreading enlightenment. He sought her out and she interpreted the letters: Kirium, Presbyter, Derisit, Ascendat, Penitens, Homo. “A priest mocked the Lord, may he ascend a penitent person.”

The Berlin scribe embellishes on this word puzzle on the page that faces and introduces the Ignota Lingua there (fol. 57v), hiding Hildegard’s authorship in this reference to her prophetic powers. In the later Middle Ages Hildegard became associated with prophecy and divination, and so it is no wonder that Trithemius, with his interest in magic characters and conjuration, took an interest in her.

**Hildegard’s Alphabet**

It is in the Renaissance that an obsession with cryptography, substitution ciphers, steganographies, pasigraphies, and of course the “language of the angels” really came to fruition—much of these taken from exposure to Kabbalah (or Cabala, as the Renaissance magi referred to it), wherein we find attempts to ascertain angelic or demonic communications and to discover the original language of Eden. These projects in the hands of Trithemius, Cornelius Agrippa, and John Dee were to turn the green power of language invention into a darker art. Such investigations did not start out so darkly, however: a major source for their interest was the second-century Corpus Hermeticum, disclosed in 1462 by Marsilio Ficino’s translation, although it was known to Lactantius and Augustine before him. Scholars also investigated the Gnostic Gospels and the Hebrew Pseudepigrapha, another avenue into esoterica provided by printing. Agrippa was clearly influenced by the Kabbalistic Sefirot (which gives the ten sacred names of God) and the Sefer Yetzira (which he calls “Book of Formations”) or writings about it. The aforementioned Steganographia by Trithemius gives the names of chief spirits and their symbols boldly copied out, but contains within itself a cipher—the original purpose of a steganography (“covered writing”). The passage summoning the spirit Padiel, then,
is an elaborate encryption. Instead of naming a spirit to convey a message magically, the initial word gives a clue to its interpreter, who then highlights every other letter of every other word—one finds the Latin phrase *primus apex* ("the first point") in the sentence headed by "Padiel": “padiel aPoRsY mesarpon oMeUs peludyn mAlPrExo...” This book, so feared as a grimoire, was finally printed posthumously in 1606 and throughout the seventeenth century, but was banned by the Catholic Church in 1609.

“We must now speak,” writes Agrippa, “of the characters and seals of spirits. Characters therefore are nothing else than certain unknowable letters and writings, preserving the secrets of the gods, and names of spirits from the use and reading of prophane men, which the ancients called hieroglyphical, or sacred letters, because devoted to the secrets of the gods only.” One of Hildegard’s most curious achievements, then, is her *ignotae litterae* or “unknown letters,” and its reception. This alphabet is printed at the end of her taxonomy in the Riesencodex (R) and at the beginning of the Berlin MS (B). Michael Denis copied out the alphabet in the Hildegard Codex of the Vienna Manuscript (V) before it was lost. Stuttgart’s Theologische Sammelhandschrift (S) exhibits the only example of an extended use of this alphabet (see plate 4). We know that Hildegard had no such occult purpose as that suggested by Agrippa, but the ability for unknown letters to reflect a hieratic world of language had long been observed. Jonathan Green suggests that Hildegard’s inspiration may have been an exposure to Greek manuscripts, especially macaronic verse that included Greek. I turn, then, to an examination of her alphabet for clues to such an exposure: her symbol for “a”  in R vaguely resembles lowercase *gamma*, whereas it looks like a modified “r” in V:  ; “i” looks like a *chi*  in R and B, but a bent-over “8” in S:  ; her “n” could be a version of lowercase *phi*, and her “y” (at least in R) a lowercase *lambda*  or it may simply be an upside down “y.” In B it looks more like a running figure: . To what extent her scribes embellished her characters is unknown. Interestingly, “o” is represented quite differently in B and S where it is a heart shape:  ; it is an elaborate squiggle in R: . Elsewhere, her symbols seem to be elaborations on the Roman alphabet—especially “b,” “h,” “l” (fashioned after the hairpin character one finds in some German codices:  , and in the Berlin version of her Lingua), “q,” “r,” “t,” “u,” and “x.”

One must consider, however, that she may have seen Hebrew letters; just as striking is the resemblance of her alphabet to Old Hebrew or Aramaic characters, but without a corresponding equivalency. Compare her “a” to the Aramaic *tsade*, her “n” to Aramaic *qoph*, her “o” to the Old
Hebrew *qoph* written backward, her “i” to Old Hebrew *taw*, even her “c” to Old Hebrew *gimel* or *mem*:

\[ \tau \rightleftharpoons \gamma \]

It is unlikely that Hildegard was copying directly from any of these alphabets; her letters are most likely her own invention, showing merely an acquaintance with and an imitation of other alphabets, rather like one who has seen a foreign alphabet and loosely bases her own inventions on its remembered letters. Furthermore, certain shapes are popular in simple invented alphabets, and there is bound to be some unintentional replication. It is curious, though, to consider her “b” an upside down *bet* (instead of a variant of Roman “b”) and her “l” with its upward curl an early *lamed*: \( \ell \) and \( \ell \). Oddly, her “b” most clearly resembles the Cyrillic character for “b.” Again, finding conscious influence by Greek or Hebrew in her letters is about as speculative as finding Greek or Hebrew etymons in her words.

What makes her alphabet so ahead-of-her-time, though, is that it is not until centuries later that we find a proliferation of esoteric alphabets published with their Roman equivalents, or invented by individuals—especially alphabets that were based upon Old Hebrew and Aramaic. To be sure, myriad examples of ciphers survive from the classical period and the early and later Middle Ages in the Western world alone: writers experimented with short-hand systems such as the famous and widespread “Tironian Notes” (attributed to Cicero’s scribe Marcus Tullius Tiro), and with both substitution ciphers (a “visible” code whereby a substituted character replaces each original character) and steganographies (a “hidden code” such as the popular acrostic). Several of the Anglo-Saxon Riddles use Runes as substitution ciphers for their solutions, and in Riddle 42 the answer is hidden in a clever steganograph wherein the name of each rune is written out as though it names a natural item: *Pær sceal Nyd wesan / twega oØer ond se torhta Æsc / an an linan, Acas twegen / Hægelas swa some*:\(^{41}\) “There must be NEED, two others, and the bright ASH-TREE, one on a line, two OAK TREES, and similarly two HAILS.” The solution is thus revealed by recognizing these as letters spelling *hæn* and *hana* (hen and rooster). Six marginal ciphers can be found in *The Equatorie of the Planetis*, attributed to Chaucer and believed to be a holograph.\(^{42}\) It is not clear whether the ciphers are Chaucer’s own or those of a glossator, but both operated under a medieval conception of nature’s esotericism from which all those *libri secretorum* developed and persisted into the Renaissance, many of these hiding the most banal technologies.\(^{43}\)
These medieval and Renaissance examples make much of secrecy and keeping things hidden. And yet contrast such ciphers with the foreign alphabets listed and explicated in some versions of Mandeville’s Travels. The British Museum’s MS. Cotton Titus C.xvi (dated early fifteenth century) depicts Greek, Egyptian, Jewish, and Saracen alphabets, all of them corrupt or fictional, but displays them without any attempt at secrecy. Baffled by this preoccupation with alphabets, Paul Hamelius wonders whether the samples, with their emphasis on Eastern alterity, were meant to “facilitate secret correspondence as a kind of cipher in the Middle Ages.” Clearly, Hildegard’s Unknown Letters escaped such associations in her lifetime, even when she became the “Sybil of the Rhine,” capturing the attention of Trithemius who introduced her to his intellectual world. He moved in circles which, far from denigrating Hebrew, longed for the lost Ethiopian “Book of Enoch” (referred to in Jude 14–15 and in the Pistis Sophia), because Enoch had walked and talked with God in Paradise, revealing His original language. Agrippa writes out the “Theban Alphabet,” the “Characters of Celestial Writing,” “The Writing call’d Malachim,” and “The Writing call’d Passing the River,” three of which are based on the Hebrew alphabet. Trithemius offers symbols for his divinities, some of them strangely reminiscent of Arabic neskhī characters. Pantheus claims to have found the “alphabet of Enoch” or “Enochian” that, according to Deborah Harkness, “strongly resembles John Dee’s divine script.” The curious resemblance of Hildegard’s first three letters to those of “Theban Writing,” attributed by Agrippa to Honorius of Thebes and showing some influence by Aramaic script, is striking (see plate 3), especially since in this alphabet Roman characters—“a,” “b,” “c”—like that in Hildegard’s, are written from left to right with their Theban characters, quite unlike the other alphabets Agrippa records that are written right to left with the name of the Hebrew letter: aleph, bet, gimel. It is a mystery.

Note “c” in R and B respectively: ꜕ ꜖

While strange alphabets and their known equivalents prevailed in Hildegard’s day, it is not until the Renaissance that we have anyone assigning *verbūm pro verbo* meanings for invented words in the way that Hildegard does. This important element is what turns glossographia and divine lists of names into what I am calling “glossopoeia,” and which I explore in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR

FIFTEENTH- TO NINETEENTH-CENTURY
LANGUAGE INVENTIONS

Since the advent of printing, language experiments have been easier to make public. The exuberance with which neologisms were being penned in England by the ynkhorn writers testifies to the success of the printing press in making closeted pursuits more available to readers. The rest of this book must include medium in its discussion of glossopoeia—whether chirographic, printed, seen in a shewstone, written in a memoir, induced in a séance and recorded on a phonograph, enacted in person, or published on the Internet. The following invented languages are satiric, heretical, divinatory, faked, “channeled,” and playful. They illustrate various dimensions, aided by their media, of the serious and the ludic, the secret and the plain.

Thomas More’s “Utopian”

Thomas More (1478–1534), write Jed Rasula and Steve McCaffery is “credited with the invention in Utopia of the first imaginary language.” This statement is fallacious, given that the editors have overlooked Hildegard’s Lingua in their collection. But More’s popular intellectual novel, published in the original Latin in 1516, and meant as a jocular imitation of New World discoveries at the same time that it disguised its trenchant political criticisms in Latin and Greek, is perhaps the first secular and fictional glossopoeia—that is, an invented language (or a portion of a language) with a coherent structure accompanying an imaginary culture that has served as a model for subsequent “Voyage” and “science fiction” fantasies and their imaginary languages: François Rabelais’s Gargantuan and Pantegreul (1564), Thomas Coryat's Crudities (1611), and John Taylor’s doggerels (1630), which copy More’s term “utopian” for his nonsense poems, Shakespeare’s satire of imaginary
language in *All’s Well That Ends Well* (“Chough’s language”), Francis Godwin and his Lunarian language in *The Man in the Moone* (1638), Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* (1726), J.R.R. Tolkien’s *The Lord of the Rings* (1954–1955), Anthony Burgess’ *A Clockwork Orange* (1962), Russell Hoban’s *Riddley Walker* (1980), Suzette Haden Elgin’s *Native Tongue* (1984), and Ursula K. Le Guin’s *Always Coming Home* (1987) are only a few prominent authors whose fiction features alien or futuristic environments and imaginary languages in varying degrees of development. Very few of these men and women, however, with the exception of Burgess, Elgin, and Le Guin, provide grammatical information about their languages or long glossaries of words, and very few of them seem to develop them independently from their fictions, with the exception of Elgin and Tolkien.

It is not impossible that the scholarly More had read of Alexarchus, the “philologist” of Macedonia (fourth century BCE), and satirized him mildly. Under Cassander’s protection, Alexarchus was reputed not only to have built a little city-state he named Ouranopolis, the “City of Heaven,” but to have invented a language for it, and astrological deities (of which he was the Sun god). Utopia has some of this weird quality of the ideal and the mad, with a language in miniature. A connection is all the more tempting by Hithloday’s claim that Utopian is influenced by Greek and Persian. The printed preface to the 1516 edition of the *Utopia* has a quatrain or Tetrastichon in the Utopian language, attached by More’s friend and copy-editor, Peter Giles, along with an angular, ugly alphabet that Giles probably created, and a Latin translation:

Vtopos ha Boccas peu la chama polta chamaan.
Bargol he maglomi baccan soma gymnosophaon
Agrama gymnosophon labem bacha bodamilomin
Voluala barchin heman lauoluola dramme pagloni.

Vtopos me dux ex non insula fecit insulam
Vna ego terrarum omnium absque philosophia
Ciuitatum philosophicam expressi mortalibus
Libenter impartio mea, non grauatim accipio meliora.5

[“Out of a non-island my ruler made me, No Place, an island. Unique among all lands, and without philosophy, I have imitated for mortals the philosophical city. Willingly I share (what is) mine, ungrudgingly I accept (what is) better.”]

A first glance tells you at once that the language is a calque for its Latin translation with an attempt at imitating a similar case system:

\[
\begin{align*}
Vtopos & \ ha \ Boccas \ peu \ la- \ chama \ polta \ chamaan \\
(Vtopus & \ me \ dux \ ex \ non \ insula \ fecit \ insulam)
\end{align*}
\]
Thus do we have *ha* (accusative *me*) in line one, *he* (nominative *ego*) in line two, and *heman* (accusative plural substantive pronoun *mea*) in line four; *la* (non) in lines one and four; *chama* (nominative singular feminine *insula*) and its accusative version in *chamaan*. In order to make sense of the last line, one must assume that *volvola* is a misprint for the preceding *volvala*, so that we have an elegant double negative: “willingly and not unwillingly.” The only recognizably borrowed words are the two instances of Greek *gymnosophaon/-sophon* in lines two and three with a spelling adjustment to represent the different cases in *philosophia* (m)—and possibly *agrama*, “city,” from Sanskrit *grāmam*. Given its word for word correspondences, it is not a terribly sophisticated language construction by modern standards; but besides Hildegard’s Lingua it is one of the earliest glossopoeic productions; it shows More’s keen delight in invention, and its verbal play is subtle: *Gymnosophy* literally means “naked wisdom,”—a term More may have invoked ironically to indicate that his true philosophy is clothed in this fiction. Further, it is one of the first attempts at a grammatical structure such that its parts could be translated into coherent sentences—something Hildegard’s recorded substantives do not exhibit. Like the Lingua, it exists in a rarefied venue: written in Latin it is intended to discourage the laity, and its trenchant criticisms circulated among the learned, safe from the casual reading of the English king and his court. Often misunderstood today as “good place,” the original ironic meaning of *utopia* is “no place,” which has furnished early scholars of language invention with the popular term *uglossia*, “no language,” a language that either cannot be a language by virtue of its isolation and artificiality, a language that has a utopian philosophy in mind, a language that has no place within an outsider’s comprehension of it, or a language that can claim no place even within the speaker’s sense of speaking. Significantly, Hildegard’s own term for her language is *ignota*.

**Balaibalan**

In the Middle East, meanwhile, ciphers, codes, and secret writings proliferated and one of the least discussed invented languages participates in a special kind of secrecy that derived from its religious unorthodoxy. A greatly
sophisticated creation again not mentioned by Rasula and McCaffery—but noted in Sylvestre de Sacy⁶ and Alessandro Bausani—is the mysterious Bala-i-balan.⁷ Very little has been written about this text with its invented language (probably because of its sensitive content), which is described in a manuscript in Paris’s Bibliothèque Nationale. Unfortunately, it cannot be reliably dated, and may have been written anywhere from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century. Nor do we know anything of its dissemination or use. In 1813, the French orientalist de Sacy wrote a long description of it, having been sent an article from a certain M. de Hammer by a certain M. Rousseau, who noted what he had found in a Baghdad library. This information may be questionable. In 1912, E. Blochet suggested that it was generated in a hurufi environment, in other words, within a school of heterodox Muslim doctrine started by the Iranian scholar Fadzlullah of Astarabad at the end of the fourteenth century.⁸ Devoted to the mystical properties of language, the hurufi, whose name means “letters,” spread throughout Anatolia to Albania where it was taken up by the Bektashi, considered infidels. Within this sect, writes Bausani, to invent language is to imitate the divine powers of God and Balaibalân is a manifestation of language “re-enlivened” (spiritually renewed?) to express religious truths, but also to hide them, perhaps from the orthodox.⁹ The only surviving text found thus far is handwritten and contains a grammar and a dictionary from Balaibalân into Persian and Turkish. Bausani provides the transliteration of the Arabic neskhi characters that de Sacy gives, and I provide de Sacy’s translation of the introduction:

Ba-šān-a y-An-a y-afnāna-a y-habān,
Y-asnam ra y-An čūnā wazanas ra-giwzāw-a i-našā fājā, a-fajaš fa-m_m-a i-mafnā ra-ʾlā- b_ qājā, a-i-rfām a-i-mafam ja makn-ad Sanaš zāt jām-a i-nanšānā a-y-axšānā, a-ja maqr_a-lamnā-bi čūnāyā ra-i-karfanā rā-yā y-a šana. (Bausani, 90)

[ Au nom de Dieu clément et miséricordieux.
Louanges à Dieu qui a produit les origines de toutes les choses sous la forme d’une lumière, et qui s’est élevé de la bouche de ceux qui louent ses merveilles, en se manifestant (1). Que la faveur divine et la paix soient sur notre seigneur Mahomet, prince de toutes les choses qui tirent leur origine (des éléments), [sic] et des éléments eux-mêmes, et sur sa famille et ses compagnons qui sont les moyens (du salut) pour ceux qui ont des dispositions à en profiter.]¹⁰

[ In the name of God the Merciful and Compassionate: Praise be to God who originated all things in the form of a Light, and which arose from the mouth of those who extol his marvels where they manifest themselves. And let there be divine favor and praise for our Lord, Mohammed, source for all those things that derive their origin (from the elements), and
for the elements themselves, and for his family and his friends who are the means of salvation for those disposed to profit from them.]

Accompanying this passage is a series of notes about its structure and syntax, such that we can determine that the language is verb–object, as are the Semitic languages; that it has articles, conjunctions, and affixes that are explicated; that it draws upon Persian and Arabic vocabulary as its UR tongues; and that the title of the language itself—Balaibalain—is meaningful: bal, “language”; a, “of”; i, the article “the”; bal (with a short “a”) the verb “enliven” or “give life”; and -an, a suffix carrying participial force—“the language of the Enlivening One,” or “Enlivener.” Bausani calls it the “first true (vera) and original (propria) invented language of the educated world” (mondo colto), whatever this last phrase means, as we cannot confidently date it. Intriguingly, the original omits Mohammed’s name, supplied by both de Sacy and Bausani; Fadzlullah had been accused of considering himself a divine prophet. Like the Kabbalah, the hurufi texts suggest that the proper use of divine writing contains within it the power to become like the Creator in manipulating the universe. Balaibalain thus differs from Hildegard’s Lingua in being secret and heretical.

What fascinates, though, is the possibility that Hildegard may have viewed her invention as a means of drawing from God not merely the power to polish kings and ecclesiasts through divinely granted speech, but the divine power to re-enliven her monastic world in new verbal building blocks. She would undoubtedly have considered this a blasphemous comparison. But God’s Word, as she describes it in Liber divinorum operum, and repeatedly throughout her work, is not only Christ Incarnate but that which “with a resounding voice awakened all creatures.” Later in the book, she remarks that we may understand something of God’s secret mysteries (occulta misteria Dei) lying hidden in his creation: in animalibus, in reptilibus, in uolatilibus et in piscibus, in herbis et in pomiferis. Here are the reptiles and fish of her Physica and the flying creatures, plants, and trees that she verbally recreates in her Lingua, imitating, perhaps subconsciously, God’s generative Word. Her project, however, was esteemed in her time, whereas reception of John Dee’s language of the angels four hundred years later was to take a tragic turn, no matter how often Dee protested not to be a necromancer.

The Angelic Language of John Dee

John Dee (1527–1608)—mathematician, astrologer, and intelligencer to Queen Elizabeth—allowed himself to get caught up in the summoning of
angels, which eventually discredited him and ruined his career. Fascinated by secret scripts and languages, he collected in his vast library the works of Trithemius, Cornelius Agrippa, and the *Voarchadumia contra alchimiam* of Joannes Antonius Pantheus, which claimed to have discovered the language of Enoch. With the help of his scryer, Dee produced perhaps the most famous invented language of his era, apart from the mysterious Voynich Manuscript, of uncertain date, whose written code has yet to be deciphered. Dee was unusual as a conjurer in that instead of summoning spirits for personal gain or power, he seemed genuinely interested in learning from divine sources about political outcomes and the future and meaning of the universe. Having consulted Kabbalistic texts, he believed that the angels could not only tell him about the structure of the cosmos, but also reveal the sacred letters that provided the material elements of Nature. According to Aryeh Kaplan, the *Sefer Yetzirah* teaches that God created the world using the ten Sefirot, or “enumerations,” and twenty-two “Foundation” letters. It is both a meditative and a magical text in that it describes certain exercises that “were meant to strengthen the initiate’s concentration,” which would then allow him “to perform feats that outwardly appeared to be magical,” such as the creation of a golem. For Dee, learning the language of the angels was tantamount to finding a unified field theory.

Dee’s language has been somewhat misleadingly referred to as the “Enochian language”; Dee never called it that, preferring “angelic language” or “language of the angels.” This later moniker was applied, it seems, by scholars who associated it with Pantheus’s “Enochian” alphabet. Even the attribution of the angelic language to Dee is questionable, as it was his principal scryer, Kelley (also known as Edward Talbot), who dictated the angelic communications as he “descried” them in the shewstone. Dee employed several scryers, but the 48 Claves Angelicae were communicated during Kelley’s employ between 1582 and 1586.

The “invention” or “discovery” of this language is intriguingly mysterious. According to the notes that Dee left behind, divine beings appeared in the crystal to Kelley and pointed at letters identified by a number on several vast tables that both consulted. These passages were laboriously dictated backward—word by word, letter by letter—perhaps to suggest that they were seen in a mirror; perhaps in imitation of the right-to-left writing of Hebrew; perhaps to recall the necromantic fascination with things backward (although Dee denied vehemently that he practiced any kind of Dark Art). Here is a short example taken from the “First Call.” Note that the first line (in uppercase) is the order of the words, letter by letter, as they were called out by Kelley. The second line (in lowercase) shows the words as they were meant to be spelled, read, and pronounced.
(note that they run in the opposite direction). The third line gives Dee and Kelley’s translation, the words in boldface being the definitions of the word provided in the second column:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIZ</th>
<th>HOLBON</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>HAMMOC</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>ZMIZ</th>
<th>AOHTON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ol</td>
<td>sonf</td>
<td>vors-g</td>
<td>goho</td>
<td>Iad</td>
<td>Balt</td>
<td>lansh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>reign</td>
<td>over-you says</td>
<td>God</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAQ</th>
<th>QLOH</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>GRPLAM</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>AARG</th>
<th>DO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>calz</td>
<td>vonpho</td>
<td>sobra</td>
<td>zol</td>
<td>ror-i-ta</td>
<td>nazpsad</td>
<td>od</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above: the</td>
<td><strong>firmaments</strong></td>
<td>of</td>
<td><strong>wrath</strong></td>
<td>whose</td>
<td><strong>hands</strong></td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DASPZAN</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>ROR</th>
<th>LOZ</th>
<th>ARBOS</th>
<th>OHPNOV</th>
<th>ZLAC</th>
<th>HSNAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>graa</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>malprg</td>
<td>ds</td>
<td>holq</td>
<td>qaa</td>
<td>nothoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td><strong>moon</strong></td>
<td>as</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>penetrating</td>
<td><strong>fire</strong></td>
<td>who</td>
<td>measures</td>
<td>your</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLAB</th>
<th>DAI</th>
<th>OHOG</th>
<th>GSROV</th>
<th>FNOS</th>
<th>LO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zimz</td>
<td>od</td>
<td>commmah</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>nobloh</td>
<td>zien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of</td>
<td>my</td>
<td><strong>vestures</strong></td>
<td>and</td>
<td><strong>trussed</strong></td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEIZ, at the beginning is *zien*, “of my hands,” at the end; and FNOS LO here at the end is *ol sonf*, “I reign,” at the beginning. This is only one sentence: whole texts were dictated from end to beginning.

It seems that enormous mnemonic powers were required on the part of this scryer—that is, if we exclude the supernatural explanation. The supernatural explanation has persisted, though, in both popular and scholarly studies. Geoffrey James asks in all seriousness: “was Kelly ever actually in contact with supernatural entities?” 22 Stephen Skinner, author of the preface to the revised edition of Donald C. Laycock’s *The Complete Enochian Dictionary*, warns us that “[t]he Enochian system is . . . one of the more complex bridges ever built between this world and the world of daemons, spirits, and angels, a piece of spiritual engineering created by one of the most brilliant minds of his age. As such it deserves to be traversed with care.” 23 Even the book by Deborah E. Harkness, *John Dee’s Conversations with Angels* (1999), an admirably scholarly study of Dee, is evasive when it comes to the nature of the language and the manner of its transcription, downplaying Kelley’s role in it.

Kelley is a difficult element in the problem of Enochian. As he was clearly not of the intellectual or moral stature of a John Dee, it is painful to think that Dee may have been conned by him, or that Kelley might have had such control over an invented language that he could dictate it backward to his employer. Richard Deacon writes that “[o]ne cannot dismiss the whole business as a fraud, because something that escapes normal explanation was occurring. It is almost impossible to believe that this could be faked, especially.
when one remembers that there were ninety-eight tables to choose from and for memorizing . . .”

James, too, rejects the possibility of fraud, asking:

Could Kelly, whose single linguistic accomplishment was mastery of schoolboy Latin and even whose English was laced with colloquialisms, have devised an entire language, with its own unique grammar and syntax? It took Tolkien, a professor of philology, years to fabricate the Elvish tongue that figures so largely in his work; if Kelly fabricated the keys, he would have had to do so in a matter of days.

Enochian is hardly an “entire language,” any more than Quenya is, but comparing Enochian to Tolkien’s complex invention is a stretch. The best and most open-minded commentator on Dee’s angelic language is Donald Laycock, who observes that the phonology of Enochian is “thoroughly English,” providing hard and soft values for “c” and “g,” and combining the characters for “s” and “h” to represent the sound “sh.” The structure of the sentences is English as well, as anyone can readily see by the example provided earlier. Laycock notes an added problem:

The English rendering of the Enochian calls is very free, often using five or six words where the Enochian has one; thus, the word for “man” (or “reasonable creature”) is glossed as “the reasonable creatures of Earth, or Man” . . . Particles, prepositions, and pronouns are filled in where the sense requires them, but we do not know exactly what they are supposed to represent in Enochian.

There is some structure to the verbs and the pronouns, but the only verbs that show any consistency are “be” and “say.” Further, there is an attempt to make some nouns look as though they have declensions; Laycock writes that we find, for example, caog, caogga “earth,” caoggi “earth (accusative case),” caogin “than the earth,” caoggo “of earth,” caoggon “to the earth”—but are these really case endings, or just chance variants? The same case endings are not found from one noun to another, so that there are either a large number of different declensions (as in Latin or Greek), or else there are no case-endings at all. I incline toward the latter view.

Essentially, then, this language of the angels is incomplete, anglocentric, and simplistic, not at all the ingenious philological invention of a Tolkien—nor could it be; Dee and Kelley invented before the study of modern philology. Given the circumstances—a belief in angel correspondences—it is no wonder that Enochian seems produced haphazardly. Nor does it seem so remarkable if Kelley had created some of this language
privately, especially the basic words, and committed it to memory before he had ever met Dee. Kelley’s bad character and his moral depravity are used as excuses for non-intelligence, but linguistic prowess and eidetic memory can easily trump moral and social judiciousness—even learning—especially when compounded in a state of intense concentration. The impatient Dee may have driven Kelley to a level of exhaustion that contributed to his mental breakdown and the dissolution of their contract. Dee paid a terrible price for it, vilified and accused of spiritual error, his notes and diaries held up to judgmental scrutiny. Part of the tragedy is that Dee never made a secret of his angelic communications; he believed he was conducting a scientific examination of spiritual phenomena.

His reputation was tarnished in a way that Hildegard’s was not; at her death the Inquisition examined her works, including her Unknown Language and Letters, and found in them proof of her orthodoxy and godliness. It is interesting to compare these two persons of intelligence and influence (both of them conversing with monarchs) in terms of their ignotiae linguae and their devotion to religiously important or dangerous acts. The tenor of their separate eras and the means of devising their languages contributed to their reception among their contemporaries. Hildegard wrote during a time of intellectual challenge and change, and within the supportive structure of the Church wherein she was protected from the political squalls of the twelfth century. Dee wrote during a time of tremendous religious turmoil. His contact with his angels distracted him from his duties at court and was considered ancillary and suspicious. Further, by the end of the sixteenth century, a man who openly channeled languages or thought that he conversed with angels had become a figure of ridicule. Meanwhile, the elaborate attempts by the Philosophical Language Movement to produce the perfect international language were on the rise. This movement was stimulated in part by discovery of foreign natural languages, which kindled the imaginations of the eighteenth century.

George Psalmanazar and Princess Caraboo

The Orient and its cultural and linguistic mysteries inspired two famous hoaxes that involved imaginary languages and pretended identities: in 1703 the so-called George Psalmanazar claimed to be a native of Formosa (today Taiwan), with an invented alphabet and language that he described in his book A Historical and Geographical Description of Formosa (1704). Over a hundred years later “Princess Caraboo,” or a certain Mary Willcocks (alias “Baker”), was found wandering the English countryside speaking an unidentifiable language. Psalmanazar so fooled the European populace, partly
because they knew so little about the Far East, that he won a position at
Oxford to teach the Formosan language. Baker was identified by her for-
mer employers as the daughter of a Devonshire cobbler who ran away from
home and begged for a living under a number of guises, the most famous of
which is her persona “Princess Caraboo” from the land of Javasu.

Sixty years after he arrived in London and amazed the English populace,
Psalmanazar wrote his memoirs in which he confessed to his hoax and
claimed to be the son of poor German parents. His mother sent him to
France to be educated, and so talented was he at languages, especially Latin,
he decided to forge a new, more glamorous identity that would display his
learning and advance him socially. He thus became a converted, literate
Christian who had escaped his native and invented “Formosa,” a heathen
island of cannibalism. The credulity of his believers (he was blond and
had distinctly European features) is explained by Michael Keevak as an
eighteenth-century indifference to visible racial categories. Rather, it was
his Formosan alphabet and language that convinced them of his foreign-
ness, along with his excellent Latin, and Keevak writes that the story of
Psalmanazar’s success is “to a remarkable extent a story of language.” In
order to seem credible, he invented a writing system and filled his Description
of Formosa “with a kind of gibberish prose and verse, written in [his]
invented characters, which [he] muttered or chanted as often as the humour
took [him].” He was tested by the Reverend Alexander Innes who asked
him to translate a passage from Cicero, confiscated the paper, and asked
him to translate it again. Instead of exposing him, Innes exploited him for
fame and fortune, advising him to improve the believability of his Formosan.
It was a tedious charge, Psalmanazar reports in his memoirs, as he was “too
indolent to go thro’ the fatigue of forming a whole language.” His effort,
though, was an invented language that resembled the personal projects
I examine in the next chapter. Linguist Thomas Reisner declares it to be
“no mere farrago of whimsical nonsense improvised on the spur of the
moment, but the product of systematic construction,” much as I will
argue in defense of Hildegard’s compound words in chapter six. While
more extensive than More’s Utopian, Formosan is based on Latin models
of grammar, with a few exotic embellishments such as rising and falling
tones to indicate the familiar categories of tense one finds in Latin (present,
perfect, future, imperfect, pluperfect, and future perfect). Psalmanazar
provided root words with prefixes and suffixes, gendered articles, and in his
translation of the opening of “The Lord’s Prayer,” he relocates the copula
at the end of the sentence for exotic effect:

Amy Pornio dan chin Ornio viey
Our Father who in Heaven art.
Great regularity was a feature of Formosan, writes Keevak, something that would have exposed its artificiality to modern linguists, but not to a public accustomed to hearing from the Language Philosophers that the best (and perhaps the more exotic) languages were simple in construction, and who believed that these exhibited as little departure from European models as did Psalmanazar’s physical features.

Mary Baker’s pretended identity and invented language allowed her to cross boundaries of class and gender. Considered unruly and something of a tomboy, she started her adventures at the age of fifteen, running away from her abusive family, begging, cross-dressing, evading the law, conceiving a child out of wedlock, turning to prostitution and to an elaborate self-invention, which finally landed her in a gentlewoman’s estate where she enjoyed fame and attention as “Princess Caraboo,” escaped from pirates. While Psalmanazar attributed his pretenses to vanity and genius, Baker’s assumed identity derived from desperation, cunning, and great personal charm. Both imposters were of poor families and gifted in ways that were unusable in their stations in life. Baker’s decision to become Princess Caraboo stemmed from her experience in Bristol in 1817 when she tried to raise money for passage to Philadelphia. On the quays she met people of many different races, and since an 1817 initiative was passed in England to discourage and punish begging, Baker found it expedient to assume a more appealing form of vulnerability. She posed as a deserted princess from “Javasu” (inspired by the recent investigations of Java and Javanese) and wandered into Knole Park, owned by Samuel and Elizabeth Worrall. There she pretended not to understand English, and spoke only in gibberish, which she implied to the sympathetic Elizabeth Worrall was her native language.

When identified by a former employer, Baker was sooner to confess to her charlatanism than Psalmanazar, but though she had an invented alphabet, her language amounted to little more than a few made-up words published in the Bristol Mirror after her exposure. This “female Psalmanazar” became the subject of parody, but amazingly retained her popularity and was eventually given passage to America. Her story is important to the reception of women and language invention, in that along with Psalmanazar, she walked a thin line between grandiosity and criminality. The man’s charlatanism survived longer because his published book and his spurious position at Oxford established him within a tradition of scholarly male writing. Had Psalmanazar not enjoyed the leisure given him by another man to invent his language, he may have been exposed sooner than he was. Baker was subject to more suspicion, and she made more mistakes. Not as educated as Psalmanazar, she could only borrow words from gypsies and what little she knew (unusual for her class and gender) of oriental languages. Woman’s
speech since the Middle Ages has always been suspect, a reputation Hildegard escaped because of her profession and class status, and her reputation as a visionary incapable of lying. Baker’s consciously false and meaningless language carried all the weight of dangerous female utterance. In the late nineteenth century, some of this wild, unwomanly transgression, with its language invention and play-acting, was given a new medium, as it were, in spiritualism.

Hélène Smith’s Martian Language

“Martian,” along with the more developed “Hindoo” language, was “channeled” by a nineteenth-century Swiss medium named Catherine Élise Müller in a state of altered consciousness (as some assume Kelley contacted the angels and Hildegard received her Lingua). Hélène Smith, as she called herself, was the subject of a sensitive and complex study published in 1899 by psychologist and contemporary Théodore Flournoy. Des Indes à la Planète Mars: Étude sur un cas de somnambulisme avec la glossolalie switched its subtitle (when the English translation by Daniel B. Vermilye was reprinted by Sonu Shamdasani) to A Case of Multiple Personality with Imaginary Languages. It seems that as psychiatric theories about Smith’s condition altered (from somnambulism, here meant to express a “waking trance,” to dissociative identity disorder), so did the title of the book. At the end of the nineteenth century, with the rise of Pentecostalism and the interest taken in hysteria, hypnosis, automatic writing, speaking in tongues, and inquiries into the unconscious, the mysterious mentality of the female medium became a special area of study for the “subliminal psychologist.”

Smith was the daughter of a Genevoise mother and a Hungarian father who spoke five languages and had mastered Latin and Greek; so she came naturally by her linguistic talent. When Flournoy met her, she was employed at a commercial house where she had “risen to a very prominent position (une fort jolie situation)” Her work as a medium, where her remarkable gifts were best displayed, was unremunerated. In her childhood she was given to hallucinatory reveries observed while fully awake, but which she was reluctant to share with her mother. This phenomenon markedly recalls that of Hildegard’s childhood visions, kept hidden from her family. When writing to her friends, Smith produced, so she told Flournoy, “unknown characters that she remembered substituting involuntarily for French characters,” something Flournoy calls “hallucinations graphomotrices,” even though it is a common childhood game. It is not that I wish to dismiss the extraordinary nature of her vision, or even the possibility of cryptomnesia (suppressed memories) or self-hypnosis; but by taking on the personae of Léopold, Marie Antoinette, Simadini, Esenale
and others, Smith’s mediumship allowed her to play-act without inhibition or charlatanism.

For both Psalmanazar and Baker, the fantasy of being nobility from the Orient allowed them to escape their humble upbringing and provided them with some longed for fame and glamor. Flournoy remarks that Smith’s character, since childhood, “shows us that her dominant emotional tenor was an instinctive inner revolt against the modest surroundings into which destiny caused her to be born.” I wonder if it is possible to view these activities as remarkable achievements instead of failures, pathologies, or products of laughable naiveté. Language invention and the fantasies it engenders of exotic places are natural developments of human imagination and adult play. Taken to an extreme such pretenses can be dangerous. For Smith, the context of a medium was safe, and perfect for a woman who was visionary and multiply talented. Her altered states allowed her not only to connect with her gifts but also to attain some public prominence like Baker.

Two samples of Smith’s Martian suffice to show its structure:

```
ti iche cêné épênié ni ti ézi atèv astané ézi
De notre belle “Espénié” et de mon être Astané, mon
érié vîzé é vi...i kîché ten ti si ké di évé
âme descend à toi...oh! pourquoi près de moi ne de tiens-
dé étèche mîné izé bénèzée
tu toujours, amie, enfin retrouvée!
```

[From our beautiful “Espénié” and from my being, Astané, my soul descends to you . . . Oh why don’t you stay near me, friend, finally found again?]

```
cé évé plèva ti di bénèz éssat riz tès midée durée cé ténasé
Je suis chagrin de te retrouver vivant sur cette laide terre; je voudrais
riz iche épênié vêtèche iê ché atèv hêné ni pouv ten ti si
sur notre Espénié voir tout ton être s’élever et rester près de moi;
êni zée métîché oné gudé ni zée danié grêvé,
icí les hommes sont bons et les coeurs larges.48
```

[I am sorry to find you living in this hateful land; I would like to see all your being rise up to our Espénié and remain near me; here men are good and hearts generous.]

As with More’s Utopian, and Dee’s angelic language, Martian follows the structure of French in word and idiom: cé for je; ti for de; iche for notre; ten for près; si for moi, even with an imitation of the present perfect in retrouve/retrouvée: bénèz/bénèzée. Flournoy points out that elsewhere her word Métiche and Médache echo Monsieur and Madame, and, interestingly,
bons is here given the germanophonic equivalent gudé in the second example. As with some of the other languages we have looked at, the phonology of Martian is limited, its words ending rather monotonously on è or é. These written examples were garnered by what Flournoy calls “graphomotor automatism” written in Roman characters, but Martian came—as did Utopian, Enochian, Formosan, Baker’s gibberish, and Hildegard’s Lingua—with its own special script. Along with the language and its writing system, Smith produced an alien world, Espénié, as well as some extraordinarily beautiful paintings of the Martian cities and gardens, and of her contact, Astané.

Her communications with the people of Mars reflected her social and emotional interests: how they lived, what clothes they wore, what kinds of houses they built, what flying cars they drove. Unlike Smith, Hildegard’s visionary world along with her Lingua expressed an intellectual dimension that Smith’s Martian did not. It included social and political vocabulary; Hildegard called upon it for the dedication of a church and the castigation of popes; and it carried the weight of twelfth-century theological understanding of the divine Word. Finding Martian puerile, Flournoy conducted an experiment in which he pointed out to Smith while she was conscious the simplistic quality of her Martian language and its lack of credibility. Despite her protests, Flournoy noted in Smith’s subsequent channelings (especially in her Hindoo cycle) attempts to produce idioms that were not so evident calques of French. Whatever we may think of Smith’s girlish imagination or suggestibility, here we find a modern woman who, while she listened to the whisperings of Astané, her ambassador from Mars, and not the whisperings of God Himself, was a medium, as was Hildegard, for the transference of a foreign language and script—presumably without ordinary conscious effort.

**Invented Languages and Their Ambassadors**

It is easy to view Smith’s constructed world as belonging to an adolescent mentality and to dismiss it for that, especially in light of Psalmanazar and Baker’s pretenses. I prefer to see all these inventions as extraordinary acts of imagination wherein a revealed world that offers alterity to this one has a foreign language. It is part of the mythopoeic process, so popular in human creation and divination. In so many of these worlds there is an “ambassador” that translates for the discoverer: Philip in the “Evernew Tongue”; Christ in the *Pistis Sophia*; Raphael via Hithloday in More’s *Utopia*; the angels via Edward Kelley for John Dee. Psalmanazar and Baker play-acted at being their own ambassadors of Formosa and Javasu. Smith had numerous ambassadors, one of them being Flournoy, her interpreter and record
keeper. Hildegard’s creations were bifurcated: she was her own ambassador and speaker, but she also received her language “from above,” having also experienced remarkable glimpses into an emblematic world. It may have been easier for skeptics to accept the taxonomy as Hildegard’s invention if more unknown words like those to be found in “O Orzchis Ecclesia” occurred in her prophetic books instead of merely mentioned in a preface to one of them.

Each of these inventors of language and worlds had different motives for inventing and a different sense of their control over it. Each was influenced by the ethos of his or her times, the technologies available, and private intentions. For the medieval s, language invention was largely divine, demonic, or comic, and many of their examples were copied manually from lost exemplars. For the Renaissance magi, secrecy, magic, and code were the games that were played, accompanied by the new books made available by printing. The bizarre instruments Dee used—the charts, the scrying stone, the backward writing—heavily influenced not only his conception of what he was doing, but its reception by others. More was inspired to satire and veiled political criticism because in his day outright objection of policy was punished. Psalmanazar and Baker took advantage of the curiosity and ignorance of their patrons, and their fame was spread by journalists and painters. Smith’s invention was recorded by phonograph, and in her “automatic” writing she channeled her various languages, which Flourney then interpreted.

Some of these inventions were produced in what may be called “altered states,” but it is not clear where we divide vision and imagination, trance and deep concentration, or even how we define consciousness. It is also hard to draw a line between play and obsession, play and profession, and play and pathology. Play, as we shall see in the next chapter, is “ambiguous” because it often participates in areas not associated with it. Whether Hildegard was at “play” with her language and letters depends on how we define that word: in her time a woman of her status and calling could not merely be amusing herself. Neither of the creations by Hildegard or John Dee fit adequately, it seems, under the rubric of “play” as we know it, but play as it is ambiguous, and reflects pursuits that are serious. As time wore on, though, and as the world became more knowledgeable about language and society, more cynical about vision, and more preoccupied by mental illness, a certain stigma was attached to the creation of a private language. To invent a personal language had became associated less with inspiration than with the immature, the underdeveloped, the feminine, and the mad—a development that was to be reversed in the late twentieth century.
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CHAPTER FIVE

PLAY AND AESTHETIC IN CONTEMPORARY LANGUAGE INVENTION

[You must think that I forg’d the whole Story out of my own Brain; and if so, I am sure you extravagantly magnifie the fertility of my Invention, and the strength of my Memory; for he must be a Man of prodigious parts, who can invent the Description of a Country, contrive a Religion, frame Laws and Customs, make a Language, and Letters, etc. and these different from all other parts of the world.

—George Psalmanazar

So did George Psalmanazar defend his pretense in the second edition of his Historical and Geographical Description of Formosa (1705), claiming, as Michael Keevak writes, “that no one could possibly have made it all up.”1 This chapter examines the twentieth-century language inventors who are not only undaunted by “the fatigue of forming a whole language,” but are women and men of prodigious parts who describe countries, contrive religions and laws, and invent languages and letters—for fun. I will argue ultimately that the Internet and its chambers of play provide a respectable medium for personal pursuits—unattached to fiction or vision—that until now could only be expressed by fiction.

“The Ambiguity of Play”

In The Ambiguity of Play (1997), Sutton-Smith asks why it is we have assumed that only children play, whereas adults engage in “recreation”:

If one still assumes that children’s play is about general adaptation, growth, and development . . ., then what are the reasons for adult play? . . . one of the few to even consider the matter has suggested that while the child goes forward in his play, the adult goes sideways. This apparently means that children are
growing up while they are playing and adults are not. Presumably adults have already grown up, so the supposed growth virtues of play are irrelevant. If play is a preparation for maturity . . . , then what are the mature doing when they play? Are they preparing for death? Perhaps they are not preparing for anything.2

In his Homo Ludens (1950), Johan Huizinga notes a marked aspect of adult play: agon or “contest”3 that is merely “an interlude in our daily lives,”4 but has a competitive goal. In finessing such issues, Sutton-Smith gives five levels on a “scale of development” that have been proposed by theorists: (i) the inability to play, such as when one is under stress or illness; (ii) play as pathology, such as gambling, or dangerous obsessions and risk-taking; (iii) play as a form of security, “typical of what have been called ‘low-players,’ persons who are anxious or aggressive . . . and confine themselves to repetitive and minimally expressive forms of play”; (iv) play as stereotypic, such as games that have rigid rules like teams or spectator sports and are largely competitive; and (v) “playful forms of play.”5 The fifth is more complex, and involves a high degree of creativity wherein the players are able “to convert their own playful characteristics into play scenarios for others.”6 Such play demands flexibility, and has the “greatest potential for transfer” and adaptability. Sutton-Smith gives the fairly unsatisfying example of a baseball pitcher who “on rare occasions get[s] to be an outstanding thrower of hand grenades,”7 which suggests that what he means to define is an activity that changes from a ludic into a non-ludic occupation—or, as in the case with Mary Baker, a problem that was solved by sport. “The contrast between play and seriousness is always fluid,” writes Huizinga: “Play may rise to heights of beauty and sublimity that leave seriousness far beneath.”8 In this respect, art is a kind of “play” in that people may engage in it avocationally, but it becomes a serious vocation when it is a livelihood, providing professional outlets for nonartists when assessed in public venues. As for converting play into scenarios for others, a better example may be found in joke- or story-telling, where the playful banter of imaginative, rhetorically powerful people allows other people to quip in return. Psalmanazar’s aggressive play-acting ignited and involved intellectual Europe. Today, role-playing games allow adults to play in ways that were once considered the domain of children. On the Internet, LiveJournals, blogs, and message boards encourage playful transference and argument among adults who often take on invented personae.

If one assumes that language invention is a form of play, then one can ask where it falls within this “scale of development.” If we skip the first and take the second of Sutton-Smith’s categories, we find many instances in which language is used pathologically. “Clang association” in schizophrenic and
other cognitive disorders puts a premium on the sound of a word at the expense of its meaning. Distortions of language ("word salads" and "echolalia") are associated with schizophrenia or autism, the assumption being that they emerge from an inability to respond in socially appropriate discourse, the antithesis of the true sign in Augustine’s view of it. Dante’s Nimrod uses language pathologically, severing it from social and rational reference, and even glossolalia has been put in this category. Hildegard’s Lingua clearly does not fit under this rubric. The “low player” may prefer to play her language games by herself, imposing repetitive rules as a form of security, such as writing in diaries that no one can read (comparisons of Hildegard’s Lingua to a secret language have lost ground). Language invention hardly seems stereotypic, as it does not appear to imitate the widely known sports that bring people together, and Hildegard’s Lingua was unique to her time. Yet I assert that the last two categories, the stereotypic and the playful forms of play, with their competitive and incorporative aspects, are especially applicable to twentieth-century glossopoeia as it has developed on the Internet, and encouraged in the increasingly popular and respected genre of science fiction and fantasy writing. These categories probably move it furthest away from Hildegard’s purposes and milieu, at the same time that I see in these individual inventions a process that more closely approaches that of the *Ignota Lingua* than has been properly noted.

**The Internet Glossopoeists**

My interest in Hildegard’s Lingua was deepened by a discovery I made in 1998. Since about 1991, over three hundred people from around the world, I found, were “playing” on a Brown University sponsored listserv called CONLANG, a discussion group devoted to the CONstruction of LANGuages. These were not attempts at an international auxilliary language (IAL)—Volapük, Esperanto, Novial—but unique, detailed, imaginary languages, invented for intellectual, creative, and personal gratification, and demonstrate a fecund explosion of creative linguistics. The list had grown out of a discussion group devoted to IALs, but those interested in personal language invention had begun to overtake the list. Besides the increasing convenience of the Internet, the exhibition of personal invented languages seems to have developed from two major factors: a need to distinguish this kind of project from IALs and their fierce advocacy, and an exposure to fictional glossopoeia wherein the creator has sole control over his or her language. Contributors come from all walks of life (computer programmers, librarians, musicians, ministers, novelists, college professors, and students in a range of disciplines—especially linguistics), and many of them are multilingual. In my inquiries and observations, I found that the
demographics are primarily men from North America and western Europe although a few are from Australia/New Zealand, Asia, the Middle East, and South America, and they range in age from thirteen to over sixty years. It has doubled its participants since 1998, developed some subsidiary lists, and more women now contribute. Started a decade later, Mark Rosenfelder’s “Virtual Verduria Message Board,” named after his invented language and culture, became the “Zompist Bulletin Board” (ZBB); it has hundreds of contributors interested in mytho- and glossopoeia, and the “Conlanger Bulletin Board” (CBB) is also attracting new users.9

Today sophisticated computer technology offers an opportunity for showcasing invented worlds and languages. Elaborate websites display them graphically and aurally, and both the listserv and the message boards provide fora for their appreciation and discussion. On such sites one finds ordered lists of linguistic information, rather like the ordered list of the Ignota Lingua, the crucial differences being that inventors communicate with one another; compete with one another; do not, for the most part, look upon their work as divinely inspired; make use of a technology that is superior in access and speed to manuscript production and modern editing; and exhibit the vocabulary and categories of contemporary linguistic description. We find phonology, then orthography created through font-ware or scanning (invented scripts such as Hildegard’s ignotae litterae abound); then morphosyntax (the structure of the words and grammar with nouns usually first); and after that an alphabetized lexicon, sample passages, translations of writings, and often sung or spoken soundbytes.

The most important feature of these new inventions is their freedom from political or religious context: these inventors are not hiding their new words in secret writings because they are heterodox or cloaking their inventions in satire to keep a monarch from condemning them; they are not conduits for aliens or angels except fictionally, nor are most of them advocating for the latest lingua franca, but they invent for sheer pleasure. Nor are they simplistic calques of known languages. Many of these people invent to discover language principles, and since so many of them are students and teachers of linguistics, they show equal fascination with natural and invented language. On ZBB, the number of posts for “Language and Linguistics” far outstrips that for any other forum. They draw upon a variety of language types for models, are keenly aware of various branches of linguistics including cognitive linguistics, and seek new conceptual metaphors to live by in order to structure unique expressions.10

There are many different rubrics—a priori and a posteriori creations—those that invent new words and structure and those based on known language groups or types, and combinations thereof. An artlang differs from a log- or engelang, the first being an imaginary language produced for aesthetic
reasons and the second an experiment in “theoretical linguistics,” produced to avoid the ambiguities inherent in natural languages. Its goal is better, more precise communication, superior application to computer technology, and examination of new linguistic possibilities. Some “conlangers,” as they call themselves, are interested primarily in the invention and not in the painstaking acquisition of vocabulary, and take up and discard projects like shedding clothes; others work on one language for decades. Indeed, the ambiguity of play and aesthetic in this pursuit is apparent in the disputes about whether private language invention is a “hobby” or an “artform.” The issue hinges on the matter of consumption and appreciation, still largely contained within the virtual community itself. The critical material on this development is almost exclusively electronic. The sheer enormity of important analysis on contemporary “conlangery” is all on the Internet, spanning nations and cultures. It may appear that this development moves furthest away from what Hildegard was doing; a second glance shows that despite their philosophical, cultural, or religious differences, their invented languages derive, as perhaps did Hildegard’s Lingua, from private joy taken in verbal innovation.

In speaking with these glossopoeists I have come to understand that the more original a language is for some, the better, and many have moved away from nominative/accusative languages (found in our western European languages and in the Elvish tongues of Tolkien) to invent ergative/absolute languages (similar to Basque and Georgian), or trigger languages (such as Tagalog and other Austronesian languages); some have created their own typologies, inventing verbless languages (such as Sylvia Sotomayer’s Këlen), “stack” languages based on the computer model of “last in first out” (such as Jeffrey Henning’s difficult Fith with its uniquely embedded clauses), and other structurally and cognitively strange Linguas, such as H.S. Teoh’s Tatari Faran and its ingenious case system, or John Quijada’s engineered language Ithkuil, which aims for maximum precision with maximum concision. As membership increases, though, and as the pursuit gains more public prominence, it has become less incapable, as J.R.R. Tolkien famously put it, for an invented language to win a prize: “Tepa [invented by Dirk Elzinga] is simply the most professional treatment of an artlang on the Internet,” writes Henning on his award-winning Internet site “Langmaker,” making it clear that constructed languages are being judged for beauty, efficiency, originality, and sophistication. The secret vice has become a public virtue.

Sutton-Smith’s fifth category of play is most evident here in the creative transactions of these inventors. The Internet has allowed them to confer and interact with an ease unknown by previous media. Participants ask for and give advice, comment on linguistic information, and share aspects of
their own languages—all of which lead to forms of transformation and maturation. *Ill Bethisad*, for instance, is a community of conlangers who have collaborated on an alternate earth, a pastime that requires a considerable knowledge of history and current events. These inventors are not going sideways, they are going forward: they borrow words from one another, make their own languages more subtle while increasing their linguistic knowledge of natural languages in the process, expand their glossaries, and invent shared neologisms.

They engage as well in translation games. The most popular challenge has been the Babel Text, examples of which can be found among Henning’s *Langmaker* pages: scores of conlangers have translated “The Tower of Babel” in Genesis 11:1–9 for its obvious relevance. A Translation Relay, invented by Irina Rempt in 1998, is based on the old childhood game “Telephone”: a “Relay Master” draws up a list of contestants and a timetable. He or she writes a short text in her language and sends it to the first contestant privately with a glossary (often divided into roots and affixes) and a detailed description—but no translation—of how the language is structured. The recipient has forty-eight hours to translate that text into his or her language with instructions sent on to the next recipient. The contest comes round again to the Relay Master who then publishes the texts and translations online, showing the often amusing changes the original piece has undergone. Such an exercise participates in Sutton-Smith’s “playful forms of play,” engaging not only literal transference, but active involvement of one participant with another’s invented language: mistakes, double-meanings, and cultural differences are essential to the game.

It seems, then, that an artistic form of expression and play associated uniquely with J.R.R. Tolkien is a deep well-spring for a large number of people today, and not merely because of his influence. In a 1998 survey that I took online, and repeated in 2003 and 2005, many confessed to having started an invented language at puberty before they had heard of Tolkien or Esperanto, although these sources were inspirations for newer members. Many of them were inspired as was Hildegard by having learned another language, and by perusing a textbook. Many of them worked in isolation, thinking that they were original in their pursuit. Tolkien himself tells the poignant story of encountering another language inventor in the army while they both listened to a lecture:

I shall never forget a little man . . . revealing himself by accident as a devotee, in a moment of extreme ennui . . . The man next to me said suddenly in a dreamy voice: “Yes, I think I shall express the accusative case by a prefix!”
A memorable remark! . . . Just consider the splendour of the words! “I shall express the accusative case.” Magnificent! Not “it is expressed,” nor even the more shambling “it is sometimes expressed,” nor the grim “you must learn how it is expressed” . . . Here were no base considerations of the “practical,” the easiest for the “modern mind,” or for the million—only a question of taste, a satisfaction of a personal pleasure, a private sense of fitness.18

Especially significant is Tolkien’s reaction to the ownership, the “I” behind the language, as well as the personal nature of a game not made to be an Esperanto, nor a prescription set down by the grammatical lawgivers, but for individual satisfaction. The man was his own nomothete and onomaturge, just like Tolkien. He could get nothing further from the man, who “proved as close as an oyster,” although his “smile was full of a great delight, as of a poet or painter seeing suddenly the solution of a hitherto clumsy passage.”19 Earlier in the essay Tolkien explains the “bashfulness,” even “shame” that inventors of private languages often feel—so much so, he writes, of course prematurely, “that they hardly ever show their works to one another, so none of them know who are the geniuses at the game, or who are the splendid ‘primitives’ . . .”20 That Tolkien met this fellow thinker by chance suggests an invisible prevalence of private language makers during the Great War, and perhaps earlier, who found no notoriety for their private game—not being famous mediums, charlatans, necromancers, or visionaries—but found no comrades, either, in a psychiatric age emerging from Hélène Smith’s exposure. Tolkien was not alone, then, in his “vice,” and it is the Internet that has given it its fullest outlet.

What is notable, too, is the sense of delight expressed by Tolkien, observed in his fellow recruit, and a nice antidote to Artaudian torment. The list and board as I have observed them leap, vault, and sing in cataphatic enthusiasm for exposure and argument. Popular music is another outlet that expresses an intense joy taken in linguistic creativity: Lisa Gerrard, Bobby McFerrin, and the musical groups *Cocteau Twins*, *Ekova*, *Urban Trad*, and *Sigur Rós* offer spontaneous lyrics—a kind of musical glossolalia—that are sound experiments or “fantasy languages,” empty of meaning but given significance by melody. These developments are partly a result of exposure to international music; they more often resemble actual foreign languages than they resemble “scat,” so much so that many listeners are unaware of their artificiality. Composers and musicians who are also language inventors (a high number of the Internet glossopoeists admitted to being musical) share something in common with Hildegard and her musical gift. The degree to which the online inventors display a talent for order and taxonomy is also marked: roughly half of those I surveyed are involved in digital technologies, mathematics, or computer science. This tendency toward
system prevails as well in Hildegard, whether she is grouping healing elements into categories (the *Physica*), describing and analyzing her visions (*Scivias, Liber divinorum operum*), or producing a list of invented words arranged by hierarchy and topic—God to cricket.

**Women Inventors on the Internet**

Because this book revolves around the invention of a remarkable medieval woman and its context within similar inventions, it behooves me to focus as well on contemporary language inventions by women. I repeat, however, what I said in my introduction: in the contemporary conlangs by women, which I have perused, I do not find a marked “feminine” approach to language invention, nor do any of them seem any more inspired by Hildegard’s *Ignota Lingua* than male inventors are. Hildegard’s Unknown Language has simply been too unknown. Nevertheless, the gender inequality of both the list and the board is harder to explain. A traditional and unsatisfactory answer is that men are more often trained in symbolic systems and computer sciences than women, but that gap is closing. It may be that men and women online feel more comfortable in same-sex venues where there is some discursive, argumentative, and cultural commonality—such as the message boards that are newer than the old-fashioned Listservs. Hundreds of men have contributed on CONLANG compared to about thirty contributing women over the years I have frequented it. The structure of a message board with its graphics, its sorted threads, and its pseudonyms encourages anonymity, playfulness, and consequently a kind of equalizing of gender, expertise, and education.

Many women today obviously enjoy systems analysis, role-playing, and mythopoeia, but my sense is that women are being trained to pursue print publication and other achievements that will establish their importance in a more visible community. It may merely be that men have traditionally had more freedom than women to relax that pragmatism in the pursuit of seemingly inutile projects, just as Hildegard, in her freedom from marriage and her exposure to literacy, could write and experiment with language. The objections raised by a woman novelist to a lecture I gave on language invention is telling: in a fantasy novel, she said in so many words, it will be the novel that sells and its story—not the created language in the novel. Do as Jonathan Swift did and give us only a few sentences of Lilliputian, saving your energy for the work that will publish. This advice is not an example of feminine indifference to system. It is a novelist’s practicality and one that makes sense, but it could easily have been uttered by a man. It does not address, however, the art of language invention, which satisfies a unique form of creativity for both women and men.
Irina Rempt’s Ilaini and Sylvia Sotomayor’s Kêlen are showcased on the Internet at present; both have contributed volubly to the list, and their languages represent different approaches to online presentation. Rempt’s pages are voluminous and take us into an immensely colorful world of Valdyas with maps, cities, customs, drawings, scripts, games, histories, literature, recipes, and soundbytes, and she has created a separate listserv just for the Translation Relays. Ilaini, the language of Valdyas, is highly inflected with SOV (subject/object/verb) word order, post-positions instead of prepositions, and no copula. Rempt has devised three noun-classes in five cases (originally nine; some have been conflated over time), which add a naturalness to her language. Adjectives are structured like nouns, and verb conjugations have been simplified. The following is her initial text in the very first Conlang Translation Relay of 1998:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Hanleni halsen varyenan laynat} & \quad \text{The song of the starlings speaks of heroic deeds} \\
\text{Daysinen verein idanla le listat} & \quad \text{In the morning rain the heron does its laundry} \\
\text{Havien hinla laziena forat} & \quad \text{In the night the lark worships the stars} \\
\text{Culea rachleni arlea a chalat?} & \quad \text{Who sees the true nature of birds?}
\end{align*}\]

Here is her interlinear analysis of the first two lines:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{hanleni} & \text{halsen} & \text{varyenan} & \text{laynat} \\
\text{starling-gen-p} & \text{song-nom-s} & \text{heroic.deed-acc-p} & \text{SPEAK-PRS-3s} \\
\text{daysinen} & \text{verein} & \text{idanla} & \text{le listat} \\
\text{rain-loc-c} & \text{morning-gen-s} & \text{heron-nom-s} & \text{RFL} & \text{RINSE-PRS-3s}\end{array}
\]

Rempt’s pages remind me of Ursula K. Le Guin’s book *Always Coming Home* (1985) in its hypertextuality and the painstaking development of a believable culture. Her language is intended to be naturalistic and a development of her invented world. While Sotomayor is no less interested in mythopoeia and extraordinary peoples, her invention reminds me more of Elgin’s Láadan in its devotion to an experiment. Kêlen is her “laboratory” for “exploring the line between a human and a non-human language.” Learning about linguistic “universals” prompted Sotomayor to “take a universal and violate it.”23 One of the prominent and debated linguistic universals is that there is always a distinction between nouns and verbs, at least in concept if not in form, so what she does is provide her Kêlen with a small number of closed-class particles called “relationals” that perform the function of verbs “without any of the semantic concepts.” There are four of them: \textit{la}, “which asserts that an argument exists in a location or state”; \textit{ni},
“which asserts that an argument is or has changed its location or state; se “which asserts that an argument is related to a source or a goal”; and, pa, “which asserts that one argument contains another.” These may look like verbs when translated into English but they behave more like prepositions:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
la & jačela & sū & jačeva. \\
\text{location:} & \text{bowl} & \text{on} & \text{table.}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
ōra & ūi & jačela & jačeva
\end{array}
\]

Complete newstate bowl (nom. sg.) broken (nom. sg)
New state: bowl now complete brokenness, or, “the bowl broke.”

Here is Sotomayor’s translation of the first words of Genesis 11:1: “Once long ago, the world had only one language”:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
Ielte & la & an-māru-i
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{temporal modifier} & \text{location} & \text{world}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
pa & an-taxon-i & ân & tēna.
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{relative to} & \text{language} & \text{one} & \text{all.}
\end{array}
\]

Although verbless languages have been an experiment since the 1950s, fellow conlangers consider Kēlen to be efficient, elegant, strange, and innovative, and its writing system is greatly admired. It exhibits two kinds of scripts, “regular script” and “box script,” the former hanging its curved and dotted letters from a horizontal line, a little like Sanskrit, and the latter placing them vertically in “boxes,” to present a train of elaborate panels. Clearly, contemporary men and women have private lives of imaginative invention and the Internet is allowing them, in ways never before seen, to share their unusual dreams.

**Elgin’s Láadan and Le Guin’s Kesh**

Two other women inventors I wish to examine appear in print, and show different purposes and venues. Both are established and prolific professional writers. Linguist and novelist Suzette Haden Elgin’s science-fiction trilogy seems primarily the vehicle for her feminist linguistic project, Láadan, meant as a reform of language for women. Its details are compiled in her 1985 *A First Dictionary and Grammar of Láadan*, expanded in the second edition (1988) and reissued with a CD. Ursula K. Le Guin’s Kesh, on the other hand, seems supplemental to her novel *Always Coming Home*, which features an extended glossary at the end.

Láadan is a language “constructed by a woman, for women, for the specific purpose of expressing the perceptions of women.” In this respect
it comes closest to Jeffrey Schnapp’s notion of a modern “uglossia,” a perfected language, which shares some of the utopian qualities he finds in Hildegard, and it has its own society of followers and practitioners. It also offers the most pertinent comparison to Hildegard’s moral and social philosophy. Elgin aims in Láadan to correct the errors of phallocentrism in English and other languages, and which, she says, discourages gendered language experiments in fiction: an imagined society of women and women’s perceptions can only be narrated in language that has developed over the centuries for use by men. More broadly, she seeks to remedy the errors of Western language in general. Elgin provides an important counterexample to Tolkien in that her linguistic models are not familiar European languages but the structures of Native American and other less well-known grammars. While Elgin is realistic about Láadan’s adoption in real life, she nevertheless sees her language as a kind of “file” to polish and be polished, and encourages newcomers to use and adapt it. As a novelist, she comments on the difficulty of representing otherly gendered peoples in fantasy and science fiction. She realized that in writing the novel about a language created by women she could not merely “insert a handful of hypothetical words and phrases to represent it”; she had to “experience what such a project would be like.”

Native Tongue resembles in some respects Margaret Atwood’s The Handmaid’s Tale (1986), and like Atwood’s novel it depicts a future world that has disenfranchised and infantilized its female citizens. Women have two uses in society—breeding and translating—and have been denied all other rights. The protagonist discovers that an underground movement has been started by elderly women to unite and empower themselves through a secret language. Such a project reminds one of Nu Shu, the writing system devised by the Hunan peasant women of China who were condemned to illiteracy and isolation, and brought to light in Ye-Qing Yang’s documentary by the same name (1999).

This experiment restructures Western language with a completely new and clipped vocabulary. The grammar is basically aimed at fellow linguists and language inventors, and is speculative and creative in nature. Not counting some of the function words, the glossary in A First Dictionary and Grammar of Láadan lists approximately 1,050 nouns, adjectives, verbs, numerals, and names for days of the week and the months. Láadan makes distinctions between different forms of the verb a, “to love, love”: áayáa, “mysterious love, not yet known to be welcome or unwelcome”; am, “love for one related by blood”; azh, “love for one sexually desired now”; aye, “love that is unwelcome and a burden,” and so forth, and there are similar distinctions made with “state of consciousness” morphemes for “anger,” “compassion,” “contentment,” and “grief.” Láadan also puts at the beginning of every sentence a “speech-act morpheme,” which indicates whether
the sentence is a statement, a question, or a request. It borrows from Navaho a pejorative particle that attaches to nouns initially or finally, turning \textit{awith} (“baby”) into \textit{lha unh} or \textit{aw unh} (“darned baby”). Láadan has temporal particles, doing away with complex verbal conjugations; it has no articles; it has a non-gendered pronoun that is nevertheless given honorific degrees (“neutral,” “beloved,” “honored,” “despised”), and it makes no distinction between verbs and adjectives. The word \textit{thal} means both “good” and “be good.” I offer the following constructions of my own:

\begin{center}
\textit{Bii thal omid wa.}
\end{center}

declarative sentence good horse evidence morpheme.

“I see the horse [to be] good.”

Object complements (“case phrases”) are formed without the copula:

\begin{center}
\textit{Bii be edutháhath wí.}
\end{center}

declarative sentence she doctor evidence morpheme.

“It is widely known that she [is] a doctor.”

Láadan’s most important and interesting linguistic feature is a structure of evidentials (or “evidence morphemes”) modeled after certain Native-American languages in which no statement can be made that does not reflect how the speaker has arrived at the information she utters. Thus \textit{wa} and \textit{wí} in the constructed sentences supplied above suggest, respectively, that the speaker understands her statement to be true (i) because she has observed it first hand, and (ii) it has been observed by everyone. This feature, along with the banishment of the copula, reinstates the excluded middle and discourages essentialisms. Why this should be an apt grammatical feature for a woman’s language seems obvious on the surface, as logocentrism, defined by Jacques Derrida, puts \textit{logos} (both “word” and “law”) at the center of Western language, underscoring epistemological dependence on a set of universal principles handed down by masculine rule, rather than on personal observation. Men, however, have invented such constructions, and Elgin’s language would seem to benefit both men and women.

While Elgin encourages its use and development by others, her Láadan has not gained the popularity that Esperanto has, partly because its structure and phonology are foreign to the average language learner (the tonal quality of the language is difficult to master without the CD), it does not offer the kind of mythopoeia that Klingon does for gamefully minded people, and because it is targeted mainly for use by women, regrettably a still unpopular cause among the public. For Elgin, women are socially and
cognitively different from men and have different linguistic needs. Her glossary includes a selection of words that represent subtle social and emotional concepts wherein the negating prefix ra-addresses and fills in a discursive aporia; recognizable in its exposed absence:

- **radamahl**: to non-touch with evil intent.
- **radecla**: non-garden, a place that has much flash and glitter and ornament, but no beauty.
- **ralith**: to deliberately refrain from thinking about something.39

Láadan also offers some efficient neologisms for concepts of interest to women that can only be expressed by circumlocution in English: *lila*, for instance, means to “female-sexual act,” that is, to engage in sex from the female point of view.40 *Asháana* means “to menstruate joyfully.”41 To express such concepts in English would require a sentence, perhaps even a story.

In a note in her introduction, Elgin wonders “whether St. Hildegarde’s [sic] motivation for the construction of her language was a sense that no language adequate to express her perceptions was available to her.”42 This interesting query returns us not only to the matter of Hildegard’s antiphon (“O Orzchis Ecclesia”) and its unknown words that have problematic translations, but also to her employment of unique metaphors in Latin. In the Lingua, however, I see nothing that reveals Elgin’s speculation, as all her published words can be expressed in Latin or German. A creature of her times, Hildegard had no interest in a language for women only; her goal was the delivery of a divine message to all humankind, and God’s reliance on her as a prophet and speaker was a burden He could confer on any human being. Her aesthetic replacements, however, I discuss in my next chapter, where I speculate that natural elements are given what look like feminine endings; also, her inclusion of female attire and jewelry intrigues, especially given her custom of allowing her nuns on Holy Days to wear their hair exposed, covered only by veils and golden crowns. Her response to Tenxwind’s snipe at this indulgence is provocative: *Virgo non habet tegmen crinium uriditatis sue in precepto* [A virgin (as opposed to a married woman) is not ordered to cover up her tresses of youthful vigor (literally, “of greenness”)].43 Once again, the potent Latin metaphor allows Hildegard to associate feminine beauty with God’s creation in a splendid and astonishing statement: *O quam mira res es, que in sole fundamentum posuiste et inde terram superasti!* [O [woman] what a wonderful thing you are, who have established your foundation in the sun and have thus surpassed the earth!].

Regrettably, there is little else in the list that expresses concepts unfamiliar to people or preference given to women. Despite her encomia to
Mary or her many visions wherein female figures represent honored concepts, Hildegard shared with her era the notion that only virginity and maternity dignified women who were ordinarily weak vessels, and she continually referred to the frailty of her sex—*paupercula feminea forma*. Barbara J. Newman remarks, however, that Hildegard’s frequent employment of this *humilitas* topos humbles the writer at the same time that it exalts her authority, while challenging the reader to transcend worldly standards and glorify God in his prophet. Hildegard’s sex thus becomes her personal claim to that divine foolishness and weakness which is stronger and wiser than men. And in this case, “men” means not *hominis* but *viri*, for Hildegard was keenly aware of her anomalous role as a woman. In fact, she saw her gender as an essential condition of her prophetic call which, like the Old Testament prophets, she interpreted in broadly historical terms.

Nevertheless, both Hildegard’s Lingua and Elgin’s Láadan share the concept of a perfected language, a language meant for an educated group of people (the religious literate and politically minded women), and an experiment that attempted to purify the corruptions of known language and turn them into youthful vigor. Both women are deeply interested in the social and moral uses of language, both show reverence for the Holy (see Elgin’s translation of the Lord’s Prayer and two psalms), and both share the conviction that there are better words and structures for their philosophical interests.

Le Guin is a prolific, award-winning novelist whose work stretches the envelope of mainstream fantasy and science-fiction narrative technique. She has always been deeply interested in the problems and mysteries of gender and language, but only began exploring her power as a feminist writer in *The Left Hand of Darkness* (1969), winner of the Hugo and Nebula Awards. A complex and deeply philosophical book, it features a race of androgynous humans populating the planet Gethen, or “Winter,” who only become “male” or “female” in their mating cycle: “kemmer.” The rest of the time they remain in “somer,” or sexual neutrality. They are visited by “first mobile” Genli Ai, a man from whose point of view most of the story is told, and an anthropologist and visitor who must see if these people can be invited into the interplanetary “Ekumen.” The major linguistic problem for Le Guin was the pronoun, as the story was being narrated by Genly in English: “man I must say, having said ‘he’ and ‘his.’” She attempts to suggest something of these people’s androgyny by mixing up generic signals: “My Landlady, a voluble man. . . .” but the end result, unfortunately, is that we still see all these Gethenians as male. The pronoun insists on it, and, sexual creatures that we are, it is impossible for us to imagine humans as neuters. Le Guin was
criticized by feminists for her use of “he” and “him” in the novel, and her dilemma precisely exhibits the problem Elgin addresses: the portrayal of gendered alterity in fiction is constrained by the limitations of English.

Le Guin is nevertheless a masterful neologist. From *The Left Hand* we find *somer, kemmer, shifgrethor* (“shadow”: the complex sense of self that requires certain formalities and reticences in addressing others, but which obfuscates open communication), *nusuth* (the philosophy of acquired ignorance and noninterference), *dothe* (the burst of supranormal physical strength one can summon mentally), *thangen* (the “dark sleep” needed to recuperate from that effort). And then there is the sheer evocativeness of her names for people and places. Like Hildegard’s Lingua, her words are drawn from a keen sense of sound for concept: Genly starts his mission in the ancient, rigid, yet familiarly European city of *Erhenrang* in *Karhide*, visits the evocatively eastern mystics called the *Handdara*, and travels to *Mishnory*, the principal city of *Orgoreyn* among the *Orgota*, where he is kidnapped and imprisoned—each of these names reminding one vaguely of German, English, Sanskrit, Russian, and Native American languages.

In *Always Coming Home*, Le Guin shows much more of a penchant for actual language invention with a glossary of words and translated samples of Kesh, a word meaning “valley.” This novel is nominally science fiction in that it is set in the far future, but it is better described as a fictive anthropology, a description of a people distantly resembling a Native American tribe living in California’s Napa Valley who have returned it to a kind of Eden. Her opening vignette, “Towards an Archaeology of the Future,” has Pandora, the patient scientist, sifting through sand for the parts of the town she is looking for, and consequently the story is written for the patient reader who finds The Valley, or *kesh*, in these pieced-together narratives. *Always Coming Home* expands on the structure of *The Left Hand of Darkness* in interspersing the story told by the woman “Stone Telling” with other stories, poems, histories, maps (drawn by Le Guin), illustrations (by George Hersh), and archival materials gathered by the fictional Pandora. Much of this is put in an appendix titled “The Back of the Book” so that “those who want narrative can ignore them and those who want explanations can find them.” The novel does not read like a traditional novel, but resembles a hypertext wherein the reader is free to skip through the book at random. Rempt’s online pages about Valdyas resemble what Le Guin is doing in their collections of information about her people, down to the maps, the illustrations, the recipes, the descriptions of Valdyan clothing and customs, and of course the language and literature with its script—in Ilaini, English, or Dutch, and in any order one wants.

Seeking explanations and details, I counted the words in the Kesh dictionary (*Always Coming Home*) and found that it is a little over half as long
as Hildegard’s Lingua, although it is not a comprehensive list of all the words used in the novel and its appendices, which suggests a much richer project than the glossary can contain. In “The Back of the Book” we also find a script for Kesh, samples of songs set to music in Kesh, and a few explicated phrases in Kesh. The notated music in the reprinted edition is the only real example of sustained Kesh, for Le Guin provides no grammar, letting us infer it in her only interlinear translation of a sentence in Kesh—a rendering of William Blake’s “The Whole Business of Man is the Arts, and All Things Common”:

\[
\begin{align*}
Húíshev & \quad wewey & \quad tushēye & \quad ru \\
\text{of-two-legged people} & \quad \text{[adj]} & \quad \text{all} & \quad \text{[s.n.] work this [is]} \\
gestanai & \quad m & \quad duwey & \quad gochey. \\
\text{doing things well, art} & \quad \text{and} & \quad \text{[o.n.] all shared, held in common.}
\end{align*}
\]

From her glossary we can deduce that her language is agglutinative and zero-copula, as the earlier example illustrates, and that demonstrative adjectives follow rather than precede their nouns: \textit{húí} means “human,” that is, a “two-legged people” (personhood is conferred upon animals), the suffix \textit{-sh} confers agency, and \textit{-e} presumably represents possession. As in Láadan, verbs and nouns are not distinguished apparently: \textit{Sheíye} is “to work, to do, to act,” but also “work, business, doing, industry,” and it is prefixed above by \textit{tí}, meaning “through a substance,” that is, fashioning something concrete. Adjective \textit{wewey} (“all”) is distinguished from the noun \textit{duwey} (“all”) in its prefix. \textit{Stanai} means “art, skill craft; to do or practice something with skill.” Prefix \textit{ge-} is not listed in the glossary, but I presume it signifies the object in a declarative sentence. In a section on medical practices, though, the word appears as the closest approximation in Kesh to “health,” considered an action, not a condition.\textsuperscript{52} Here, then, is my translation: “All this work of people is art well-done [or ‘living well’], and shared by all.” Unlike More’s Utopian or Smith’s Martian, this is not a calque in English of the sentence by Blake, nor does it seem to mean quite the same thing. Craft has been put into this language. Unlike Tolkien and more like Elgin, though, the language was inspired by the novel, and does not reveal a sustained, independent project (like Rempt’s Ilaini).\textsuperscript{53} In prefacing her appendix with this sentence, though, Le Guin reminds us of the art that has gone into her novel’s making and her willingness to share it.

Le Guin’s joyous focus on the restoring powers of earth and community through music and language brings her closer than ever to Hildegard’s religious world and her \textit{viriditas}, and certainly reflects something of the medieval woman’s range of talents and vision. \textit{Always Coming Home} is a deeply spiritual book—\textit{heyiya} is “a sacred, holy, or important thing”\textsuperscript{54}—about a return to
nature and community, a respect for animals, a delight taken in music and ritual, and most importantly it is about compassion. Like Láadan, Kesh has a list of the various aspects of love—an important abstract missing in the Ignota Lingua, but not in Hildegard’s writings. Unlike Hildegard’s visionary world, though, Kesh does away with patriarchic depictions of God—even, perhaps, with God altogether.

**Wittgenstein’s “Private Language”**

An important question this chapter must ask is why language needs to be artistically redesigned at all if it is not meant to correct some social problem or become part of a mythos. We already have poetry, fiction, and song wherein one’s urge to stretch language can be satisfied, so why make up a personal language so few can participate in? Its foreign scripts are beautiful, but it is not an object like an artist’s landscape in which viewers can recognize trees, mountains, rivers, or birds flying—at a glance. It can communicate no message to outsiders except the fact of itself and its splendid alterity. It cannot be reached into and manipulated (as one can a miniature) without the laborious task of learning it—so why should an outsider go to the trouble of piecing Kesh together—or an author offer a word-for-word translation of it? In their displays and explications online, the Internet language inventors show their eagerness for others to understand the systems and aesthetics of their inventions. Like Hildegard, many are demonstrably interested in opening up their artistry to the public at large, or at least having it recognized as an art, which is what this book intends in part to do. But a personal language inevitably invites us to ask whether it truly is a “language.” All of them, though, meet Benveniste’s requirements for real language by using apprehensible signs within a coherent linguistic discourse. It is the social aspect, others aver, its circulation within the world, that make language language, and so few language inventors besides Marc Okrand, inventor of Klingon, achieve social use of their creations.

In his *Philosophical Investigations* (1958), Wittgenstein interrogates what he calls a “private language”: frequently misunderstood by those who think it means an idioglossia not shared with anyone. Private language for Wittgenstein, rather, is a phantom, an impossibility in language, and an argument he uses to hypothesize and refute solipsism—that is, private signification of the incommunicable self. Language is a system wherein we obey agreed-upon linguistic rules, and which functions to display and communicate both objective and subjective experience in lived reality. One can use conventional words to describe private feeling (no matter how inaccurate or general), but we understand our private feelings only because
of the public and ostensive nature of language. We understand thirst or jealousy because we can apply by analogy the accounts spoken and written by others to our own sensations and experiences, what Benveniste calls “intersubjectivity.” There can be no “private” language wherein we engage in “inner ostentation,” Wittgenstein avers—assigning highly personal names to subjective sensations that are not intelligible to another human being or cannot be pointed to—and have it be considered language as we know it. Here Wittgenstein addresses a philosophical argument long in the making: how we have access to the world outside of our speaking of it. It should be clear that none of the displayed and explicated languages are private languages in this sense, nor is Hildegard’s.

More useful to my argument is what Wittgenstein writes in *Philosophical Occasions*—wherein he makes a distinction between “privacy” and “superprivacy.” Ordinary privacy assumes that one hides from others thoughts that could be expressed if the subject wished to, but does not. Superprivacy assumes an inaccessibility of meaning: “Nobody but I can see it, feel it, hear it; nobody except myself knows what it’s like.” This distinction approaches the one I made earlier in this study between Volmar’s reference to Hildegard’s “inaudita linguae” and the one that is recorded—an experience she had in her head (that she perhaps could not articulate—superprivacy), a list of words that she had not yet written down (ordinary privacy), and the project that was revealed. No one who has posted his or her language online is interested in its superprivacy, or even in keeping the invented language “ordinarily” private. That is why they are published and described, as was Hildegard’s Lingua. The Internet conlangers are open and cataphatic in their discussions and descriptions of imaginary language. Meanwhile, the stinging criticism from those hostile to the art is still “why not spend your time learning natural languages?” In reply I assert that learning a natural language and inventing a personal one call upon different kinds of linguistic cognition, and produce different results. What these modern language inventors exhibit is a delight taken in a new form of xenographia—“foreign writing”—and new forms of utterance. They remove language from its quotidian context and construct a new edifice out of it, the elements of which they display as something foreign to be read or heard by others, and torn down and reconstructed by themselves. For this reason they have taken as their primary symbol (and flag) the Tower of Babel.

**Language Invention and Mimesis**

The degree to which play involves itself in simulacrum or imitation—whether it be the games of a child or the re-creations of an adult—is
crucial to examining invented language. An invented language has been compared to the “model” and the “miniature,” but these analogies are a little inaccurate in that they call to mind miniatures of specific things, like an inch-to-foot replica of the Empire State Building. A contemporary invented language, rather, is a “pretend” language in the way that an actor is a pretend person, a romance novel a pretend adventure, and mythopoeia a pretend culture and history. The invented language (or uglossia) has “no place” recognizable to viewers outside of its site of display or its existence within the mind of its maker. I would rather call it a supplement of written language (since only a fraction of these conlangers “speak” their inventions), which produces an interesting new deferral: it is both an addition to and a replacement of natural written language, which is itself a supplement of spoken language. The difference, then, between language invention in our day and Hildegard’s lies in the acknowledgment of the imaginary, imitative, and essentially “fake” nature of this pursuit. Hildegard would never have spoken of her Lingua as “pretend” or “false,” or even as a “game.” For her, it was a transcendent truth. It is mimetic, though: her Ignota Lingua imitates the taxonomy and lemmata of the German summarium available to her from Trier, and the phonology of the words she relexifies.

Inventing language fed and still feeds desires for the exotic, the imaginary, the pleasure of defamiliarization, the need to “contain” something larger than life, the love of making a new sound represent an old signified—or even of bringing complex concepts into existence by a new word: “maggelity,” after Christophe Grandisire’s language Maggel; the ridiculous difficulty factor of a language that has more irregularities than regularities—an aesthetic all its own. “Lâ̂r̃ss̃i”: “personal values and principles held despite potentially negative consequences” (from John Quijada’s Ithkuil). Or my favorite—“kemet”: “the sudden, spontaneous, collective movement of a large group of small objects,” such as “when a bunch of pigeons suddenly all fly up into the air, circle around, and then land in an altogether better place . . . Or when a bunch of fallen leaves are blown up into the air by a gust of wind, fly around, and then fall back down to earth again” (from Matthew Pearson’s Tokana).62 Many of these inventions are accompanied by invented worlds and peoples, as we have seen, where again the Internet is useful: websites are adorned by drawings, maps, and MP3 files that contain recorded samples of recitations and songs, a little like Hildegard’s macaronic antiphon, “O Orzchis Ecclesia,” which showcases her invention in music. When asked, most conlangers responded that beauty of sound is an important feature in their inventions—this notion of “beauty” being highly individual—and so I turn now to the concept of language and aesthetic.
Tolkien spoke of the fellow conlanger as an artist, “a poet or painter seeing suddenly the solution.” Of interest, then, are Tolkien’s aesthetic preferences in language creation. Sindarin was modeled phonetically after Welsh, and Quenya after Finnish—two languages that Tolkien considered beautiful. Spoken by an “angelic” and “immortal” race, Tolkien’s hieratic Quenya (the “Latin” of the Elvish tongues) is replete with labials and alveolars, many open syllables, diphthongs, and liquids—laurië, sírinen, aldaron—rather like the angelic language recorded in Tenga Bithnua. The classic example of the Language of Mordor, spoken by his Orcs, is inscribed on the Ring and uttered at the Council of Elrond. Whereas Quenya is diphthongic, its structure full of harmonious efficacies and concision, the “Black Speech” collects all the gutteral consonant clusters—nazg, gimbatul—that are fitting, to Tolkien’s mind, for a demonic language. Its structure seems blandly agglutinative, instead of inflected, its parts meant as a relex for the famous poem, which was obviously written first.

The rebarbative quality of Klingon has become its cherished aesthetic, reflecting a noble, aggressive, no-nonsense people living in a warrior culture. The website epithet for “The Klingon Language Institute” is “A Battle of Words.” Its authors write that “Paramount wanted the language to be gutteral and harsh, and Okrand wanted it to be unusual, so he selected sounds that combined in ways not typically found in other languages (e.g. a retroflex D and a dental t (dht) but no retroflex T or dental d (thd).” The Klingon script has a sharp, dangerous look to it, unlike Tolkien’s Tengwar with its rounded bows, and its Roman transcription was meant to be formidable and nonintuitive, combining upper- and lowercase characters with a straight apostrophe for glottal stops: “Today is a good day to die”: Heqhlu’meH QaQ jajvam.

Many contemporary inventors take pride in a limited phonology, such as that exhibited by conlanger Pearson, whose admired Tokana merges t and d, p and b, and other stops into sounds that represent them half-way. Elgin’s language may superficially resemble the simplistic structures of what Schnapp and Samarin call “glossolalic” with its open syllables and repeated vowel tones, but her goal in creating Láadan is to reduce evidence phrases and other concepts in English to succinct particles and words built by accretion. Her tones show a preference for a falling inflection in her language, and, interestingly, she limits her “lh” sound to her pejoratives. This sound is cherished in the Welsh language and represented in its famous “double-l” (Llangollen, for instance), but for Elgin it is ugly: “In Láadan it occurs only in words that are themselves references to something unpleasant.” Dee’s angelic language offers consonant clusters that seem harsh and almost
unpronounceable—malprg, naspzam, vorg—quite unlike the angelic languages that Agrippa and Swedenborg describe and the Tenga Bithnua exhibits. Many of these words may have been chosen at random by Kelley who saw them in the scrying stone. More’s language borrows, as we saw, words from Greek and Sanskrit, but a number of his words vaguely resemble the false Hebrew of earlier inventions. Le Guin’s words show that they target the cultures she invents. They are far more elaborate and variable in The Left Hand of Darkness (shifgrethor, Erhenrang) with their closed polysyllables and consonant clusters than the words found in Always Coming Home (heyímas, depenehai, kwaíyo, heya), which seem to imitate the patterns of some native American languages, and display a distinct preference for the accent mark, just as Sotomayor prefers the macron in her romanized transcriptions. One can postulate that speakers of western languages are influenced by western notions of verbal beauty—Italian ranking high on the list of beautiful languages and German and English on the low side. Smith seems to have banished all the French nasals in her Martian and leaned heavily on final /e/. Preference for any sound or combination of sounds is highly subjective, cannot be assigned to gender, and tendencies toward liquids and gutterals, expansive or limited phonologies are shared by men and women alike.

The Internet has granted a venue for something that is defining a new form of linguistic play and artistry, but also what some are calling an aesthetics of “system”—a value set on the beauty of organizing something for efficiency and ease of operation, whether it be human, divine, or machine language. I see, too, a pleasure taken in “process”: its participants know that a privately invented language will never be complete, that hardly anyone in his lifetime will be able to make an extensive workable language on his own (i.e., without software for generating compounds). It is the process itself that is aesthetically and gamefully pleasing, and which naturally requires being externalized in some form, rather than kept in one’s head. So while it differs in its philosophy and format (technology, communication with other inventors, linguistic training), the relevance of this new form of glossopoeia to that of Hildegard’s is obvious. Her accomplishment started with exposure to Latin, it took for its models the grammatical texts of its time, it needed to be written down, it contained more system than has been acknowledged, it was accompanied by a script and included in a song, it represented a supernal language, and it could never be finished: the missing animals and minerals speak to the things every conlanger finds missing in his or her lexicon. To a great extent, Hildegard’s medium (dictation, wax tablet and stylus, the transfer to vellum by her secretaries) was a hindrance that has been alleviated by the ease of typing on a computer keyboard where items can be inserted and alphabetized, found through search
engines, generated through randomizers, and fonts created for foreign characters, but no less a medium for publication. And of course, like so many glossopoeists did before they discovered CONLANG, Hildegard felt that she was uniquely gifted in this language given her from above. But it is the same process, I maintain, that pleases: a process of ongoing invention that is an integral part of adult play, and which shapes the inventor and his invention through constant polishing.

Finally, conventional academic studies of such things too often exhibit our love of the “fool”: we are in love with the fou du langage, the naïf; we respond to mystics, visionaries, and tongues speakers as though they were children—there is something that excites us about the loss of control in ecstasy or lunacy, and bores us with the conscious, years-long development of a personal and fictional language by a respected philologist who created a popular world for it that has had too much press. And yet, here is a man in our own time, of the Catholic faith, who wrote a panegyric to a female deity. When one hears Tolkien recite “A Elbereth Gilthoniel,” one might think, now, of “O Orzchis Ecclesia.” Tolkien’s song is a religious dedication to a goddess; Ecclesia to Hildegard is a towering woman, bearing the physical structure of the Church itself. Hildegard addresses the mother of God as the “greenest branch.” Tolkien sings his song reverently, as a can- tor; Hildegard’s antiphon has an unusual range and difficulty that suggests the “lofty sounds” of Church. However, Tolkien’s Quenya and Sindarin are meant for an angelic and heroic people, and the record he left behind yields little of the mundane vocabulary for sewing, plowing, smelting and cooking that one finds in so much of the Ignota Lingua. Hildegard, though, would never write what today we call a fiction. Tolkien understood that he was making his Elvish up; he denied that his fiction was “allegorical” but he did not deny its spiritual symbolism.

I hope to have shown how this viriditas of language invention today comes closer in concept and construction to what Hildegard had in mind eight hundred years ago than anything in her own era. The spiritual plays a significant role in contemporary language invention, even if it is masked by fiction and grammatical explication: we see it in Tolkien, in Elgin, in Le Guin, in Paul Burgess (introduced in the following chapter), and more often on the Internet than I have revealed here. It does Hildegard no discredit to suggest that the receptive state of mind in which these ideas came to her were creative, nor does it insult the Internet glossopoeists to suggest that there is something of Hildegard in their creations. I return, then, to an examination of the artistry of the Ignota Lingua.
CHAPTER SIX

GREENING LANGUAGE: HILDEGARD’S
MONASTERY GARDEN

Has anyone observed that Hildegard’s Lingua is beautiful? It seems a point that calls out for emphasis. Not only is she erecting a beautiful building, a lexical monastery, she is growing a garden of new words, exhibiting the spirit of her “greenness.” Speaking of green, then, I turn at this point to Hildegard’s trees.

Hildegard’s Trees in the Ignota Lingua

So intent is Jeffrey Schnapp on his definition of the “expressive,” he misses an important feature of the Lingua, and of glossopoeia, when he attributes Hildegard’s sudden use of the suffix -buz in items 754–799 to “an obsessive leitmotif”:

The Lingua ignota . . . repeats a pattern typical of glossolalicias: its somewhat limited phonetic “palette”—which does not, among other things, appear to include any diphthongs—undergoes a series of cyclical mutations, such that once a given syllable occurs in one or two successive invented words, the same syllable is likely to recur constantly, as if an obsessive leitmotif, in the succeeding words. This “clustering” phenomenon ceases only when a new leitmotif takes its place, at which time it either vanishes or becomes dormant. For example, the consonant/vowel sequence -buz, entirely absent in the first 750 items in Hildegard’s vocabulary, suddenly figures in over half of the next fifty entries, never to resurface after item 800.¹

The section Schnapp is talking about is devoted entirely to Hildegard’s trees:

Scoibuz, “boxwood”
Laschiabuz, “mountain ash”
Gramzibuz, “chestnut”
Sparinichibuz, “peach tree”
Zaimzabuz, “quince”
Gruzimbuz, “cherry tree”
Culmendiabuz, “dogwood”
Guskaibuz, “winter oak”
Gigunzibuz, “figtree”
Scongilbuz, “spindle tree”
Clamizibuz, “laurel”
Zaschibuz, “mastic”
Mizamabuz, “mulberry tree”
Burschiabuz, “tamarisk”
Zirunzibuz, “pear tree”
Burzimibuz, “plum tree”
Seinzibuz, “savín”
Kisanzibuz, “cotton tree”
Omalzibuz, “sanguinaria”
Vischobuz, “yew”
Gulizbuz, “birch”
Suanibuz, “myrtle”
Schirobuz, “maple”
Muzimibuz, “walnut.”

Clearly -buz is “bush” or “tree”—corresponding to the suffix -boum in medieval German, which is used for many of her names of trees in the Physica. Schnapp also comments on the repetitive suffix -zia (as another obsessive leitmotif). It is one of her most common endings next to -iz, and it occurs most frequently among her natural items (parts of the body and mostly among her plants):

Pusinzia, “snot”
Gulzia, “palate”
Gruzia, “esophagus”
Kolezia, “throat”
Zizia, “mustache”
Tilzia, “belly”
Kosinzia, “rib”
Lizia, “gland”
Amzglizia, “male pudendum”
Golinzia, “plane tree”
Ginzia, “pimpernel”
Piğiiza, “wild thyme”
Bouizia, “winter cherry”
Sizia, “beet root”
Cauzia, “thyme”

Baiczinzia, “southernwood”
Ruzia, “rose”
Fulzia, “marigold”
Flauzia, “betony”
Dizia, “dittany”
Agonzia, “columbine”
Grimizia, “white bryony”
Bulchzia, “lamb’s lettuce”
Philizia, “chives”
Pazia, “henbane”
Zugezia, “dill”
Gruzia, “hazelwort”
Schorzia, “nettle”
Kachzia (some kind of plant)
Glamzia, “jay”

There it is joined with -schia, an ending that occurs almost nowhere else except among the trees, herbs, and birds, as if she associated this suffix with wildlife.

Cririschia “bayleaf”
Kirischia “yellow gentian”
Pluschicha “pennyroyal”
Bruschia “centaury”
Bischia “ugera” or “meadow saffron”
Chorischia “lily”
In her enthusiasm for this ending, two words serve double duty: *Luschia* ("lovage" and "duck") and *Galschia* ("germander" and "dove").

**Hildegard’s Treatment of Grammatical Gender**

These suffixes also suggest a schema for reflecting gender. The aforementioned suffix *-schia* occurs outside the wildlife only once: *Tronischia* ("cathedral"). I count nine items with *-zia* as an ending among ecclesiastical structures and vestments: *Crizia* ("church"), *Sparinzia* ("lock"), *Kolinzia* ("column"), *Kinchzia* ("candle"), *Spinzia* ("torch"), *Amozia* ("eucharist"), *Phazia* ("cruet"), *Tizzia* ("alb"), *Tilifzia* ("tapestry")—almost every one of which has a feminine Latin noun as gloss: *cathedra*, *ecclesia*, *sera*, *columpna*, *candela*, *lampas*, *eucharistia*, *ampulla*, *alba*, and *scandalia*. So a likelier explanation is that *-zia* is Hildegard’s ending for the feminine nouns she is reinventing. But since other feminine nouns do not end in *-zia*, one might conclude that it held for Hildegard a connotation of beauty and naturalness—except for *Maluizia* ("prostitute"), another feminine Latin noun (*meretrix*). We find eleven other *-zia* endings scattered throughout the manufactured items, only some of them feminine. One may contrast these with her *-z* and *-iz* endings, which predominately share masculine and neuter gender with their Latin glosses.

Many words in the Lingua end in *-ol*, *-iol*—*io*—but I find no secure semantic link between them as I did for *-buz*, whereas *-ziol* is applied in a row to three important people: *Kinchziol*, *Tronziol*, and *Cruniziol* ("advocate," "patron," "deputy"). There is also *Durziol* ("soldier") and *Lifiziol* ("cook"). It is possible that these *-iol/-ziol/-zio* suffixes indicate professional men. I find *Inschiol* ("martyr"), *Funschiol* ("son-in-law"), *Abiol* ("abbot"), *Schmiol* ("mariner"), *Oriezio* ("porter"), *Scaltizio* ("Palatine count"), *Clizio* ("bailsman"), *Scoltilzio* ("butler"), *Kolsinzio* ("tradesman"), and most importantly *Korzinthio* ("prophet"); but these suffixes are applied to a number of inanimate objects as well, and so is *-ziol*. They are glossed, however, with almost entirely masculine and neuter Latin nouns (I count five feminine nouns: *Korzinthio*, propheta; *Sinziol*, testudo; *Phinziol*, urna; *Gazio*, caterua; and *Ruizio*, siligo), so it may be that these endings are not “obsessive leitmotifs” so much as another attempt
on Hildegard’s part to indicate gender, as with -zia. A good indication that they do so may be found in items 986 and 987: Nazischo, “rooster,” and Nazia, “hen.”

**Hildegard’s Compounds**

Hildegard invents more often by association and sound rather than by the accretion of compounds, but the compounds she does have suggest a memory of many root words. She obviously had the native word before her and applied her invented word to it, mindful of gender. Although her system is not regular or reliable, her penchant for compounding is greater than most critics have granted (we have seen the -buz words), but are based on a somewhat loosely organized set of root words and affixes. These are evident in Phazur (“grandfather”) and Kulzphazur (“ancestor”); Peueriz (“father”) and Nilzpeueriz (“stepfather”), also Matz/Nilzmaiz, Sairizin/ Nilzsairenz (“mother/stepmother,” “son/stepson”); Maiz- in Matzija (“maternal aunt”); Hoil (“head”), Hoilzirier (“opening in a garment for the head”), and Hoilbatz (“head covering”); Luzpomphia, Luzcrealz, Luziliet, Luziminispier (“eyeball, eyesocket, eyelash, eyelid”); Oir (“ear”) and compounds in Oinguizol (“earwax”: a double gloss with Vnguizol, “fat”), Oiremanisil (“ear-cartilage”), Oirschal (“trumpeter”), Oiralbriun (“earrings”); Nascu- in Nascutil, Nascuzirz, Nascumisil (“nose,” “nostril,” “nose cartilage”); Kole- in Kolezia (“throat”), Kolecruziz (“neckbone”), and Koletabeiaz (“neck vein”) compounded with Tabeializ (“vein”); Maletin (chin) and Maletinosinz (lower or “chin” jaw), and other compounds with osinz—Osinzmalskir makes “jaw tooth” or “molar”;Ormaz (“hair”), Ormalziin (“curly hair”), and later Ormalzanzia (“hairband”—possibly Ormalzibuz as descriptive—“sanguinaria” or “spurrey”—“hair-tree”); Burbe- in Burbeiscal (“breast”) and Burbeleiz (“breast-spoon,” a double calque with “spoon,” Feleiz; i.e., “sternum”); Cruniz and Sciaruniz (“leg” and “shin”); Crizia (“church”) and Spancriez (“church-dedication”); Enpholianz/Arrezenpholianz (“bishop/archbishop”); Zeninoz (“deacon”) and Tilzeuinoz (“subdeacon”); Pham- in Phamkil (“wax”) and Phamphziolaz (“wax candle”); Kinch- in Kinchez (“candle”) and Kinchalis (“candle-stick”); Libiz in Libizamanz, (“book”), Kiranzlizibiz (“missal”); Izinziolibiz (“gospel-book”); Mumizalibiz (“matins-book”); Vis- in Visheoiz (“wine”) and Uischamil (“vineyard”); Mel- in Melzimaz (“mead”) and Melzita (“honey”); Muz- in Muzimbibuz (“walnut tree”) and Muzimia (“nutmeg”); possibly Orschibuz (“oak,” i.e., great tree?) and Orzchis (“great, immense”) of the antiphon, although the spelling hinders this association a bit; and even perhaps Ran- in Ranzgia (“tongue”) and Ranschil (“chatterbox”). Examination of these words shows hardly the open-syllables Schnapp talks.
of in primitive language invention, but rather the multiple consonant clusters one finds in the German language itself.

What may bother some seasoned language inventors is that these compounds do not follow a logical enough system, but are somewhat whimsically applied or not applied often enough. They abound in the list for body parts, perhaps because words for the body were the earliest words invented by Hildegard. Even so, if *luz-* is used in compounds to mean “eye,” why is the actual word for “eye” *Luzeia* instead of *Luz*? Likewise, we have *Libizamanz* for book, whereas in compounds it is *-libiz.* (*Libizamanz,* however, may be a calque of “manuscript” or “handbook”—note *-manz* and *manus*). Why is there no semantic relationship displayed between “heated room,” “bathing room,” “storeroom,” and “chamber”? Hildegard gives *Coindanz* for *caminata,* *Stoinz* for *stupa,* *Kalchizinz* for *cellarium,* and *Gauschuliz* for *camera.* Again, it is clear that she is inventing spontaneously for the Latin, apparent in the initial consonants in three of these four words. A pattern, perhaps, in *Luzeia* and *Libizamanz* seems to be that the “main” word has more ornamentation than the roots formed from it that appear in compounds.

**Hildegard’s Verbal Aesthetic**

What the Lingua demonstrates to me is a combination of old and new invention: a project that added new words (for the technical items of the list, perhaps) to already created words, with a great deal of association and paranomasia. An analysis of the Lingua shows a decided preference not only for “z” and “l,” but for three and four syllable words where the semi-diphthongic final syllables in *-ia, -iet, -ier,* and so on may contribute to a dactylic or pen-penultimate stress: *LuzPOMphia, LuZILiet, LuzimiNISpier.* We may derive an idea of her stress from her antiphon, which treats final diphthongs as separate sounds and favors certain syllables in its melodic ornament: “tu es *cal-DE-mi-a* STIG-ma-tum *lo-i-FOL-um.*” The melody shows that the “o” and “i” in *loifolum* are separated, and the two high notes given to the syllable “fol” suggest a penultimate stress in a four-syllable word. The three notes given to the “de” in *caldemia* give it pen-penultimate stress in a four-syllable word that again separates the final diphthong into two sounds. While plainchant routinely breaks patterns of stress in spoken speech, one must not forget that the creation of the Lingua is closely tied to Hildegard’s love of music, and its syllables seem chosen for euphony.

I wish we could be more certain how to pronounce some of her letters. Intervocalic “u” is surely a [v] sound—*Liuionz*—as it is in medieval Latin. The cluster *sch* was not the soft [ʃ] of New High German, but more like the
premodern (and Low German) pronunciation [sx] or [sk] in her time. Her famous z was probably the early affricate [ts] or the voiceless fricative [s], although the word Silisza (among others) indicates that “z” was distinct in sound from “s” [s]—perhaps something like “see-LEES-tsa”—and the Rscribe has scraped and rewritten it to make the “sz” distinct. As much as I would like for it to represent the exotic sound [z], I’m inclined to think that final “z” is the voiceless fricative or affricate of early Middle High German, as it was highly visible in the German texts of her time, and that she used it to imitate the sound of Latin endings and the look of German endings. It is sometimes replaced by “x” in positions where a suffix would normally be -iz or -zia, so that we get Limix (“light”) instead of Limiz, and Graxia (“violet”) instead of Grazia. This variant may be due to scribal influence by medial and final “x” in so many Latin words (lux, for instance), or an alternate symbol for ts. As far as initial sounds are concerned, it is interesting to note that “Z” starts a word a mere 80 times, “H” starts a word 11 times and of “S,” which starts a word in the Lingua 135 times, 80 of those beginning with “Sc” or “Sch.” Hildegard’s phonology favors the initial clusters of her native language.

However she may have pronounced her words, she chose syllables that were evocative to her, as did the anonymous redactor of the Tenga Bithnua, and which expressed a private sense of verbal beauty and significance. What is particularly delightful about the Ignota Lingua is discovering in it associative, anagramatic, and even onomatopoeic applications of sound to sense, although it must be admitted that these identifications are subjective. One of my favorites is Zinzrinz, “winding staircase,” which for me imitates not only the repeating coil of the stairwell but the hissing vertigo one experiences descending it. Oinanguizol, “earwax” possibly reflects the cadence of medieval Latin  unguentum, “anointing oil”—Hildegard gives “fat” as a translation of her word Vnguizol—but the polysyllables and diphthongs are amusingly suggestive of the gyrations one goes through in getting that substance out of one’s ear (auricularis, “little-” or “ear-finger”). Schnapp notes that the adjective crizanta in her antiphon, and Crizia (“church”) of the Lingua suggest Gr.  chrism, an association I uphold as well. He also observes that Vanix for “woman” suggests L. vanus, “empty,” “vain,” an association that Hildegard may have made in her era and its misogyny.3 Peter Dronke, on the other hand, sees in it a double reference to Eva, the mother of all folly, and nix, “snow”—the symbol of womanly purity.4 A number of her words seem organized along the lines of puns: Dronke notes the dual Korzinthio and Falschin for propheta and uates, respectively. The one has the honorific -io/-iol ending; for the other, he writes, “she had a pagan charlatan in mind” with her echo of falsus.5 The deaf man is Nosinz, or what Dronke reads as non sentire.6 I note that Figirez is glossed as pictor (“painter”),
but it suggests L. *figura*, a concept obviously important to her and the record of her visions, and her own use of figurative language. *Luxzia* fascinates because it can mean either “locust” or “butterfly”—depending on which manuscript one takes as the definitive one: either the sloppy scribe of the Riesencodex or the tidy scribe of the Berlin MS switched the meanings of eight words at the very end of the Lingua following we cannot know what source. In its obvious resemblance to the word “eye” (*Luzeia*) it seems to describe the “eyes” on a butterfly’s wings, and its feminine -*zia* ending may have seemed more suitable for “butterfly” than for the lowly locust (*Ariz*), whose droning is best described, in my opinion, by that invented word.

Language, Creativity, and Vision

What can we deduce then, by observing that Hildegard has systematized and listed these words for posterity? Let me provide a hypothetical about a young American glossopoeist, ten years old. Exposed to Spanish and afire with the possibilities of creating her own, better language, she continues to pursue the game to which her friends have long abandoned her. She turns it into a project that has the status for her of her invented towns, peoples, street maps, and houses—all forms of utopian simulacra—and she vividly imagines a world peopled with beings who speak this language, and to whose deities she can privately appeal. She turns as Hildegard did to systems and lists: she does not have glossaries arranged in taxonomies, but she does have her *Thorndyke and Barnhardt Junior Dictionary of the English Language*. She does not write on a wax tablet or dictate to a scribe; writing is easier for her than it was for Hildegard. She has a pencil and blank paper in a notebook that comes with alphabetized tabs. After recording the few meager words she has come up with (those starting with A after the “A” tab), she begins to find this system awkward. She is insufficiently instructed in the developments of language to start building from basic units or without the aid of English. What she does instead is turn to her dictionary and copy out only those words necessary for a rudimentary language and apply exotic multisyllables of her own to them. By the time she has come to “E” it is harder to invent in the face of so many *en-*prefixes, which makes her realize she cannot simply pull words out of the air. She repeats things or makes infelicitous matches. She skips words as inspiration fails her, for the word in her invented language has to “sound” like what it means, even though it is different from English: *Zinzrinz*.

Then let us suppose that when she is fifteen and has been introduced to a popular and complex fictional language, she looks at her own efforts in
Learning other languages gives her more critical focus in college. Exposure to graduate study in linguistics and philology makes her sneer at her project in college. Essentially, she had begun working with the system of categorization she knew best—the dictionary and her Spanish grammar book—and made spontaneous inventions that she would never have attributed to divine inspiration. There was another word for it: “creativity.” This girl believed she was being creative.

Hildegard's spontaneous imaginings made sense to her within a divine context, and there was a word for it: visio. Hildegard was undoubtedly gifted in the relaxed reception of imaginative ideas, and her vivid visual and auditory experiences are difficult for most contemporaries to imagine. But in her world the means were different for identifying the processes of invention, inspiration, and decision. She used a categorical system she knew best: the glossed taxonomy of Latin words. Her repeats, along with the flagging energy shown in making compounds and completing the list (the absent mammals, minerals, abstractions), resemble the burden this American girl suffers in completing her early project. Hildegard’s “conlanging” has all the earmarks of the adolescent versions of what some language inventors have taken to more complex levels; but by “adolescent” I mean no disparagement of her work. Hildegard had an adult theology and philosophy—the deific relationship of word and sign, God and speech, Adam’s naming and Babel’s fall—to bolster her in her project whereas the American girl does not. It may be that an epistemology of an era contains the traces within it of earlier logical and imaginative systems, so that the American girl’s attempts when she was a pubescent strike her as “medieval” when she is an adult. It is only in time, research, and further development that this trajectory can be seen.

If we turn again briefly to the experiences of modern inventors, we may find an example of “vision” as it is experienced today. In the spring of 2003, I was contacted by a Presbyterian minister who had stumbled by accident on the CONLANG List. Paul Burgess told me that while he was no stranger to the Internet he was astonished to discover this venue and the number of people all over the world who made use of it to discuss their languages. Burgess had been crafting his “Hermetic” (or mau Vanantha) since he was thirteen and before he had ever heard of Tolkien. This is no fou du langage: a mathematician, a scholar of Charles Peirce’s semiosis, and a linguist, artist, and theologian, this man has an eidetic memory (he can remember the time and context for the invention of almost every word) and much of his language is undocumented. It has evolved with his intellect, though, and he writes and speaks it fluently, an accomplishment that only a few conlangers I have consulted can boast of, even those who embark on the patient and tedious accretion of vocabulary. While it has a
certain regularity mna Vanantha is not a calque of English; Burgess was inspired, as so many language inventors were, by Latin, and he voraciously studied languages and language principles in his early adulthood. Mna Vanantha has an Indo-European feel to it with almost baroque additions: ten noun cases, five aspects, eight moods, two forms of negation, six comparatives, and four genders, but also quite a number of idiomatic expressions. At the age of seventeen it had already taken on “a mind of its own.” Irina Rempt, too, writes on her site that her culture has grown “more like discovery than creation,” and this feature may come closest to a modern glossopoeist’s brush with vision. Likewise, “Hermetic” dictated itself to Burgess, and he wrote a treatise and allegory in it—in his unique script—called mna Sipri Cilama (“The Celestial Labors”), now mounted on a website along with his beautiful water-color illustrations. Mna Sipri Cilama is essentially a psychomachia, an allegory of the contest between two forms of power: “dhnamo [roughly translated as ‘glory’] is the power of lightning, of the sword stroke, of main and might. While athlo [roughly translated ‘splendor’] is the power of the unforeseen chess gambit, of architectural form, of perfect balance, of the craftsman’s master touch.” These forces, as I understand it from Burgess’ explanations, represent violence and strategy, the one and the many: the infinite variety of the daedalian world that one god struggles to uphold and the monolithic purity, the point in which all creation originated, to which the opposing god tries to return it.

Translating it into English, however, was difficult for him because of the succinctness of the idiosyncratic terms he nurtured over decades:

Mna righniso zvir’agosthonov naothagaris airig oriantal mna ghthi righniso Thosolanol lithom sthijo ntharol VOL, savno ciiso ghthi sdhnampo thorcov thlicathis.

Unlike the Internet glossopoeists, Burgess is not an explanator suae linguae on his site, although he has given details of Hermetic grammatical structure to the list. Nonetheless, his text reminds me of the Scivias in its allegory and illustration, and quite by coincidence, it seems, Dhalbembu, the nurturing moon god of pluralism, is represented by a green crescent (viriditas), whereas Rotas, the jealous sun god of monism, dries up the land that competes with him (ariditas).

In its resistance to translation, mna Vanantha may share something in common with the Lingua of Hildegard's antiphon:

Oh orzechis Ecclesia! Girded by heavenly arms and adorned in jacinth, you are the peoples’ wounds’ caldemia and the City of Knowledge. Oh! you are truly crizanta in sounds on high and a chorzta gem!
The blandness of the glosses may be due not merely to an effort to keep the song intelligible but to a certain opacity of meaning, especially in words such as *caldemia* and *crizanta*, the former producing so many semantic difficulties and the latter being differently translated in the Theologische Sammelhandschrift. The unglossed words in the sung antiphon are more powerful for me than the systematic lemmata of the *Ignota Lingua* despite its many fascinations. One wonders what it is that Burgess displays for others if he does not translate it, unless we return to the notion of mysticism and its connections with muteness, silence, the “hermetic.” There is obviously something in the appeal of the spiritual and mysterious that, combined with gifts in language, music, oration, painting, and vision, can lead to creations of this sort that more resemble devotion than taxonomy. Therefore the *Lingua* and its “sublunary” words have perplexed many modern scholars and moved me to compare them to contemporary inventions and their vocabulary lists. Many conlangers have expressed a keen interest in getting exposure for their artform, and a public appreciation of the efficiencies and beauties of its making. Others believe that the public does not care, that too much exposure threatens to banalize it, and that its chief power resides in its remaining closeted and rarefied.

Perhaps I side with Adeodatus in valuing the sign over the signified in such inventions; the Internet glossopoeists construct their languages so that they *do* refer and *can* be understood and used. Even so, the question that we must ask is this: what is it that glossopoeists are saying in their languages? Only a few of the contemporary language inventors have texts as long as the *mna Sipri Cilama*, or as original and philosophical, and if they are, why not write these in a language intelligible to outsiders? This conundrum explains the translations that accompany so many of these writings. For More, Dee, Smith, the anonymous authors of the Philippine apocrypha, showing that these extraordinary languages are intelligible and significant is an important part of the ambassador-hearer relationship. Meanwhile, I propose that the creation itself is the message, the sign of an invented world’s alterity. “To make up a name of a person or a place,” writes Ursula K. Le Guin, “is to open the way to the world of the language the name belongs to. It’s a gate to Elsewhere.”

Perhaps it provides more appropriate and descriptive names—so long as that sense of appropriateness in that new connection can be shared by others (*Erhenrang, Silmaril, Luxzia*). On the other hand, though, a notable quality of contemporary glossopoeia lies in the reification, the concretion, and ultimately the visibility of its words. Natural languages are invisible—even unhearable—to the peoples who speak them, their signifieds easily available, and interesting only to poets, linguists,
logophiles, and foreigners. Roman Jakobson writes that words in poetry “acquire a weight and value of their own instead of referring indifferently to reality.”\textsuperscript{10} I would modify this analogy in applying it to glossopoia: structure and semantics are important to its makers, but their artistic recreation of language approaches a kind of poetry that is ultimately personal. Author of Ithkuil, John Quijada wrote online that “the nature of the creation itself offers its own aesthetic and intellectual pleasure to be enjoyed and subjective mysteries to be analyzed and dwelt upon,” or as Tolkien writes in his advice to glossopoists: “[A]s soon as you have fixed even a vague general sense for your words, many of the less subtle but most moving and permanently important strokes of poetry are open to you.”\textsuperscript{11}

We are brought back to our still unsatisfied question: what is it, finally? The \textit{Ignota Lingua} is an “unknown language,” unknown only in that it represented no known language, but was proudly made known, even if in part, and to a small audience of readers. It is the production of a creative woman who was exposed early on to the hieratic languages of the Church that were also unknown to the laity, who was inspired by language and language mysteries, language and music, who admired macaronic verse and copied it in her antiphon, and who looked upon her invention as a purer way than even Latin, Greek, or Hebrew to dignify and describe her world. In bringing the spiritual and the material together in her Lingua, she invoked what the Russian formalists called \textit{ostranenie}—making the familiar strange, or rather making the things of this world divine again through the alterity of new signs.

In this sense, it is a product of her \textit{viriditas}—greenness—making moist and green what threatens to become corrupted, mendacious, ill-used, and dried out, but it is also a product of her keen interest in divine structure: the Tower reassembled. It is a way to rename her world in personal and spiritual terms, which on one level elevates even excrement to a new form of speaking about it, and on another praises the orzchis Ecclesia that has given her her life, her being, her Savior, and her liberty to pursue intellectual, spiritual, and literary endeavors. It is a creative and scholarly invention that partakes not only of art and poetry, but of schema and order, an Adamic move claimed by a bold woman and onomaturge who was made to believe in an authorship divinely granted. Her list is systematized in a way that glossolalia is not; it is cataphatic in that it turns toward known language and its uses rather than away from it, and a study of it shows that more ratiocination went into it than is evident at first glance. And yet it “dictated itself” to her through God’s voice, and may have grown “more like discovery than creation,” a component of vision that
few of us admit to in our imaginative adventures. It was well regarded by her provost Volmar, her biographers, and the scribes who copied it. It claimed a status in their minds not only because of her reputation for divine gifts, but also because of her belief in the divinely crafted nature of language, as much a tower as it is a plantation.
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47. See G.R.S. Mead, “Summary of the Contents of the So–Called Pistis Sophia Treatise,” in Fragments of a Faith Forgotten (New York: University Books,
1960), p. 487: “but as for the rest of the lower mysteries, ye have no need thereof, but ye shall find them in the two books of Ieuo, which Enoch wrote when I spoke with him from the Tree of Knowledge, and from the Tree of Life, which were in the Paradise of Adam.”


52. Ibid., p. 9.

53. Samarin, Tongues of Men, p. 185.


55. Ibid.

56. Part 4 of Yaguello’s book is entitled “Défense et illustration des langues naturelles,” translated by Catherine Slater as “In Defence of Natural Languages” (Lunatic Lovers of Language: Imaginary Languages and Their Inventors [London: Athlone Press, 1990], p. 111); one contemporary language inventor remarked online that this reminded him of the “Defense of Marriage Act.” Invent a language or let homosexuals marry and both language and marriage come toppling down. Another remarked that both language-invention and homosexuality were conditions society expected one to “grow out of.” The frequent comparison online of language invention and the closet (Tolkien’s “Secret Vice”) is worth further exploration.


Chapter Three  Medieval Language Philosophy


3. In his *Decreta*, which establishes the questions to be asked of penitents or those brought before the ecclesiastical court (PL 140: col. 971.B).


19. Ibid., p. 139.

in denying the ability to speak of God still believe in the existence of God outside human experience.


24. Ibid., p. 3: “dice et scribe quae uides et audis . . . ea sic edisserendo profer- ens, quemadmodum et auditor, uerba praceptoris sui percipiens, ea secun- dum tenorem locutionis illius, ipso volente, ostendente et praecipente propalat.”


26. Ibid., p. 1212.


28. Otherwise known as the *Ars Notoria*, this text is a medieval “grimoire” belonging to the “Solomonic Cycle,” the oldest version dating back to the thirteenth century, and featuring lists of angelic and demonic names, a tradition that seems even older if we look upon these utterances in the Apocryphon, noted by James, as “descriptive of God.”


34. See the chapter on “Manuscript Information” for a discussion of this Figurengedicht. For a reproduction of the page itself, see plate 6 in this book.


42. Derek J. Price, ed. facsimile version of The Equatorie of the planetis, Peterhouse ms. 75.I (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1955), fol. 30v et passim.

43. See William Eamon, Science and the Secrets of Nature: Books of Secrets in Medieval and Early Modern Culture (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994) p. 4. More like “technical books than magic books,” they were produced under “the assumption that nature was a repository of occult forces that might be manipulated not by the magus’s cunning, but merely by the use of correct techniques.” One of the strangest uses of a cipher in a “Book of Secrets” can be seen in the putatively medieval Voynich Manuscript, dated anywhere from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century. The entire book is written in what looks like a substitution cipher, but it has never been decrypted, nor has its “language” been identified. See my comments in chapter four, note fifteen.


Chapter Four  Fifteenth- to Nineteenth-Century Language Inventions

3. A specimen of Alexarchus’s language is preserved by Athenaeus in his *Deipnosophistae* (3.98d–e); Peter Green compares it to Nadsat, the mish-mash language in Burgess’s *A Clockwork Orange* (*Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age* [Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990], pp. 395).
5. Ibid., p. 18. The translation given on the facing page is over-embellished and so I provide my own. I have also rearranged the lines into a true “tetrastichon,” as the texts claims it to be and as it is portrayed in other editions.
8. Qtd. by ibid., pp. 88, 89, 92.
9. Ibid., p. 88.
10. de Sacy, “Balaibalan,” p. 367. Bausani has a somewhat different, more literal translation wherein he provides the omitted copulas and conjunctions in parentheses, along with the omitted name “Mohammed” (*Lingue* 90): *Nel nome di Dio Clemente Misericordioso. Lode (sia) a Dio, che originò i Principi delle Cose (come) luce, e sorse dalla boca degli inneggiatori ai Suoi sengi (come) Manifestazione; e la preghiera e la lode (siano) su nostro Signore il Lodato (Maometto), prima origine della totalità delle (cose) derivate e delle (cose) semplici, e sulla sua famiglia e i suoi compagni che, ai ben disposti verso di loro, sono i Mediatori; see also his somewhat poor English translation in “A Curious Mystical Language,” p. 234.

13. Ibid., p. 255.


15. The *Voynich Manuscript* is so called because it was brought to light by a nineteenth-century Lithuanian scholar Wilfred Voynich who described it in detail. Its date is disputed, and suggestions range from the late thirteenth to late sixteenth century. It contains botanical, astrological, and scientific drawings—pictures of flowers and tubes of water filled with naked women—but its outstanding feature is the writing no one can decipher. The “letters” have been assigned Roman characters to ease the process of interpretation, but it is not known whether they spell out a natural language, an invented one, or a code that represents the sounds of individual letters in a word. The “sentences” obey certain laws, but many of them are strings of repeated phrases. There have been many examinations in print and on the Internet, but perhaps the most comprehensive one is that by Mary d’Imperio, *The Voynich Manuscript: An Elegant Enigma* (Laguna Hills, CA: Aegean Park Press, 1978). Gerry Kennedy and Rob Churchill’s recent study, *The Voynich Manuscript: The Unsolved Riddles of an Extraordinary Book Which Has Defied Interpretation for Centuries* (London: Orion Books, 2004), summarizes and reflects upon the most prominent theories, even comparing it to Hildegard’s Lingua, along with her illuminations. There are some weaknesses in this comparison, obviously, but the text is one of the most mysterious ciphers—or invented languages—known to us.


17. Ibid., p. xi.


21. Laycock, *Enochian Dictionary*, p. 248. See note nineteen earlier I have provided the backward order, not present in Laycock’s rendition here.


23. Stephen Skinner, in Laycock, *Enochian Dictionary*, p. 5. Laycock writes: “Perhaps strangest of all is that we still do not know whether it is a natural language or an invented language—or whether it is, perhaps, the language of the angels . . .” (*Enochian Dictionary*, p. 19).

27. Ibid., p. 42.
28. Ibid.
29. No longer convinced that the original language of Adam could be discovered, the precursors to the creators of Volapük, Esperanto, Novial, and other contemporary International Auxiliary Languages decided to return speech to a refurbished pre-Babelian state, purged of its arbitrary nature, and words made to reflect their positions within a great taxonomy of significations. This movement, best reflected by John Wilkins’ *Essay Towards A Real Character and Philosophical Language* (1668), is well-covered by various scholars, especially by Umberto Eco (*The Search for the Perfect Language*, trans. James Fentress [Oxford, UK and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1997]). I have no room to discuss its vast dimensions, especially since this study focuses on personal languages.
33. Ibid., p. 61.
38. Ibid., p. 74.
39. Ibid., p. 71.
40. Keevak, in *The Pretended Asian* (p. 75), suggests that Psalmanazar participated indirectly in the linguistic movements of his era. His “Lord’s Prayer” may have been inspired by that published by John Wilkins in his *Essay* and he may have influenced further language experiments.
42. Théodore Flournoy, *From India to the Planet Mars: A Case of Multiple Personality with Imaginary Languages*, ed. Sonu Shamdasani (Princeton: Princeton University...
NOTES TO PART I


43. Flournoy, Des Indes, p. 37.
44. Ibid.
45. Ibid., p. 40.
46. Ibid., p. 41.
47. Ibid., p. 45: “la note émotionelle dominante en elle était bien celle d’une instinctive révolte intérieure contre le milieu modeste où le sort l’avait fait naitre.”
48. Ibid., p. 189.
49. Ibid., p. 145.
50. Ibid., p. 189. Flournoy’s account of Smith’s grammar and vocabulary, including its inconsistencies, can be found on p. 21.
51. See the examples offered by Flournoy, Des Indes, pp. 183–185, 194.
52. For black and white reproductions of these paintings, see Flournoy’s fifth chapter (pp. 133–175).

Chapter Five  Play and Aesthetic in Contemporary Language Invention

4. Ibid., p. 9.
6. Ibid., p. 46.
7. Ibid., p. 46.
8. Huizinga, Homo Ludens, p. 3.
10. I refer to George Lakoff and Mark Johnson’s Metaphors We Live By (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1980), which examines the fundamental physical apprehensions of the world that shape our language and thinking. No matter how unique their syntax and morphology, inventors of naturalistic languages are challenged to break away from the image schemas of their native languages: does a shoe go “on a foot” or is a foot “embraced
by the shoe”? Does one “wear” a shoe or “penetrate” it? Every natural language has a different visceral concept of such things, and language inventors today continually show their awareness of this fact.

11. “Logical” and “engineered languages” differ from “international auxiliary languages” in not advocating for political use. They are not meant to provide a *lingua franca* for the world, but are experiments in producing more efficient, culturally neutral, and less problematic language use for personal and computing communication, and for instigating philosophical discussion about language and ambiguity. The most famous logical language is “Lojban,” an offshoot of Loglan started in 1955 by James Cooke Brown and maintained by the “Logical Language Group” since 1987. See “What is Lojban?” on the official site: http://www.lojban.org/tiki/tiki-index.php?page=What+Is+Lojban?kbl (accessed July 14, 2007).


19. Ibid.

20. Ibid., p. 198.
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33. Ibid., pp. 4–5. Her emphasis.

34. Ibid., p. 136.

35. Ibid., pp. 62, 66, 72.

36. Ibid., p. 95.

37. Ibid., p. 10.

38. The language experiment “E-prime” does much the same thing by banishing the copula and forcing speakers to include observation and/or opinion. I offer my own example: rather than saying “Chaucer is more interesting than Lydgate,” I should say “As a Chaucerian I prefer Chaucer to Lydgate because . . .” E-Prime was inspired by Alfred Korzybski in *Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics* (Chicago: Institute of General Semantics, 1933) with the intention that scientists clarify and disambiguate their pronouncements. Most people I have queried consider it weak in ordinary parlance, partly because providing an equation seems decisive, succinct, and discourages contradiction. See Robert Anton Wilson’s essay: http://www.nobeliefs.com/eprime.htm (accessed July 14, 2007).


40. Ibid., p. 105.

41. Ibid., p. 92.

42. Ibid., p. 5.


47. Ibid., p. 5.

48. Ibid., p. 47.


50. Ibid., p. xi.
51. Ibid., p. 407; “o.n.” probably designates an “oblique noun.”
52. Ibid., p. 475.
54. “The first element of this word, hey- or heya, is the untranslatable statement of praise/greeting/holiness/being sacred”; Le Guin, Always Coming Home, p. 489.
55. Ibid., p. 493.
56. Ibid., p. 486.
58. Ibid., starting with para. 202 on “rules,” and explicated most fully in para. 243, 81, 88.
61. To view this icon, see the website designed by Ellen B. Wright for the “First Language Creation Conference” held at Berkeley on April 23, 2006: http://conlangs.berkeley.edu/about.php (accessed July 14, 2007). This conference, organized by Sai Emrys a.k.a. Ilya Starikov, focused particularly on the conlang community and its creations. Emrys has already started the Language Creation Society. The second conference, again held at Berkeley, took place July 6–8, 2007.
62. These words have either been discussed on the Internet or communicated to me in my 2005 survey. I am grateful to the participants who have allowed me to cite them.
66. For the Klingon script, see http://www.kli.org/tlh/pIqaD.html. The sentence is taken from “Everyday phrases in Klingon,” Mark E. Shoulson: http://www.kli.org/tlh/phrases.html (accessed July 14, 2007). There is also
Chapter Six  Greening Language:  
Hildegard’s Monastery Garden

1. Jeffrey Schapp, “Virgin Words: Hildegard of Bingen’s Lingua Ignota and the Development of Imaginary Languages Ancient to Modern.” *Exemplaria* 3.2 (1991), 290–291 [267–298]. I cannot understand why Schnapp remarks that the Lingua is without diphthongs. Consider Maiz, Peuearez, Funschiol, and so many other words. Lack of observation seems to be a fault here and continues to be demonstrated in the rest of this passage.

2. The melody is recorded in the Riesencodex, and one can hear it sung on the Sequentia version.

3. Ibid., p. 290.


5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

7. See http://www.paulburgess.org/msc.html; also http://pmburgess.blogspot.com/2005/06/language-of-my-own.html (both accessed July 14, 2007). Some of his other comments are derived from his remarks on CONLANG, his responses to my survey, and from a private exchange we have had and that I repeat with his permission.

8. Reproduced, with permission, from a private letter; Burgess has kindly translated this passage for me along with the entire text—he declares that it is inadequate—and it will be my private gift; but VOL still remains something of a mystery to him as well as to me.


Plate 1  The rubricated opening of the *Ignota Lingua* in the Riesencodex.
Plate 2  Dilzio ("day") and Ziginz ("plowshare") from the Riesencodex.
Plate 3  Hildegard’s *Ignotae Litterae* in the Riesencodex.
Plate 4  The use of Hildegard’s *Litterae* in the Sammelhandschrift.
Plate 5  “O Orzechis Ecclesia,” from the notated music in the Riesencodex.
Plate 6  K A P H D: The *Carmen Figuratum* of the Berlin Manuscript (author’s rendering).
PART II

MANUSCRIPTS, EDITION, AND TRANSLATION OF THE LINGUA IGNOTA
This page intentionally left blank
Following is my edition and translation into English of the *Ignota Lingua*. I believe a new edition is called for given the problems in the Basel edition, hereafter referred to as the WUS for their Wörterbuch. Wilhelm Grimm has given us tentative glosses for the German words in the Riesencodex only, and F.W.E. Roth and Elias Steinmeyer provide editions of both texts. But the English-speaking world also needs access to the *Ignota Lingua* in its two extant recensions, especially its earlier one. Because the WUS is not clear in its conflation of the Riesencodex and the Berlin MS, or which glosses belong to which text, and as it gives obvious preference to the latter with its corrections and spellings, it is important to offer an edition of the earlier text and its spelling and word order. This edition, then, privileges the Riesencodex version, but incorporates the added glosses of the Berlin version because they assist translation. My edition offers an English translation of the Lingua in two versions—the first listed in the order of Hildegard’s original taxonomy and the second providing an alphabetization of her invented words. This allows my readers to locate more easily the words I refer to in my discussion as well as observe the frequency with which Hildegard begins with any one letter or syllable.

**Date, Provenance, and Relationship of the Manuscripts**

The *Ignota Lingua* is found in its most complete form in two surviving manuscripts, both containing writings by Hildegard. The “R” or Riesencodex (Hessische Landesbibliothek Wiesbaden MS. 2) contains the Lingua on folios 461v–464v where it is headed in rubric by the title *Ignota Lingua per simplicem hominem hildegardem prolata*. Aptly named the “Giant Codex,” this book is far more comprehensive than the Berlin MS, and contains the following texts in order: *Scivias, Liber vitae meritorum, Liber divinorum operum, Ad praelatos Moguntinenses, Vita sanctæ Hildegardis, Epistolæ* (a long section that includes *Oratio ad congregationem sororum suarum, Vita sancti Ruperti*, the
lyrics to some of her Symphoniae, and the Oratio ad congregatorem filiam suarum), then Liber expositionis quorumdam evangeliorum, followed by the Ignota Lingua. After the Lingua we have a short text called Litterae Villarenses, and the notated Symphonia. The three major visionary texts head the manuscript; so in its inclusion with them the Lingua is recognized as a prophetic work. The B or the Berlin MS (Lat. Quart. 674), formerly known as Codex Cheltenhamensis, contains the Lingua on folios 57r–62r, preceded by the Vita sancte Hildegardis virginis and the Epistole beati. This recension makes helpful additions to both the Latin and the Middle High German glosses listed in R.4

Hildegard’s script has been more often duplicated than her Lingua: besides the glossed alphabet offered in both the R and B (along with that copied by Michael Denis from the now missing Vienna MS described later), one finds her invented letters curiously scattered throughout a section of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 1016 and described at length by Michael Embach.5 The “S” or Theologische Sammelhandschrift (codex theol. et phil. 4º 253), with its collection of her Epistolae, contains an extended application of Hildegard’s script: three words written in her invented alphabet are included in the address of one of her epistles (fol. 75v). Schrader and Fuhrkötter offer a transcription: “hildigardis xiuuild,” that is, “to Hildegard’s monks at Zwiefalten (xiuild[ensibus]).”6 This curious passage indicates that the scribe knew at least her invented letters, but the difficulty one has reading it is due to the alteration of “h,” “i,” and “o,” and the disruptive punctum in hildigar.dis (see plate 4).

One could weep over the loss of Wiener Handschrift Rec. 33, the “Hildegard Codex” of Vienna (V). All we have left of it is Denis’s detailed description in Latin of this manuscript of some 528 pages, set in dual columns like the R text, and resembling in its divisions the oldest collections of Hildegard’s writings at Rupertsburg.7 According to Denis, it contained Hildegard’s major writings, and in 1830, it resided in the Hofbibliothek of Vienna, but thereafter went missing.8 On folio 499, writes Denis, the Lingua begins, and it exhibited the same rubric as that appearing in the Riesencodex: Ignota lingua per simplicem hominem hildegarden [sic] prolata.9 The authorship of the Ignota Lingua is attested, Denis writes, in the Vita and the Liber vitae meritorum, and he states that this most rare manuscript contains “substantives only, of over a thousand words divine and human, parts of the body, dwelling places, clothing, offices, arts, times, utensils, plants, and animals in unheard of [words] over which are superimposed Latin and German meanings.”10 So it was as complete as the Lingua in both R and B. Denis gives the first twelve words, and we have
to rely on his exactness (or that of his copy-editor) to understand how it may have departed from the Riesencodex and Berlin MS:


Zuuenz (Ziuienz) could be a result of minim confusion, and Juuonz (Liuienz) could have resulted from confusing notable letter L with I (along with further minim confusion); the “t” in Diuueltz is probably a publisher’s misprint for “i,” but the rest, I suspect, are common reader’s errors. These departures are frustrating, because there is no way of telling whether Denis, the printers, or the scribe erred in copying. Nor can we examine its orthography for proof of date, although Denis puts the manuscript in the thirteenth century. Of some significance, though, is the “i” in Aieganz for “angel,” which puts B’s Aleganz in the minority here, and suggests a closer relationship of R and V, especially since there are no German glosses. Denis gives a sample of the names for the months:


Omischo seems a misreading of R and B’s Omischo, and in Tiriszinthio Denis makes the same error Grimm does in mistaking notable Z for notable T, which in R, especially, has an extended bottom crossbar. Other than these errors, the text seems to cohere with the R version, but there is no way of knowing whether it served as exemplar for or copy of that manuscript. Denis concludes with a beautifully bold rendition of Hildegard’s Litterae Ignotae, which more closely matches R’s alphabet than it does B’s. Because the manuscript is missing, however, and because we must rely on an omissive and possibly faulty source for information about it, it cannot play much part in a discussion of the relationship of all three manuscripts.

The date of the Riesencodex is now generally believed to be late twelfth century, circa 1182–1187 or even earlier. Schrader and Führkötter write that the compiler of the letters in R may have been Provost Wezelin of Cologne who died in 1185, and who took over after the death of Volmar (Hildegard’s original amanuensis) in 1173 to produce the manuscript. Embach suggests that this important codex invites the question whether its arrangement was monitored by Hildegard as a compendium of her major
works before her death in 1179, which would explain her identification in the Lingua’s rubric.\textsuperscript{15} Copied in Rupertsburg and later moved to Wiesbaden, it stayed within its Rhineland origins, whereas the Berlin Manuscript wandered further afield. This latter codex exhibits the work of two scribes: the first and crucial one completed folios 1 through 62, including the Ignota Lingua, and it is the same hand, claim Schrader and Führkötter, that is exhibited in the early-thirteenth-century Lucca-Codex (Biblioteca de Statale, MS 1942) wherein we find the richly illuminated version of the Liber divinorum operum, circa 1220.\textsuperscript{16} Embach views this fact as an important indication of its date, closer to 1220.\textsuperscript{17} There is evidence that the B text may have been harbored in the Cathedral Chapter of St. Maria of Pfalzel near Trier, procured by the Jesuits of Agen–on–Garonne after 1676 and the dissolution of the cloisters by the French.\textsuperscript{18} From there it found its way eventually into the possession of antiquarian and bibliophile Thomas Thorpe who sold it to Sir Thomas Phillipps in 1836, who in turn added it to his immense collection in Cheltenham. When Phillipps died in 1872, his collection was auctioned off, and the Hildegard-Codex was purchased by Max Wächter who donated it to Kaiser Wilhelm II. This fact explains why neither Grimm, Pitra, nor Roth knew about it. In 1912 it was given to the Berlin library, then known as the Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin.\textsuperscript{19}

Conventional opinion regards these manuscripts not to be copies of one another. The possibility that the B scribe worked from an unknown exemplar is suggested by several facts: the presence of the extra word Magriz (889) is missing from the Riesencodex. The minim mistake made in B’s Duziliuz: the word Duziliuz in R 883 is split at the end of the line on folio 464r—Duzili-uz. No copyist could have missed that. Finally, the confused order in eight items (1,003–1,010): Cruza/wibel to Boiz/bruchus. In the B text, brucus, “grasshopper,” is brought back from its position after Boiz (in the R text) to gloss Cruza, shifting seven other glosses to the right in the manuscript (or down in my edition). As a consequence, Hildegard’s word Luxzia in B is glossed by papilio, “butterfly,” instead of locusta as it is in R. In my opinion, the former is the better fit for concept. Luxzia, in its resemblance to Luzzia (eye), is obviously based on Latin lux, and given her penchant for the visionary and the visibly beautiful, it is aesthetically more suitable as “butterfly”—with its “eye” spots—than the commonplace Ariz (which in the B text is glossed by wibel). If an exemplar with R’s ordering provided the source for B, then the B scribe “corrected” this mismatch by shifting the meanings of eight words. But that seems a little excessive. Why eight words? It is simpler to think that the B scribe missed a word, especially as the divergence occurs at the beginning of the very last line on folio 62r. On the other hand, the penchant in the Ignota Lingua is to duplicate the first syllable of the original word in the relex, in which case R’s Luxzia is the
logical gloss for locusta as it starts with “l,” and especially since the ending -zia tends to accompany feminine Latin nouns.

There are other significant differences. The B scribe has resituated the word Ranzgia in the section on body parts between Kolezia (collum/hals) and Firanz (saliua/speichaldra). In R, it ends folio n. 461v, given prominent position right after the repeat of Nochziz, which is missing in B. I count sixty-seven departures from R in the spelling of Hildegard’s words, too numerous to list here in full, but many of them omit letters or are minim reversals, such as Meginz for R’s Menguiz (161). Here are the significant ones: R’s second use of Peuearrez (patriarcha, 10) occurs as Peuearzet (192) between Karinz (cardinalis) and Arrezenpholianz (archiepiscopus). The B scribe offers R’s original spelling in 10. Where “rz” are juxtaposed in R, B sometimes writes “iz” (Noizka for Norzka [456], Haizima for Harzima [563])—but R’s juxtaposition of “r” and “z” is notoriously difficult to detect given its orthography. B often changes “x” to “z” (and vice versa), which suggests that these letters were pronounced alike; B lacks the first “l” from R’s Gloggizil in 383 and the second “ph” from Phamphziolaz in 290 (both words seemingly marred by dittography); and Schalmindibiz in 754 becomes Schalmindibuz, “almond tree,” in keeping with the repeated calque for -boum. However, the word preceding it, Pazimbu (“medlar”), was clearly meant to have the suffix -buz, something the B text does not correct.

Despite these differences, there is some reason to believe that the Berlin MS is an update of the Riesencodex or its exemplar. The B scribe, while giving the spelling hoibet/hobet for “head” (Haupt) in three places (glossing caput, sinciput, and occiput in 61, 62, and 63), repeats the spelling of R’s houbetlovc in 618 (“opening for the head”). In fact, most of the R scribe’s single German glosses are repeated with nearly unchanged spelling. Nascutil, Nascuriz, and Nascumisil in 88, 89, and 90 repeat the pattern of notable “N” variants in R, described in my notes to the translation. A possible explanation for the extra word Magriz is that the B scribe merely added a word by accident, anticipating Gragiz (893) four lines to the right (prominently featured at the end of the line in R), and then forgot to cross the former out. I would be more convinced of an independent source if there were also a gloss attached to Magriz, but there is none. The repetitions of the R-text’s Pidago and Wizianz (neither recension glosses them) offer further evidence of scribal copying. Of course these variations may have been included in an exemplar—but without glosses?

**Dialect and Orthography**

The only proof we have of provenance rests in the spelling of the German words. The dialect for both the R- and B-scribes’ German seems to be of the
Middle Franconian–Rhineland/Moselle region with evidence of low German influence. So Grimm writes of the R text, granting that its German could easily be a dialect of Bingen. There are obvious similarities between the spelling and dialect shown in the *summarium* of the eleventh-century Codex Trevirensis (Trier), and this influence may account for the “look” not only of low German spellings but of anachronism in both R and B: the prevalent use of initial *c* for initial *k*, final *ch* for final *ck*; *sc* instead of the more courtly *sch*; OHG final *a* or *o* where it has become final *e* in the later and courtly tradition; the absence of marking in the German except for superscripts *ö* and *ü* and the i-Strich or “tick” (i). Grimm lists other peculiarities and inconsistencies that indicate vacillating low German influence, especially in the treatment of umlauting: *e* for *a* in *greno* (“mustache”—*granun* in the B text); *i* for *ie* in *dich* (“thigh”—*dieho* in the B), but the high German spelling is shown in *vierdel*, “quarter,” in R. He notes the vacillation as well among the initial and medial consonants: *th* for *t*: *rathdich* (“radish”); and *pp* instead of *pf* in *appel* “apple,” but *crapf*o for “spearhead.” This same vacillation occurs as well in the B text. Here are twenty-six of the sixty spelling differences shown by R and B among the shared German words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>sceidela</td>
<td>scetdela</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>punthlöch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>dich</td>
<td>dieho</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>sideru urz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>scella</td>
<td>schella</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>zucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>rochlog</td>
<td>rochloch</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>quenela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>cadevize</td>
<td>catevizza</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>nebeta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>nethde</td>
<td>netde</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>steivvarn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>scheida</td>
<td>seida</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>natscado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>buckela</td>
<td>buckgela</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>hircescunza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646</td>
<td>crapf<em>o</em></td>
<td>crapfo</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>priselouch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>addermince</td>
<td>aderminze</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>rathdich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666</td>
<td>suuella</td>
<td>swella</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>fridelesocha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>ingebutden</td>
<td>inchebutden</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>nathdegala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675</td>
<td>uierdel</td>
<td>uirdel</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>hozduba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the low German spelling of *scella* (264) in R but the high German in B; but then note the high German spelling of *scheida* (636) in R and the low in B. In the glosses for the plants, B differs primarily from R in updating the suffix *-urz* to *-wurz*. Many of the differences are minor, and some are errors in R that B corrects (*hozduba* [wood dove], 997, for instance). Obviously, German spelling in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was not regular, but sixty departures in the B text is only about 20 percent of the German provided in R that B reproduces unchanged, half of the differences occurring in the section on plants.
The orthography of both texts is late-twelfth- to early-thirteenth-century caroline miniscule, which does not surprise. The Berlin hand that copied the Lingua differs from R in that the litterae notabiliores (or enlarged initial letters) for each of Hildegard’s words are more embellished with double strokes (or Haarstriche): the dropped or “h-N” is very elaborate: ȝ and the L ɐ has a “whipped” ascending finish that is imitated in Hildegard’s symbol for “l” in her alphabet. Final “s” is miniscule instead of tall, the “two-r” is used more often especially where it clarifies a following “z,” and the ticks over the “i” are more prominent than they are in the Riesencodex, which is why Grimm read drīun in R as drum and thereby missed its meaning. R has a slightly more disorderly look to it; it is written in two columns per page with about five words per column, many of them spilling over onto the next line. There is evidence of correction in the insertion of letters, as though someone labored to get the spellings of Hildegard’s words right. Over each invented word a Latin or less frequently a German gloss is written in the same hand and of nearly the same size as the unknown word it glosses. If both a Latin and a German gloss are given in R, the German is squeezed above the Latin line in smaller letters. (This double glossing is infrequent.) In B, the script is much easier to read: there are no columns to cramp writing space, no interlinear divisions of words, fewer abbreviations and curls—the B scribe has more room to write out Latin endings—and the superscripted glosses are reduced in size making Hildegard’s words stand out as they do not in R. The R text by comparison is a real challenge to read, and Grimm confused the glossary line with the Lingua line in one instance: witness his Oirclaia,22 a divided word the beginning of which is Hildegard’s invention and the ending of which is the second half of the gloss for it on the next line. He worked, granted, without knowledge of the Berlin MS.

The Carmen Figuratum in the Berlin Manuscript: kirio prespiteri deest

Presentation of the Ignota Lingua differs oddly in B. In R, Hildegard’s list begins with the rubricated introduction in the second column of folio 461v, following closely on the heels of the previous text (Expositiones Evangeliorum) and clearly announcing Hildegard as the author. The B text makes no such clarification, choosing to hide Hildegard’s authorship of the Lingua in what is called a carmen figuratum (“shaped poem”; mod. G. Figurengedicht) that references in disguised writing the story told about her divinatory powers in her Vita (see my rendition in plate 6 and my description of the story in chapter three, pp. 58–59). On the verso side of a blank page, there is an elaborate frontispiece that appears to set the Lingua apart from
the rest of the manuscript. If one opens to page 57v and spreads it out, one finds that it faces the opening page of the Lingua with its cryptic alphabet and strange words on 58r. On the left-hand page is drawn a square within which are five elaborate capitals in bright rubric: K at the top, D at the bottom, A to the left, H to the right, and P in the middle, making a cross, as written in the margins of the Riesencodex Vita:

```
K
A
P
H
D
```

This puzzle, however, is much more elaborate than that described in the Vita: around each capital letter are written words (vertically and horizontally) that begin with that letter, like an odd acrostic: *kirio, kristum, kristo* is written vertically around K; *habet, hauriendo, habet* written horizontally around H; *altare, ascende, alas* written horizontally around A; *de est, derisit, de crimine* written vertically around D; and *poculum, prespiteri, primum, pupille, plangitur* around the middle P both horizontally and vertically. In order to read these sentences, one must turn the page to the left and then back to the right:

Vertically (turned to the left):

```
kirio prespiteri deest. kristum primum derisit. kristo plangitur decrimine.
```

Horizontally (turned back to the right):

```
altere poculum habet. ascende pupille hauriendo. alas prespiter habet.
```

The inscription refers to the salvation of an errant priest through the power of Christ:

```
For the Lord (kirio) there is lack of a priest (who) first mocks Christ. For Christ’s sake is he struck down by accusation. The altar has the chalice. Arise, O orphan, by drinking! The priest [now] has wings.
```

What intrigues is the separation of this text from the prior Hildegard material in B, and without attribution, such that I wondered at first if it had been inserted. Indeed, B’s Figurengedicht starts on the verso side of a folio that is blank on the recto side. At the end of the B Lingua, 62v is also blank and bears someone’s signature in a later hand.

Embach reports that this same Figurengedicht is found in the Florentiner Handschrift (Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, MS. Plut. 22.4, fol. 145r) situated not before, as in the Berlin MS, but directly after a reproduction of Hildegard’s Litterae.23 Whoever the B scribe was, he or she
followed a tradition that announced Hildegard’s invented script by emphasizing the Abbess’s involvement with mystical, riddlic letters and language. In so doing, the B scribe has expressed an interpretation of Hildegard’s invention that explains his or her meddling with the text: if the language is to be a mystical lesson hidden from the scrutiny of the non-cognoscenti, then it can have no errors (Glogglizil, Phamphziolanz), much less obscenities (politely left out). But if the project of the B scribe was to make Hildegard’s unknown language better known by adding the German glosses, there is a contradiction here: the more it is explicated, the more we wonder why her authorship is hidden in this way, her words omitted. We, too, are cast as interpreters, and the riddle is much harder in the Figure than it is in the Vita, for it requires us to touch the book.

In order to read the first three sentences, one must turn the page to the left, the sinister side, which suggests the “turning away” of the false priest from Christ’s teachings. Then, once the priest has been chastized, one turns the page back to the right, as in true “conversion,” and reads the last three sentences about the salvation and ascent of the priest through draining the cup. Poculum (cup) is in the center of the page, as the chalice would occupy the center of the altar. Pupille (ward/orphan) is in the center of the space made by the P, and is intersected by the vertical primum, describing another cross and suggesting that the orphan, and all those in need of the Church, is the “first” concern of Christ. The errant prespiter(i) of the first sentence is vertical, and under it the redeemed prespiter is horizontal, corrected and given wings. One wonders if there is also a correct and incorrect way of reading the Lingua and its letters, and that we risk being struck down if we err.

The Translation “Project”
Then and Now

In touching this book, one finds oneself asking why, if Hildegard had a copy of the Trier Glossary, or one similar, she provided only German glosses a third of the time instead of Latin glosses all of the time. However, lacking Hildebrandt and Ridder’s convenient index, a person can only readily find the Latin term for an item with its German gloss (either through the headings or the alphabetizations), but not so readily find the German gloss with its Latin original.24 It seems clear, then, that Hildegard did not merely copy a glossary, but only part of one; she must have had a list of words in mind, many for which she only knew the German. The Riesencodex has a ratio of about seven hundred Latin translations to about three hundred detectable German words, and for a few glosses it is uncertain whether the word is Latin or German (witness namu, for instance, glossing Zizinel—which Grimm regarded as German and Steinmeyer as
Latin). It must be remembered that many technical terms were adapted from Latin into the vernacular and vice versa. Hildegard herself, and whoever copied her work, belonged to a community who used both languages everyday and with varying degrees of confidence and uncertainty. Case is often erratic in the Latin words, and German words in R seem to be resorted to most frequently in those parts dealing with weapons, farming, professional tools, and herbs. These items, unfortunately, are the hardest for contemporary translators to find meanings for, partly because the B scribe, who has helpfully provided German translations for the first half of the Lingua, begins to lose steam in the second half.

Let us assume for the moment that B copied R. B translates about 50 percent of R’s Latin. The project seems clear when you look at it: R offers only one word per item, German or Latin, with only a few exceptions of double glossing that can be counted on one hand. Why not, said a patron, perhaps the one who sponsored the Lucca MS version of Liber divinorum operum, commission a complete double glossary of Hildegard’s Lingua, providing not only German translations of the Latin, but Latin translations of the German? So the B scribe starts out enthusiastically glossing every word, even the most obvious; he or she comes to item 465 (where the days of the month are listed) and stops, probably because the months in German are the same as they are in the Latin and her writing hand is getting sore. She picks up again tentatively at Duneziz (484), “shirt,” and carries on with some omissions for implements such as sera (512), foruex (515), subula (524), stilus (525), hamus (526), andena (527), sulcatorium (529), craticula (535), lebes (536), rastrum (539), and so forth, presumably because she does not know them and cannot locate them in a glossary. Her contributions in this section on technical items is sketchy, partly because the R scribe increasingly provides German words for which the B scribe has even more difficulty finding the Latin. Signs of real apathy begin to show when mensa is not glossed, or even aqua or panis in the kitchen items. Perhaps the scribe felt these words were obvious, even though she glossed Deus, and some of these Latin words may have been commonly used. Starting with the list of trees, the B scribe stops providing German words entirely and merely copies the glosses given in the R text with a few spelling changes.

Although a few of B’s added German words are written first, with the Latin above them, the most intriguing hint that B copied R (or perhaps V) is the space that is often left in B between the German gloss above and the invented word below: it suggests that the B scribe meant to write the Latin word in the middle where it is missing in R. A few of these raised words start midway through the parts of the body (I give B’s spellings): after muolla (71), ougappel (79), ougrinch (80), orsmero (86), orcosla (87), naselouch (89), and
nasecrrosla (90), which are not raised, the following words are elevated, but not provided with Latin translations: rist (120), cnuel (124), brustleffel (133), hegedruose (165), dieho (167), cursere (312); and then a whole line of items in the shoe and winepress section (657–687, especially noticeable in B on folios 60r–61v): drath bursta, scuoba, lo, swerza, slif, aderinenze, pin, swella, pressere, gebutde, zubeda, inchebutden, snuba, hersihe, seckere, gelleda, wredel, zober, sestere, trehedere, reis, duga, bodun, kuofa, punthloch; and then from the beer-making and farmyard section (692–705):

drath bursta, scuoba, lo, swerza, slif, aderminze, pin, swella, pressere, gebutde, zubeda, inchebutden, sruba, bersihe, seckere, gelleda, wredel, zober, sestere, trehdere, reis, duga, bodun, kuofa, punthloch; and then from the beer-making and farmyard section (692–705):

drath bursta, scuoba, lo, swerza, slif, aderminze, pin, swella, pressere, gebutde, zubeda, inchebutden, snuba, hersihe, seckere, gelleda, wredel, zober, sestere, trehdere, reis, duga, bodun, kuofa, punthloch; and then from the beer-making and farmyard section (692–705):

drath bursta, scuoba, lo, swerza, slif, aderminze, pin, swella, pressere, gebutde, zubeda, inchebutden, snuba, hersihe, seckere, gelleda, wredel, zober, sestere, trehdere, reis, duga, bodun, kuofa, punthloch; and then from the beer-making and farmyard section (692–705):

drath bursta, scuoba, lo, swerza, slif, aderminze, pin, swella, pressere, gebutde, zubeda, inchebutden, snuba, hersihe, seckere, gelleda, wredel, zober, sestere, trehdere, reis, duga, bodun, kuofa, punthloch; and then from the beer-making and farmyard section (692–705):

drath bursta, scuoba, lo, swerza, slif, aderminze, pin, swella, pressere, gebutde, zubeda, inchebutden, snuba, hersihe, seckere, gelleda, wredel, zober, sestere, trehdere, reis, duga, bodun, kuofa, punthloch; and then from the beer-making and farmyard section (692–705):

drath bursta, scuoba, lo, swerza, slif, aderminze, pin, swella, pressere, gebutde, zubeda, inchebutden, snuba, hersihe, seckere, gelleda, wredel, zober, sestere, trehdere, reis, duga, bodun, kuofa, punthloch; and then from the beer-making and farmyard section (692–705):

This raising seems to indicate a confidence that the scribe can go back and supply the Latin equivalents. But as the text continues in the seven hundreds, and possibly as the scribe fatigues or runs out of time, the single German gloss stops being raised to its secondary position and is copied as it appears in R. Of the nearly three hundred German glosses in R, I count thirty-one Latin contributions by the B scribe:

cilium for R’s ouglith (81);
yuula for huobo (103);
alenus for elenbogo (118);
ulcus for suero (182);
fesica for bladera (183);
subucula for scurliz (324);
chassupium for soum (617);
ocrea for lederhosa (629);
forma for leist (655);
broca for zapfo (688);
area for denne (716);
ventilabrum for wanna (718);
scapus for scoub (719);
stramen for stro (721);
palea for spriu (722);
pabulum for futder (724);
stips for branch (730);
olla for dupfen (732);
beccharium for becher (738);
nucas for nuzboum (796); and
aquila for ar0 (938).

It seems, then, that the “project” of translating Hildegard’s unknown words proved to be a difficult one for both her scribes.

Some of the unglossed Latin, however, is due to a redactor who seems more prudish than the Riesencodex scribe. Uirlaiz (“testicles”) is without translation. However, even Hildegard’s invented words—Creueniz (“male member”) and Fragizlanz (“a woman’s place of bashfulness”)—are left out entirely, although a space remains for them. This is a sad development, since it seems to assign Hildegard’s Lingua to the level of the words she was endeavoring to replace and dignify. R seems, by comparison, a more honest record of her language and its philosophy.

The question is whether we can ever hope to arrive at Hildegard’s original meanings. If the early German word in either R or B has an obvious and common descendent in modern German, I leave it unannotated in my notes. Because it is a taxonomy and Hildegard and/or her scribe put these words in some kind of hierarchy, we have the context of the list to tell us that stilus in a group of words about gardening means “stake,” not “writing instrument.” I have also made use of Hildebrandt and Ridder’s Register, and have listed this source where it has been useful, but since many of the
German words lead to even more obscure Latin words in the *Summarium*, it is often easier to look them up in Old and Middle High German dictionaries. For ease of access and for the diplomatic spellings, I prefer Gerhard Köbler’s online *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch* to that by Starck and Wells, although I have consulted both dictionaries. So there are many resources available to me, and for Hildegard’s natural world we have her *Physica*. Her trees, her herbs, her birds, and her flying insects are represented about 90 percent of the time in the *Physica*, with different spellings or with a German instead of a Latin gloss. I do not reference these sources except where they clarify the meaning of an obscure word.

The numbering in WUS is erratic. I have renumbered the entries, followed the spellings of the Riesencodex, omitted the *Raizgia* [sic] of the WUS edition (105a) and put its Berlin gloss after the only appearance of *Ranzgia* in the R text in number 59. I have also added *Magriz*, bringing the famous tally from 1,011 to 1,012. Three words are un glossed, though, so the Lingua actually contains 1,009 glossed words, and, if one further discounts the repeated *Nochziz*, *Ziginz*, and *Zinz/Zonz*, then 1,006. An illustration of *Litterae Ignotae* (“unknown letters”) also accompanies both the Riesencodex and Berlin MS, at the end and at the beginning of each, respectively.

**Hildegard’s Taxonomy in the Ignota Lingua**

I provide the following numbered division of the items in the Lingua for the benefit of those using the alphabetized list. Since several items have the same translation (“patriarch,” “stylus,” “compass,” “plowshare,” etc.), it would be helpful to know into what category these words fall when one consults them out of their original order. The redactor of R appears to have started a division of the manuscript into parts indicated by a large capital in rubric, and then abandoned it: *Aigonz* (“God”) starts the subdivision (1–58) on spiritual entities, members of the family, and sick people; *Hoil* (“head”) starts the second subdivision (59–189) on parts of the body; *Kelionz* (“pope”) starts a third large subdivision that includes words for church offices and physical items associated with the monastery and the village; *Dilzio* (“day”) starts a fourth subdivision on time; *Duneziz* (“undergar-ment”) starts a fairly confusing fifth section on items of clothing, tools (of the cutting, hacking sort), and kitchen items, which belong to a known category of iron implements in the *Summarium*; and *Ziginz* (“plowshare”) seems to start a sixth subdivision of words that should belong to the fifth one. Where there should obviously be headings for the plants and the birds, there are none; no further capitals can be detected, but there is a space after
Kachzia (ending the plants), and Argumzio (“gryphon”) with an undecorated capital begins the section on birds. So there are actually seven sections where WUS indicates six, and Grimm lists eight. The Berlin MS has sixteen: Aigonz (“God”), Hoil (“head”), Kelionz (“pope”), Ophalin (“temple”), Scarinz (“tunic”), Pereziluz (“emperor”), Fraizola (“lodger”), Dilzio (“day”), Duneziz (“undergarment”), Ziginz (“plowshare”), Spurz (“shoelast”), Auizel (“water”), Lamischiz (“fir tree”), Florisca (“balsam”), Cachxiz (“wheat”), and Argumzio (“gryphon”) are all capitalized. My headings in the edition and translation that follow are my own. Where the Riesencodex version demarcates a new section with a rubricated capital (see plate 2), I put the whole word in capital letters.

My taxonomy is not thorough; there are even more minute categories under “kinship relations,” for instance, and especially under “plants,” showing that Hildegard gives some order to her list of vegetables (“the onion family,” “the turnip family,” “salad vegetables and herbs”), which further contextualizes their meanings. This section was the hardest to find English equivalents for, since even American and English common names for plants differ, and they change from one century to the next. The reader should remember that many of these words and others in Hildegard’s Lingua have only approximate translations. What subtle, technical distinction she or her redactors in the Riesen- and Berlin codices are making between Zichzimil: bipennis/bihelin (521) and Galschiriz: bipennis/— (542)—or all the variations for “jar,” “pail,” “jug,” “container,” “hoe,” “plowshare,” or “cutting implement”; or between the Latin and German translations given separately and for the same items among the plants—still remain a little foggy.

I. WORDS FOR THE SPIRITUAL REALM (1–18)
   A. Spiritual Entities (1–6) AIGONZ
   B. The Human Being as God’s Creature (7–9) INIMOIS
   C. Patriarchs, Saints, and God’s Servants (10–18) PEUEARREZ

II. WORDS FOR THE HUMAN REALM (19–751):
   A. Kinship Relations and the Human Body: KULZPHAZUR
      1. Members of the family (19–45)
      2. Sufferers of disease or accident (46–58)
      3. Human body parts (59–179)
      4. Skin diseases (180–189)
   B. Church Offices and Structures: KELIONZ
      1. Offices (190–219)
      2. Structures and Equipment (220–341)
         a. architectural details of the church (220–281)
         b. items used in the mass or its preparation (282–304)
c. liturgical books (305–323)
d. liturgical clothing and cloths for the altar (324–341)

C. Secular Trades, Titles, and Activities: PEREZILIUZ
   1. Noble and military officials and groups (342–368)
   2. Innkeepers and craftsmen (369–409)
   3. Entertainers, sinners, and criminals (410–428)
   4. Hunting or military expeditions (429–438)
   5. Members of the noble household (439–447)

D. Temporal Elements: DILZIO
   1. Days of the week, words for month, year, dawn, dusk (448–465)
   2. The twelve months (466–477)
   3. The canonical hours (478–483)

E. The Monastery Household and the Village: DUNEZIZ
   1. Clothing (484–503)
   2. Iron implements: professional and farming equipment (504–560)
   3. Types of land (561–569)
   4. Items needed for the scriptorium (570–584)
   5. Tools needed for sewing, spinning, and weaving (585–609)
   6. Types of clothing, again, and jewelry (611–628)
   7. Arms and armor (629–654)
   8. Tools for the crafts, and for wine and beer-making (655–704)
   9. The house, household tools, and the farm (705–725)
  10. Items needed for the kitchen (726–742)
  11. Basic foods (743–751)

III. WORDS FOR THE NATURAL REALM (752–1011)
   A. Trees (752–802) LAMISCHIZ
   B. Plants: medicinal herbs, spices, flowers, vegetables (803–936) ZIZRIA
   C. Birds, a bat, and a gryphon (937–1,000) ARGUMZIO
   D. Insects (1,001–1,011) SAPIDUZ
NOTES TO MANUSCRIPT INFORMATION

Manuscript Information

1. Wörterbuch der unbekannten Sprache, ed. Unknown (Basel: Verlag Basler Hildegard-Gesellschaft, 1986). Elsewhere, scholars refer to Marie-Louise Portmann and Alois Odermatt as the editors of this edition, but the preface refers to them as consultants. And while these scholars may have helped the Baseler Hildegard Gesellschaft in examining the manuscripts, compiling the edition, and finding many of the translations, this help has been somewhat erroneously applied despite the many useful aspects of this edition.


4. Apparently, “C” was used even before Wilhelm Grimm to designate the Riesencodex, but the custom now is to use an abbreviation that reflects the first letter of the named manuscript.

5. See Michael Embach, Die Schriften Hildegards von Bingen: Studien zu ihrer Überlieferung und Rezeption im Mittelalter und in der Frühen Neuzeit (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2003), pp. 282–283. Folios 116r–121r of this manuscript are filled with Hildegard’s special characters, notably between the musical staves of some of her songs.


7. Michael Denis, Codices manuscripti theologici Bibliothecae palatinae Vindobonensis latini aliarumque occidentis linguarum, Vol. 2 n. 721 (Vienna: Wiener Hofbibliothek, 1793–1802), cols 1723–1729. I am indebted to Friedrich Simader at the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek for directing me to this text. Denis: “per duas columnas scriptus, et rubricis distinctus ad vetustissimas
pertinent collectiones Scriptorum Hildegardis Virginis Antistitae Montis S. Roberti prope Bingham” (col. 1723).

8. WUS remark that it vanished before 1830, a disappearance that cannot be explained (p. vii). Steinmeyer confirms its missing status in his “Glossae Hildegardis” (p. 390); so also does Embach in *Die Schriften* (p. 61). We face another possible disappearance of the Lingua: in the introduction to her edition of the *Liber vite meritorum* (CCCM, vol. 90 [Turnhout: Brepols, 1995], lviii–lix), Angela Carlevaris notes that a manuscript copy of Hildegard’s entire work (vollständige Sammlung aller Werke), compiled by the *Acta Inquisitiones* for her canonization and cited in the *Analecta Bollandiana* II, 1883, p. 697, has never been found.


11. Ibid., col. 1727–1728.

12. Ibid., col. 1723.

13. Ibid., col. 1728.


18. Ibid., p. 252.

19. I am indebted to Dr. Renate Schipke at the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin for directing me to this information; it is also described by Embach (*Die Schriften*, p. 61).


21. Ibid., p. 337.

22. Ibid., p. 321.

23. Embach, *Die Schriften*, p. 279. He notes that the text of the Unknown Language is, however, missing in the Florentiner MS.


25. Steinmeyer (*Glossae*) reports in both cases that a gap is left (Lücke gelassen). If the word has been passed over but a gap left (instead of scraped off) it suggests an interesting mixture of reverence and embarrassment. The word will not be written, but the scribe lets us know that a word was there. Or, it indicates indecision: the scribe will come back and insert it later after deliberation.
Here is how to read my edition and translation: R and B refer to the Riesencodex and the Berlin MS, respectively. The words are listed and numbered in the order in which they appear in the Riesencodex. I have written out the Latin abbreviations and the superscripted “o” and “v” over some of the German words in both texts. Since I privilege the Riesencodex, and it gives Latin translations two thirds of the time, I put all Latin glosses of Hildegard’s invented words first and indicate their presence in “R” and/or “B.” While B’s glosses are often helpful, I prefer to depend on those by R. All German glosses, if they occur for a word in B or R, are put afterward in parantheses, similarly indicated. B adds a German gloss above R’s Latin gloss for a little over half the text, but when B infrequently adds a Latin gloss that is missing in R, I put the B gloss first to maintain my Latin-first rule. Very infrequently, R will give both a Latin and a German gloss, in which case I indicate both with an “R.” In some instances it is difficult to tell what is authentically Latin or German.

A dash (—) indicates that the B text has replicated the Latin or German word found in the R text, perhaps with minor spelling differences. I use a lowercase “x” to indicate the absence of any gloss. The list that follows is given the divisions I have indicated in my taxonomy in the last chapter and do not appear in the text itself. When a word is printed all in caps, it means that it starts with a capital (often rubricated) in the manuscript. Most of Hildegard’s invented words begin with *litterae notabiliores*, or enlarged miniscule letters.

I. Words for the Spiritual Realm

I.A. Spiritual Entities

1  **AIGONZ**, R: deus (B: goth) GOD (the capital is elaborate and in rubric)
2  **Aiegnanz**, R: angelus (B: engel) ANGEL
I.B. The Human Being as God’s Creature

7 **Inimois**, R: homo (B: meinscho) HUMAN
8 **Iur**, R: uir (B: man) MAN
9 **Vanix**, R: femina (B: wib) WOMAN

I.C. God’s Human Servants

10 **Peuearrez**, R: patriarcha (B: ercevather) PATRIARCH
11 **Korzinthio**, R: propheta (B: wissage) PROPHET
12 **Falschin**, R: uates (B: warsage) SEER
13 **Sonziz**, R: apostolus (B: botho) APOSTLE
14 **Imschiol**, R: martir (B: martdelere) MARTYR
15 **Zanziuier**, R: confessor (B: bihtdere) CONFESSOR
16 **Vrizoil**, R: uirgo (B: mageth) VIRGIN
17 **Iugiza**, R: uidua (B: witdewa) WIDOW
18 **Pangizo**, R: penitens (B: ruwesere) PENITENT

II. Words for the Human Realm

II.A. Kinship Relations and the Human Body

1. Members of the Family

19 **Kulzphazor**, R: attauus (B: alderano) ANCESTOR
20 **Phazor**, R: auus (B: ano) GRANDFATHER
21 **Peueriz**, R: pater (B: fatder) FATHER
22 **Maiz**, R: mater (B: mouder) MOTHER
23 **Nilspeueriz**, R: utricus (B: stieffatder) STEPFATHER
24 **Nilsmaiz**, R: nouerca (B: stiefinouder) STEPMOTHER
25 **Scirizin**, R: filius (B: sun) SON
26 **Nilzsciriz**, R: priuignus (B: stuβsun) STEPSON
27 **Limzkil**, R: infans (B: kindelin) INFANT
28 **Zainz**, R: puer (B: cnappo) BOY
29 **Zimzial**, R: iuuenis (B: iungelinch) YOUTH
30 **Bischiniz**, R: adolescens (B: iuncman) ADOLESCENT
31 **Malkunz**, R: senex (B: altman) OLD MAN
32 **Fronix**, R: frater (B: bruder) BROTHER
33 **Miskila**, R: soror (B: suestder) SISTER
34 **Peuors**, R: patruus (B: fethdero) PATERNAL UNCLE
Fanschol, R: auunculus (B: hoheim) MATERNAL UNCLE
Pleniza, R: amita (B: wasa) PATERNAL AUNT
Maizfia, R: matertera (B: muoma) MATERNAL AUNT
Funschiol, R: gener (B: suager) SON-IN-LAW
Liaziz, R: nurus (B: snurha) DAUGHTER-IN-LAW
Zimbia, R: socrus (B: suiger) MOTHER-IN-LAW
Scair, R: socer (B: sueher) FATHER-IN-LAW
Neniz, R: nepos (B: nefo) GRAND-CHILD
Forinz, R: maritus (B: gehitman) HUSBAND
Kaueia, R: uxor (B: gehitwib) WIFE
Loiffol, R: populus (B: livt) PEOPLE

2. Sufferers of Disease or Accident

Nochziz, R: cecus (B: blint) BLIND-MAN (R repeated in n. 58)
Nosinz, R: surdus (B: dovber) DEAF-MAN (see Nosinz, n. 181)
Niszin, R: srabo (B: scilender) SQUINTER
Sciniz, R: balbus (B: stamelender) STAMMERER
Keliz, R: blesus (B: lisbender) LIPER
Scarpinz, R: mutus (B: stummer) MUTE
Kolianz, R: claudus (B: halzer) CRIPPLE
Pariziz, R: eunuchus (B: geheingestman) EUNUCH
Phanizchin, R: idropicus (B: wazersutdiger) DROPSICAL-Person
Siliziz, R: cardiacus (B: herzesiecho) DYSPEPTIC (heartburn sufferer)
Stragulz, R: paraliticus (B: behtderieso) PARALYZED PERSON
Pasizio, R: leprosus (B: miselsuthdiger) LEPER
Nochziz, R: cecus, B: — BLIND-MAN (repeat of n. 46)

3. Parts of the Human Body

Ranzgia, R: lingua (B: zunga—resituated) TONGUE
HOIL, R: caput (B: hoibeth) HEAD
Forischial, R: sinciput (B: uorhoibeth) FOREHEAD
Ambila, R: occiput (B: hinderhobeth) BACK OF THE HEAD
Frens, R: vertex (B: wirbel) CROWN OF THE HEAD
Fasinz, R: caluaria (B: gibila) SKULL
Faraliz, R: caluicium (B: calewa) BALD HEAD
Ceril, R: cerebrum (B: hirne) BRAIN
Zirinschol, R: ceriuella (B: hirnescala) CRANIUM
Scaia, (R: sceidela, B: —) PART (in hair) or SCALP
Sterauinzia, R: frons (B: stirna) BROW, FOREHEAD
Amzil, R: extrex (B: nach) NECK
Guia, (R: nuolla, B: —) NAPE (of the neck)
Orrnalz, R: crinis (har) HAIR (the tressed hair belonging to a woman)
Milischa, R: coma (B: uasch) HAIR (head hair of a man)
Ornalziriz, R: cincinnus (B: crisphar) CURLY-HAIR
Lasinz, R: capillus (B: loche) A LOCK OR STRAND OF HAIR
Crib eranz, R: cesaries (B: scara) LONG HAIR
Luzeia, R: oculus (B: ovga) EYE
Fonix, R: pupilla (B: seho) PUPIL
Luzpomphia, (R:ougappel, B:—) EYEBALL
Luzerealz, (R: ougrinch, B:—) EYE- SOCKET
Luziliet, B: cilium (R: ovglith) EYELASH
Luziminispier, R: palpebra (B: ovgbrawa) EYELID
Pilsemia, R: supercilium (B: vbebrawa) EYEBROW
Vguwiz, R: lacrima (B: drahun) TEAR
Oir, R: auris (B: ora) EAR
Oirunguizol, (R: orsmero, B:—) EARWAX
Oirclamisil, (R: orcrrosla, B:—) EAR CARTILAGE
Nascutil, R: nasus (B: nasa) NOSE
Nascuzirz, (R: naselouch, B:—) NOSTRIL
Nascumisil, (R: nasecrosia, B:—) NOSE-CARTILAGE
Pusinzia, R: catarrus (R: snuz) SNOT
Wisanza, R: gene (B: hufelun) CHEEK
Maiaz, R: maxilla (B: wanga) UPPER JAW
Scamilin, R: timpus (B: dunuewenge) TEMPLE
Moniz, R: os (B: munt) MOUTH
Talzim, R: labium (B: lespho) LIP
Osinz, R: mandibula (B: bachko) JAW
Maletinosinz, (R: kinnebacko, B:—) LOWER JAW
Uimzial, R: gingiue (B: bilrun), GUM
Malskir, R: dens (B: zan), TOOTH
Osinzmalskir, R: molaris dens (B: bachkezan), MOLAR
Gulzia, R: faux (B: guomo), PALATE? ROOF OF MOUTH?
Franix, B: yuula (R: huobo), UVULA
Gruzia, R: guttur (B: kela), GULLET, ESOPHAGUS
Kolezia, R: collum (B: hals), THROAT
Firanx, R: saliua (B: speichaldra), SALIVA
Kolecruziz, (R: halsbein, B:—), NECKBONE
Koletabeiaz, R: cervix (B: halsadra), VEIN IN NECK
Maletin, R: mentum (B: kinne), CHIN
Viriscal, R: barba (B: bart), BEARD
Zizia, (R: greno, B: granun), MUSTACHE
Dulsielz, R: facies (B: antluzze), FACE
Scalzio, R: humerus (B: asla), SHOULDER
Scaintila, R: scapula (B: sculdera), SHOULDER BLADE
115 **Iunix**, R: ascella (B: houchisa), ARM PIT
116 **Branizel**, R: brachium (B: arm), ARM
117 **Discol**, R: musculus (B: mus), MUSCLE
118 **Luguriz**, B: alenus (R: elenbogo), ELBOW
119 **Iurstaniz**, R: cubitus (B: elin), FOREARM
120 **Nilzial**, (R: rist, B: —) WRIST
121 **Vrzial**, R: manus (B: hant) HAND
122 **Zirins**, R: digitus (B: finger) FINGER
123 **Pixel**, R: pollex (B: dumo) THUMB
124 **Conix**, (R: cnugel, B: —) KNUCKLE
125 **Salziox**, R: unguis (B: nagel), NAIL
126 **Pidago**, x (x)
127 **Magux**, R: pugnus (B: fust) FIST
128 **Benizscaia**, R: dextra (B: zeswa) RIGHT HAND
129 **Siliszsa**, R: sinistra (B: winstra) LEFT HAND
130 **Warinz**, R: inpetigo (B: warza) WART, or NIPPLE
131 **Galich**, R: membrum (B: gelith) LIMB
132 **Burbeiscal**, R: pectus (B: brust) BREAST, CHEST
133 **Burbefeleiz**, (R: brustdefel, B: —) STERNUM, XIPHISTERNUM?
134 **Laniscal**, R: ubera (B: manmun) MAMMARY
135 **Veriszoil**, R: uenter (B: buch) WOMB
136 **Stranguliz**, R: umbilicus (B: nabelo) NAVAL
137 **Tirziel**, R: renes (B: lenden) LOINS
138 **Iuncxoil**, R: femur (B: huf) THIGH-BONE
139 **Spirizan**, R: ilia (B: lankin) INTESTINES (small)
140 **Tilzia**, R: ventriculus, B: — (R: wamba, B: —) BELLY
141 **Schicial**, R: latus (B: sihda) FLANK
142 **Kosinzia**, R: costa (B: ribbe) RIB
143 **Rimziol**, R: dorsum (B: rugge) BACK
144 **Scorinz**, R: cor (B: herza) HEART
145 **Ieuriz**, R: iecur (B: lebera) LIVER
146 **Molliz**, R: pulmo (B: lunga) LUNG
147 **Scauril**, R: stomachus (B: mago) STOMACH
148 **Uiperiz**, R: splen (B: milze) SPLEEN
149 **Idiez**, R: fel (B: galla) GALLBLADDER
150 **Gloiz**, R: renunculus (B: niero) KIDNEY
151 **Vnguizol**, R: aruina (B: smero) FAT
152 **Virzeia**, R: uiscera (B: inedre) ENTRAILS
153 **Dariz**, R: intestina (B: darma) INTESTINES (large)
154 **Buianz**, R: uesica (B: blasa) BLADDER
155 **Fluanz**, R: locium (R: harn) URINE
156 **Rubianz**, R: sanguis (B: bluth) BLOOD
157  **Suinz**, R: sudor (B: sweiz) SWEAT
158  **Dorniel**, R: culus (B: hers) BOTTOM, ASS
159  **Duoliz**, R: nates, B: — BUTTOCKS
160  **Zirzer**, R: anus, B: — ANUS
161  **Menguiz**, R: stercus (B: horo) EXCREMENT
162  **Creueniz**, R: uirile-membrum, uretremum (B: x) MALE MEMBER
163  **Uirlaiz**, R: testiculi (B: x) TESTICLES
164  **Lizia**, R: glandula (B: druos) GLANS
165  **Amzglizia**, (R: hegedruse, B: —) MALE PUDENDUM
166  **Fragizlanz**, R: locus-uerecundie mulieris (B: x) FEMALE PUDENDUM
167  **Croich**, (R: dich, B: —) THIGH
168  **Boil**, R: genu (B: kni) KNEE
169  **Cluianz**, R: os (R: bein, B: —) BONE
170  **Cruniz**, (R: menschen, crus bein, B: meinschenbein) LEG
171  **Sciacruniz**, R: tibie (R: scinkun, B: —) SHIN-BONE
172  **Moueniz**, R: sures (B: wado) CALF
173  **Milisch**, R: medulla (B: march) MARROW
174  **Tabeializ**, R: uena (B: adra) VEIN
175  **Crouiz**, R: talus (B: enkil) ANKLE
176  **Vrzoia**, R: calcaneus (B: versna) HEEL
177  **Funiz**, R: planta pedis (B: fuozsola) SOLE (of foot)
178  **Misanz**, R: arcula (R: ceha, B: —) TOE
179  **Fuscal**, R: pes (B: fuoz) FOOT

4. Skin Diseases

180  **Ranzil**, (R: ruof, B: —) SCABIES
181  **Nosinz**, (R: grint, B: —) SCAB (see Nosinz, n. 47)
182  **Minscol**, B: ulcus (R: suero) ULCER
183  **Abiliz**, B: fesica (R: bladera) BLISTER
184  **Razil**, R: uenenum (B: eithder) POISON
185  **Scirinz**, R: tabo (B: tror) RUNNING SORE
186  **Pasiz**, R: lepra (B: miselsut) LEPROSY
187  **Bezelun**, (R: uellun, B: —) SKIN DISEASE
188  **Ruschila**, R: ruga (B: runzela) WRINKLE
189  **Monzil**, R: scabies (B: rudo) MANGE

II.B. Church Offices and Structures

1. Offices

190  **KELIONZ**, R: papa (B: babest) POPE
191  **Karinz**, R: cardinalis (B: cardinal) CARDINAL (see Karinz, n. 864)
192 Peuearzet, R: patriarcha (B: erzefatder) PATRIARCH
193 Arrezenpholianz, R: archiepiscopus (B: erzebiscofh) ARCHBISHOP
194 Enpholianz, R: episcopus (B: biscofh) BISHOP
195 Scailo, R: clericus (B: paffo) CLERIC
196 Scalzido, R: sacerdos (B: ewartdo) HIGH PRIEST
197 Kolscanz, R: presbiter (B: prister) PRIEST
198 Zeuinoz, R: diaconus, B: — DEACON
199 Tilzeuinoz, R: subdiaconus, B: — SUBDEACON
200 Zintol, R: acolitus (B: lietdregere) ACOLYTE
201 Scurinz, R: exorcista (B: beswerere) EXORCIST (see Scurinz, n. 294)
202 Niscalnoiz, R: lector (B: lesere) READER
203 Oriezio, R: ianitor (B: dorwartdo) PORTER
204 Gasinz, R: cancellarius (B: cancelere) CHANCELLOR
205 Proueiz, R: prepositus (B: probeist) PROVOST
206 Telzion, R: decanus (B: dechan) DEAN
207 Kanesilis, R: cantor (B: sengere) CANTOR
208 Luschil, R: sacrista (B: kuster) Sexton
209 Agizinix, R: magister (B: meister) MASTER, TEACHER
210 Agilarchiniz, R: magister scolarum (B: schulmester) SCHOOL-TEACHER
211 Silzimian, R: scolaris, B: — SCHOLAR
212 Lunchkal, R: discipulus (B: iungero) DISCIPLE
213 Larchizin, R: scriptor (B: scribere) SCRIBE
214 Abiol, R: abbas (B: abbeth) ABBOTT
215 Spariz, R: prior, B: — PRIOR
216 Morizinz, R: monachus (B: munich) MONK
217 Reimonz, R: monialis (B: nunna) NUN
218 Phalischer, R: inclusus (B: closenere) ANCHORITE
219 Orinschiel, R: heremita (B: einsidelo) HERMIT

2. Structures and Equipment

a. Architectural details of the church

220 Ophalin, R: templum (B: gotheshus) TEMPLE
221 Monzchia, R: monasterium (B: munster) MONASTERY
222 Crizia, R: ecclesia (B: kircha), CHURCH
223 Clainzo, R: claustrum (B: closter) CLOISTER
224 Miziabiza, R: oratorium (B: betdehus) ORATORY
225 Praiz, R: chorus (B: kor) CHOIR
226 Kaido, R: delubrum (B: abgotheshus) SHRINE
227 Zirinzil, R: porticus (B: porzeth) CHAPEL or PORTICO
228 Oneziz, R: ianua (B: duora) DOOR
Nilziol, R.: ualue (B: ualledure) FOLDING DOORS
Tirix, R.: limen (B: druschubele) THRESHOLD
Scolioz, R.: superliminare (B: oberdure) TRANSOM, LINTEL
Poiniz, R.: postes (B: durstudele), DOORPOST
Gulioz, R.: cardo (B: ango) HINGE
Sparinzia, R.: sera (B: sloz) LOCK
Galantiz, (R: henga, B: —) HANDLE
Pioranz, R.: clauis (B: sluzil) KEY
Pezimil, R.: pessulum (B: grindel) LATCH
Bizimonz, R.: fundamentum (B: fundemunde) FOUNDATION
Staurinz, R.: lapis (B: stein) STONE
Kalirinz, R.: quadrus (B: quaderstein) STONE-BLOCK, ASHLAR
Michzio, R.: cementum (B: mortdere) CEMENT
Kolezin, R.: sabulum (B: sant) SAND
Branzin, R.: calx (B: calch) LIME
Ronzis, R.: perpendiculum (B: murwaga) PLUMB-LINE
Gunschula, R.: murus (B: mura) WALL
Stirpheniz, R.: pauimentum (B: hesderich) PAVEMENT
Kolinzia, R.: columnpa (B: sul) COLUMN
Fuschalioz, R.: bases (B: simiz), PEDESTAL
Pillix, R.: capitellum (B: capitel) CAPITAL (of a pillar)
Dioranz, R.: fornix (B: suibogo) VAULT, ARCH, or ARCADE
Sinziol, R.: testudo (B: gewolbe) ARCHED or HIPPED ROOF
Bilidio, R.: celatura (B: graft) ENGRAVING (for a tomb)
Phalidiz, R.: absidun (B: exedre) APSE
Lanschil, R: analogium (B: letdere) PULPIT, LECTERN
Diuloz, R.: tribunal (B: dinestul) SANCTUARY
Tronischia, R.: cathedra (B: bishchouesstul) CATHEDRAL
Ziuntoriz, R: scuarium, B: — RELIQUARY
Stalticholz, R: altare (B: eltdere) ALTAR
Gramizel, R: gradus (B: grethde) STEP
Blanzio, R: ciborium, B: — ALTAR CANOPY
Sanucciua, R: cripta (B: cruftda) CRYPT
Zinzrinz, R: coclea (B: vvindelstein) SPIRAL STAIRCASE
Pharisch, R: conus (B: cnofh) KNOB (for a door? Clapper in a bell?)
Tonizma, R: nola (R: scella) BELL (little)
Clomischol, R: campana (B: glochga) BELL (big)
Zeia, R: restis (B: seil) ROPE (for the bell)
Diriz, (R: rinch, B: —) RING (for the rope?)
Colinzko, R: laquearia (B: himelza) CEILING
Phaliz, R: pictura (B: gemelze) PAINTING
Vmbrizio, R: tectum (B: dach) ROOF
Gorinz, R: trabs (R: balko) RAFTER
b. Items used in the Mass and its preparation

282 **Spancriz**, R.: dedicatio ecclesie (B: kirwiha) CHURCH CONSECRATION
283 **Limzikol**, R.: crux (B: cruce) CROSS
284 **Milizamiz**, R.: imago (B: bilede) IMAGE
285 **Timzaloz**, R.: turibulum (B: rochfaz) THURIBLE, CENSER
286 **Donix**, R.: acerra (B: wirochfaz) INCENSE BOX
287 **Phamkil**, R.: cera (B: was) WAX
288 **Dilisch**, R.: sepum (B: unslith) TALLOW
289 **Zizimina**, R.: oleum (B: olei) OIL
290 **Phamphziolaz**, R.: cereus (B: kerza) WAX CANDLE
291 **Kinchzia**, R.: candela (B: lith) TALLOW CANDLE, LIGHT
292 **Kinchscalis**, R.: candelabrum (B: kerzestal) CANDLESTICK
293 **Liuzanz**, R.: lucerna, (B: lithfaz) OIL-LAMP
294 **Spinzia**, R.: lampas (B: fäkelun) TORCH
295 **Scurinz**, R.: flama, B: — FLAME (see Scurinz n. 201)
296 **Bulizin**, R.: pixis (B: busha) OFFERTORY BOX
297 **Moleziz**, R.: oblate, B: — OFFERING
298 **Amozia**, R.: eucharistia (B: gothdeslichamo) EUCHARIST
299 **Uaschiro**, R.: calix (B: kelich) CHALICE
300 **Pamsiz**, R.: patena, B: — PATEN
301 **Phirzianz**, R.: fistula (B: rora) PITCH PIPE
302 **Phinziol**, R.: urna (B: eimer) URN
303 **Sparizin**, (R: wedel, B: —) BRUSH
304 **Phazia**, R.: ampulla (B: ampela) CRUET

c. Liturgical books

305 **Libizamanz**, R.: liber (B: buoch) BOOK
306 **Kirzanzlibiz**, R.: missalis–liber (B: mesebuoch) MISSAL
307 **Gonzio**, R.: lectionarius (B: leczenere) LECTIONARY
308 **Izimziolibiz**, R.: euangeliorum liber (B: ewanieliere) GOSPEL BOOK
Musgal, R: graduale (gradal) GRADUAL
Bugeziol, R: anthiphonarius (B: anthiphener) BOOK OF ANTIPHONS
Iamischiz, R: ymnarius (B: ymnere) HYMNAL
Zarianz, (R: cursere, B: —) BOOK OR COURSE OF SERMONS?
Guziminz, (R: collectenere, B: collectere) BOOK OF COLLECTS
Schimischonz, R: psalterium (B: seldere) PSALTER
Amziliz, R: omelia, B: — HOMILY
Munizalibiz, R: matutinalis-liber (B: methdenbuch) MATINS BOOK
Titiailaz, R: breuiarium, B: — BREVIARY
Buenz, R: antiphona, B: — ANTIPHON
Dunaz, R: responsorium (B: respons) RESPONSORY
Braiz, R: uersus (B: uers) VERSE
Onez, R: canticum, B: cantpsal SONG, PSALM
Guzinz, R: collecta, B: — COLLECT
Mimischonz, R: capitulum, B: — CHAPTER

d. Liturgical clothing and cloths for the altar

Scarinz, B: subucula (R: scurliz) UNDER TUNIC
Amlizima, B: superhumerale (R: umbral) LITURGICAL ROBE
Tizzia, R: alba, B: — ALB
Zizzion, R: cingulum (B: gurdeil) BELT
Olzimia, R: mapula (B: hantzfano) MANIPLE
Tunchzial, R: stola, B: — BISHOP’S STOLE
Scolmiz, R: subtile (B: substil) VESTMENT (see Scolmiz, n. 558)
Zimza, R: casula (B: mishachel) CHASUBLE
Pazidol, R: pallium episcopale, B: — BISHOP’S MANTLE
Zinfrrozia, R: scandalia (B: romschua) SANDAL
Paiox, R: infula (B: biscofeshubelin) BISHOP’S MITRE
Kolgira, R: pastoralis-baculus (B: biscofestab) BISHOP’S STAFF
Minscal, R: uxellum (B: phano) BANNER
Tilifzia, R: tapete (B: depeth) TAPESTRY
Squamel, R: cortina (B: umbehanch) CURTAIN
Zinkia, R: ansa (B: nestela) HANDLE
Korischol, (R: pfellel, B: —) SILK
Inchscola, R: manutergium (B: hant wela) TOWEL

II.C. Secular Trades, Titles, and Activities

1. Noble and Military Officials and Groups

Pereziliuz, R: imperator (B: keiser) EMPEROR
2. Innkeepers and Craftsmen

369 **Fraizola**, R.: conuiua (B: gemazzo) LODGER, GUEST
370 **Milzonitz**, R.: pincerna (B: schenko) CUPBEARER
371 **Gospilianz**, R.: dapifer, B: discoforus (B: druschezo) DISH BEARER, WAITER
372 **Spaninzz**, R.: pistor (B: pister) MILLER
373 **Buschibol**, R.: paneficus (B: beckere) BAKER
374 **Lifiziol**, R.: couch (B: cohc) COOK
375 **Birscheiz**, R.: esca (B: ezzin) FOOD
376 **Dirischil**, R.: potus (B: dranc) DRINK
377 **Scoltitizio**, R.: cellerarius (B: kelnere) BUTLER
378 **Schiraizoon**, R.: camerarius (B: kamerere) CHAMBERLAIN
379 **Garginz**, R.: hortulanus (B: gardenere) GARDENER
380 **Larginchzint**, R.: artifex (B: listinechere) ARTIST, PERFORMER
381 Sporinzio, R.: rusticus (B: gebur) PEASANT  
382 Anziur, R.: agricola (B: acherman) FARMER  
383 Gloggglizil, R.: messor (B: snidere) REAPER  
384 Dilimischol, R.: feniseca (B: medere) MOWER (of hay)  
385 Planzimor, R.: uinitor (B: wingartman) VINTAGER  
386 Bosinz, R.: bubulcus (B: hosseneral) OXHERD  
387 Garazin, R.: subulcus (B: swein) SWINEHERD  
388 Virzunz, R.: mulio (B: stutdere) MULE DRIVER  
389 Scaliziz, R.: opilio (B: schefere) SHEPHERD (see Scaliziz, n. 844)  
390 Sunchzil, R.: sutor (B: sudder) SHOEMAKER  
391 Larizin, R.: coriarius (B: loiwere) LEATHERWORKER, TANNER  
392 Gulzianz, R.: figulus (B: vlere) POTTER  
393 Loinscho, R.: lanarius (B: wollemengere) WOOLWORKER  
394 Scabiriz, R.: piscator (B: fishere) FISHERMAN  
395 Figirez, R.: pictor (B: melere) PAINTER  
396 Smaletis, R.: faber (B: smith) SMITH  
397 Zaueriz, R.: aurifex (B: goltsmith) GOLDSMITH  
398 Bisianz, R.: argentarius (B: silberere) SILVERS MITH  
399 Munchzidol, R.: numularius (B: munezere) BROKER  
400 Fronzios, R.: fenerator (B: wuocherere) MONEY LENDER, USURER  
401 Folicio, R.: mercator (B: koufman) MERCHANT  
402 Firmaniz, R.: lapicida (B: steinmezzo) MASON  
403 Bauiriz, R.: textor (B: wobere) WEAVER  
404 Auiriz, R.: nauc]er] (B: sci]meister)] SHIP’S CAPTAIN  
405 Scilmiol, R.: nauta (B: scifnan) MARINER  
406 Douizio, R.: carpentarius (B: bo[u]mwereman) CARPENTER  
407 Moruzio, R.: carnifex (B: mezeiere) BUTCHER  
408 Dalscil, R.: caupo (B: winouga) INNKEEPER  
409 Borschil, R.: telonarius (B: zolner]e) CUSTOMS OFFICER, TAX COLLECTOR  
410 Gaurizio, R.: fidicen (B: seithspilere) MINSTREL, FIDDLER  
411 Scamizio, R.: mimus (B: spileman) TRICKSTER  
412 BALEUINZ, R.: ioculator (B: spotdere) JOKESTER  
413 Lizo, R.: saltator (B: sprengere) ACROBAT  
414 Uirueniz, R.: fornicator (B: huorere) FORNICATOR  
415 Maluizia, R.: meretrix, B: — PROSTITUTE  
416 Cliuinx, R.: magus (B: goigelere) MAGICIAN  
417 Ranschil, R.: loquax (B: cleffe]ere] CHATTERBOX  
418 Malzispianz, R.: obtrectator (B: besprechere] DETRACTO
419 **Scorinzin**, R.: susurro (B: runechere) WHISPERER
420 **Solchdamiz**, R.: adulator (B: winehaldesere) FLATTERER
421 **Fugizlo**, R.: cloacarius (B: lengeuekere) FILTH-TALKER (privy-cleaner/raker)
422 **Dolemiz**, R.: ganeo (B: uraz) GLUTTON
423 **Bizioliiz**, R.: potator (B: drenkere) DRUNKARD
424 **Siccioniz**, R.: latro (B: schachere) MERCENARY, BRIGAND
425 **Rabiniz**, R.: predo (B: roibere) ROBBER
426 **Uirtimanz**, R.: fur (B: dieb) THIEF
427 **Deiezie**, R.: nanus, (B: getwerch) DWARF
428 **Logizkal**, R: gygas (B: riso) GIANT

4. Hunting and Military Expeditions

429 **Durziuanz**, R.: sequester (B: griezwartdo) FOLLOWER, HENCHMAN
430 **Oirschal**, R.: tubicen (B: hornblesere) TRUMPETER
431 **Fulscaioliz**, R.: auceps (B: fogelere) FOWLER
432 **Beluaiz**, R.: venator (B: iegere) HUNTER
433 **Kolsinzio**, (R: uerewere, B: —) TRADESMAN
434 **Uisiscolinz**, R: translator (B: antfristere) COPYIST, TRANSCRIBER
435 **Razinthia**, R.: interpres (B: dutdere) TRANSLATOR, INTERPRETOR
436 **Sparfoliz**, R.: explorator (B: spihere) SPY, SCOUT
437 **Vrizeltin**, R.: speculator (B: wartdere) WATCHMAN
438 **Sabonzio**, R: sagittarius (B: selpscuzzo) BOWMAN

5. Members of the Noble Household

439 **Eioliz**, R: dominus (B: herro) LORD (secular)
440 **Salziz**, R: domina (B: frowa) LADY
441 **Subizo**, R: seruus (B: cnech) SERVANT
442 **Scalmiza**, R: ancilla (B: dirna) MAID-SERVANT
443 **Perzimzio**, R: aduena (B: zukumelinch) GUEST
444 **Pazuz**, R: indigena (B: inbuwelinch) NATIVE
445 **Primischol**, R: liber-homo (B: friman) FREEMAN
446 **Baischur**, R: proprius (B: herro, eigen) PROPRIETOR
447 **Scalgonzuz**, R: cliens (B: dienestman) RETAINER

II.D. Temporal Elements

1. Days of the Week

448 **DILZIO**, R: dies (B: dac) DAY
2. The Twelve Months

466 Ziuariz, R: ianuarius, B: — JANUARY
467 Scantido, R: februarius, B: — FEBRUARY
468 Ornisco, R: marcius, B: — MARCH
469 Amnizo, R: aprilis, B: — APRIL
470 Ziriszinthio, R: maius, B: — MAY
471 Archindolis, R: iunius, B: — JUNE
472 Zigionz, R: iulius, B: — JULY
473 Gargischol, R: augustus, B: — AUGUST
474 Scandidoz, R: september, B: — SEPTEMBER
475 Oscilanz, R: october, B: — OCTOBER
476 Nolischa, R: nouember, B: — NOVEMBER
477 Denizimo, R: december, B: — DECEMBER

3. The Canonical Hours

478 Ginschiz, R: prima, B: — PRIME
479 Scoinz, R: tercia, B: — TERCE
480 Anischiz, R: sexta, B: — SEXT
481 Ioinz, R: nona, B: — NONES
482 Kalizinz, R: uespera, B: — VESPERS
483 Nuschanz, R: completorium, B: — COMPLINE

II.E. The Monastery Household and the Village

1. Clothing
2. Iron Implements: Professional and Farming Equipment

Scolzia, R: marca (B: marc) MARK (the coin)
Linchz, R: talentum (B: phunt) POUND
Pligizil, (R: digel, B: —) CRUCIBLE
Mazanz, R: cultellus (B: mezzer) KNIFE
Blanschil, R: scoria (B: sinder) SCORIA, SLAG or HAMMER BLOW
Spanzol, R: malleus (B: hamer) HAMMER
Miska, R: forceps (B: zanga) FORCEPS, TONGS
Zabla, R: lima (B: figela) FILE
Zimischil, R: serra, B: — SAW
Scaun, R: essa, B: — SAW
Cloisch, (R: cluft, B: —) CLEAVER
Schirzima, R: foruex, B: — FIRE TONGS, PINCERS
Guzim, (R: meizel, B: —) CHISEL
Scanipla, (R: slistein, B: —) POLISHING STONE
Biminzsta, R: cos (B: wezestein) WHETSTONE
Sciria, R: securus (B: hachges) HATCHET
Blinchzia, R: dolabrum (B: barda) PICKAXE, MATTOCK
Zichzimil, B: bipennis (R: bihelin) BATTLE-AXE, DOUBLE AXE
Kalziga, (R: hepa, B: —) SCYTHE
523 Ranchmaz, (R: snitdesahs, B: —) BILL-HOOK
524 Sculiz, R: subula, B: — AWL (see Sculiz, n. 719)
525 Zanziel, R: stilus, B: — STAKE
526 Kanfur, R: hamus, B: — FISH HOOK
527 Brazchia, R: andena, B: — POLE, or ANDIRON?
528 Zizain, R: patella (B: phanna) PAN
529 Zisch, R: sulcatorium, B: — COULTER?
530 Zuinta, R: plana (B: saba) PLANE (the tool)
531 Zizim, R: circinum (B: cirzel) COMPASS
532 Nogiz, R: terebrum (B: negeber) DRILL
533 Ziginz, R: uomer (B: sare) PLOWSHARE
534 Zonz, R: ligo (B: sech) HOE (variation on Zinz, n. 560)
535 Milzimzia, R: craticula, B: — GRID IRON
536 Kazinz, R: lebes, B: — KETTLE, CAULDRON
537 Nochzido, R: caccabus (B: cachgela) COOKING POT
538 Lachzim, R: fascinula (B: crowel) FORK
539 Ochzia, R: rastrum, B: — SCRAPING TOOL
540 Spirilzim, R: falx, B: — SICKLE
541 Zuizia, R: falcula, B: — PRUNING HOOK
542 Galschiriz, R: bipennis, B: — BATTLE AXE, DOUBLE AXE
543 Sconz, R: incus (B: aneboz) ANVIL
544 Grogezin, R: carbo (colo) COAL
545 Banchzenuz, R: follis (B: blasbalc) BELLOWS
546 Bumberiz, R: plastrum (B: wagen) WAGON
547 Zimiz, B: temo (R: disla) POLE (for a wagon)
548 Gugiziz, B: axis (R: assa) AXLE
549 Stigienz, (R: rath, B: —) WHEEL
550 Buchziz, (R: naba, B: —) HUB
551 Relldiaz, (R: runga, B: —) STANCHION, WAGON PROP
552 Cauenel, (R: cadevize, B: —) WAGON PART?
553 Kichsis, (R: lanchwith, B: —) WAGON POLE
554 Ischiaizin, (R: speicha, B: —) SPOKE
555 Furanz, (R: storrun, B: —) WAGON BLOCK?
556 Suzemel, (R: spannagel, B: —) SHARE BEAM (plow)
557 Ranchil, R: aratrum, B: — PLOW
558 Scolmiz, R: stina, B: — PLOW HANDLE (see Scolmiz n. 330)
559 ZIGINZ, R: uomer (B: sare) PLOWSHARE (repeat of n. 533)
560 Zinz, R: ligo (B: sech) HOE (variation of Zonz, n. 534)
561 Ganzida, (R: egeda, B: —) HARROW
562 Golziol, (R: silo, B: —) THONG (for drawing the plow)
3. Types of Land

Harzima, R: ager (achger) FIELD
Lauziminiza, R: terra (B: herda) EARTH
Umbleziz, (R: egerda, B: —) FIRST PLOWED LAND
Scaleis, (R: bracha, B: —) FALLOW LAND
Creiza R: lanth, B: —) LAND
Zamzia, B: allodium (R: eigen) LAND (one’s own) (see Zamzia, n. 714)
Gigunz, R: beneficium, B: — BENEFICE, FIEF (leased land)

4. Items Needed for the Scriptorium

Gauschin, R: scriptorium (B: kendre) SCRIPTORIUM
Hauschiaz, R: cornu (B: horn) INKHORN
Bilischiz, R: incaustum (B: dinda) INK
Banziaz, R: penna (B: uedera) QUILL PEN
Arziax, R: cals, B: — CHALK
Schumz, R: pumex (B: pumez) PUMICE
Straúiniz, B: linea (R: rigelstab) STRAIGHT LINE
Bulschaiz, R: plumbum (B: bli) LEAD
Branischiaz, R: pergamenenum (B: pirimente) PARCHMENT
Gruschiaz, (R: presdela, B: —) SEAL PRESS
Luschanz, R: minium, B: — RED LEAD, RUBRIC
Kilmindiaz, R: crocus, B: — SAFFRON (for coloring manuscripts?)
Schamiz, R: tabula, B: — WAX TABLET
Brizimaz, R: stilus, B: — STYLUS
Gauimiz, R: circinus, B: — COMPASS

5. Tools Needed for Sewing, Spinning, and Weaving

Ruszianz, (R: rama, B: tama?) EMBROIDERY STAND or LOOM
Zischel, (R: spula, B: —) SPOOL, BOBBIN
Zubeiaz, (R: herleua, B: —) THREAD
Guchiz, (R: vizza, B: —) BALL OF YARN
Gozionz, R: golbracha, B: — TOOL (for working gold or gold thread)
Ziziniz, (R: weuel, B: —) WOOF
Blanschinz, (R: bligarn, B: —) LEAD WIRE (in a heddle or embroidery hoop?)
Limizin, R: scinun, B: —) PINS
Foriz, (R: driun, B: —) EMBROIDERY NEEDLES
Ploniz, (R: spelt, B: —) TORCH (for lighting a room?)
Buuinz, (R: truha, B: —) CABINET
6. Clothing for Hildegard’s Nuns on Massdays

611 Baiz, R: pannus (B: duoch) CLOTH
612 Schagur, (R: roclin, B: —) SKIRT
613 Schirizim, (R: stucha, B: —) WOMAN’S HANGING SLEEVE
614 Tenziz, (R: witede, B: —) CLOTHING
615 Zamiziz, (R: gerun, B: —) FOLDS (in clothing)
616 Nasunz, (R: nethde, B: —) DECORATIVE SEAMS
617 Glinziz, B: charsupium? (R: soum) HEM
618 Hoilzirier, (R: houbetlovc, B: —) OPENING (in garment) FOR THE HEAD
619 Naschiz, (R: linede, B: —) LINEN CLOTHING
620 Rasinz, (R: risa, B: —) VEIL
621 Hoilbaiz, (R: hoibetdouch, B: —) HEAD COVERING
622 Ornalianzanzia, (R: harsnur, B: —) HAIRBAND
623 Kanulzial, (R: wil, B: —) NUN’S VEIL
624 Oiralbriun, R: inaures, B: — EARRINGS
625 Naczuon, R: monile (spengelin) NECKLACE
626 Gragischon, R: armilla, B: — BRACELET
627 Naurizin, R: anulus (B: vingerlin) RING (for the finger)
628 Curizan, (R: bortdun, B: —) JEWELRY SETTINGS

7. Arms and Armor

629 Moruueia, B: occrea (R: lederhosa) GREAVE (made of leather)
630 Galizima, R: galea (B: helm) LEATHER HELMET
631 Scurilz, R: clipeus (B: selt) SHIELD
632 Dilizanz, R: gladius (B: swert) SWORD
633  **Zanchur**, (R: uezzel, B: —) BELT, LEATHER BAND
634  **Zichiz**, R: capulum, B: — HILT
635  **Guuniz**, R: conus, B: — HELMET CREST
636  **Schaniz**, B: vagina (R: scheida) SHEATH
637  **Bichzin**, (R: buckela, B: —) CHEEK STRAP, BUCKLE
638  **Ruiz**, (R: ranth, B: —) SHIELD RIM
639  **Zuzianz**, (R: wafun, B: —) WEAPON
640  **Squair**, R: arcus (B: bogo) BOW
641  **Grizianz**, (R: senewa, B: —) STRING (for a bow)
642  **Braliz**, (R: bolz, B: —) BOLT
643  **Bluschanz**, (R: scheftde, B: —) LACE (for a boot?)
644  **Ploschinanz**, (R: strala, B: —) ARROW
645  **Buzion**, (R: phil, B: —) SPEAR
646  **Curschin**, (R: craphfo, B: —) SPEARHEAD?
647  **Spalun**, (R: shaft, B: —) SHAFT
648  **Cauz**, R: sella, B: — SADDLE
649  **Bursich**, R: scandipola, B: — STIRRUP, MOUNT?
650  **Cumeriz**, (R: suzel, B: —) SADDLE BLANKET?
651  **Ganzian**, (R: sugir, B: —) REIN?
652  **Amizdel**, (R: bambest, B: —) ARMOR
653  **Fronich**, R: frenum (B: britdel) BRIDLE, BIT
654  **Zuzian**, (R: furbug, B: —) HARNESS (note resemblance to n. 639)

8. Tools for the Crafts, and for Wine and Beer-Making

655  **Spuiz**, B: forma (R: leist) LAST (for a shoe)
656  **Brascha**, R: subula, B: — AWL
657  **Zineuel**, (R: drath, B: —) LINE (drawn on leather?)
658  **Guraix**, (R: bursta, B: —) BRUSH
659  **Lucza**, (R: scuoba, B: —) SCOOP
660  **Bolis**, (R: lo, B: —) TANNING AGENT
661  **Murscha**, (R: suerca, B: swerza) BLACK STAIN
662  **Schuuarz**, (R: slif, B: —) SLIP (for polishing)
663  **Laiganz**, (R: addermince; B: aderminze) ??
664  **Bizbio**, (R: pin, B: —) PIN (used to turn the screw in a winepress)
665  **Kailamanz**, R: torquular (B: droda) WINEPRESS
666  **Zazzilliaz**, (R: suuella, B: —) SCREW (between the pin and the press)
667  **Zabuz**, (R: pressere, B: —) PRESS (which squeezes the grapes)
668  **Glucziminiz**, (R: gebutde, B: —) TUB
669  **Gulsich**, (R: zubeda, B: —) BUCKET
670  **Zanzimianz**, (R: ingebutden, B: —) BUCKETS?
671  **Suzgulaz**, (R: sruba, B: —) BRUSH
Flanischianz, (R: bersiha, B: —) WICKER BASKET
Burskaldiz, (R: seckere, B: —) SHEARS
Gacniz, (R: gelleta, B: —) PAIL
Corizin, (R: uierdel, B: —) QUARTER (measurement)
Aschuanz, R: hama, B: — WATERBUCKET (for quenching fire)
Famigol, (R: carrada, B: cartada) JAR, BOWL
Schuldemiz, (R: zober, B: —) TUB, VAT
Marsic, (R: sestere, B: —) MEASURING CUP
Nusic, (R: kanna, B: —) JUG
Gugurez, (R: stouf, B: —) GOBLET
Gulginz, (R: trehdere, B: —) FUNNEL
Omezin, (R: reif, B: —) BARREL HOOP
Laminic, (R: duga, B: —) BARREL STAVE
Plucz, (R: bodun, B: —) BOTTOM (of a barrel)
Bubenez, (R: kufa, B: —) SKID, RUNNER (for a barrel)
Zuchzizer, (R: punthlouc, B: —) BUNG HOLE
Sclinaz, B: broca (R: zapfo) SPIGOT
Buschinz, R: mustum (B: most) MUST, JUICE (unfermented wine)
Vischoreiz, R: uinum (B: win) WINE
Briczinz, R: ceruisia (B: bier) BEER
Cherin, (R: gruz, B: —) GRAIN
Anic, (R: hopfo, B: —) HOPS
Baczanz, (R: malz, B: —) MALT
Gunguliz, (R: schufa, B: —) BEER MUG
Uischamn, R: uinea (B: wingart) VINEYARD
Stogin, R: uitis, B: — GRAPEVINE
Ranziax, R: palmes, B: — SPROUT
Alischol, R: uua (B: drubel) GRAPE
Brisianz, (R: bercorn, B: —) GRAPESEED
Curschul, (R: rappo, B: —) GRAPE CLUSTER
Splinz, (R: pfal, B: —) STAKE (for a vineyard)
Scruiz, R: sepes, B: — FENCE, HEDGE
Stamziz, (R: stecco, B: —) STICK

9. The House, Household Tools, and the Farm
Planizunz, R: curtis, B: — PEN, ENCLOSURE (for animals)
Comzimaz, R: domus (B: hus) HOUSE
Coindanz, R: camenata, B: — ROOM WITH A FIREPLACE
Stoinz, (R: stupa, B: stuba) BATHING ROOM
Kalchizinz, R: cellarium (B: chelre) STOREROOM, CELLAR
10. Items Needed for the Kitchen

726 **Bonizimz**, (R: herth, B: —) HEARTH
727 **Burizindiz**, R: ignis (B: fur) FIRE
728 **Flagur**, R: flama, B: — FLAME
729 **Buinz**, R: lignum (B: holz) FIREWOOD
730 **Lischianz**, B: stips (R: branch) FIREBRAND
731 **Zinzia**, R: cinis (B: escha) ASH
732 **Amolic**, B: olla (R: dupfen) SAUCEPAN
733 **Cranischil**, (R: cruselin, B: —) EAR.THEN JAR
734 **Pruiuanz**, R: amphora, B: — JUG
735 **Giruschaz**, (R: harsta, B: —) GRILL
736 **Schoil**, R: scutella, B: — DRINKING BOWL
737 **Feleiz**, R: coclear, B: — SPOON
738 **Beoril**, B: beccarium (R: becher) BEAKER
739 **Nanzoiz**, R: ciphus, B: — CUP
740 **Buzbin**, R: mensa, B: — TABLE, MEAL
741 **Bibibaiz**, R: mensale, B: — TABLE WINE
742 **Buziz**, R: baccinum, B: — BASIN (for washing dishes?)

11. Basic Foods

743 **Auizel**, R: aqua, B: — WATER
744 **Marchuldulz**, R: moretum, B: — FERMENTED JUICE
745 **Melzimaz**, (R: meddo, B: —) MEAD
746 **Melzita**, (R: hunecwirz, B: —) HONEY
III. Words for the Natural Realm

### III.A. Trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamischiz</td>
<td>(R: abies)</td>
<td>FIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pazimbu</td>
<td>(R: nespelboum)</td>
<td>MEDLAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schalmindibiz</td>
<td>(R: amigdalus)</td>
<td>ALMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauschuz</td>
<td>(R: acer)</td>
<td>MAPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannischza</td>
<td>(R: alnus)</td>
<td>ALDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laizscia</td>
<td>(R: tilia)</td>
<td>LINDEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoibuz</td>
<td>(R: buxus)</td>
<td>BOXWOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gramzibuz</td>
<td>(R: castenea)</td>
<td>CHESTNUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoica</td>
<td>(R: carpenus)</td>
<td>HORNBEAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bumbirich</td>
<td>(R: corilus)</td>
<td>HAZEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaimzabuz</td>
<td>(R: cutinboum)</td>
<td>QUINCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruzinbuz</td>
<td>(R: cerasus)</td>
<td>CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culmendiabuz</td>
<td>(R: cornus)</td>
<td>DOGWOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guskaibuz</td>
<td>(R: esculus)</td>
<td>WINTER OAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigunzibuz</td>
<td>(R: ficus)</td>
<td>FIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizarmol</td>
<td>(R: fraxinus)</td>
<td>ASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambila</td>
<td>(R: fagus)</td>
<td>BEECH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoimchia</td>
<td>(R: picea)</td>
<td>SPRUCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scongilbuz</td>
<td>(R: fusarius)</td>
<td>SPINDLE-TREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clamizibuz</td>
<td>(R: laurus)</td>
<td>LAUREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonizla</td>
<td>(R: studa)</td>
<td>SHRUB?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaschibuz</td>
<td>(R: lentiscus)</td>
<td>MASTIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schalnihilbuz</td>
<td>(R: iuniperus)</td>
<td>JUNIPER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomziacz</td>
<td>(R: malus)</td>
<td>APPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mizamabuz</td>
<td>(R: morus)</td>
<td>MULBERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burschiabuz</td>
<td>(R: murica)</td>
<td>TAMARISK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laschiabuz</td>
<td>(R: ornus)</td>
<td>MOUNTAIN ASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golinzia</td>
<td>(R: platanus)</td>
<td>PLANE TREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparinichibuz</td>
<td>(R: persicus)</td>
<td>PEACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zirunzbuz</td>
<td>(R: pirus)</td>
<td>PEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burzimbuz</td>
<td>(R: prinus)</td>
<td>PLUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gimeldia</td>
<td>(R: pinus)</td>
<td>PINE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III.B. Plants

803 Zizria, R: cinomonium, B: — CINNAMON
804 Crichzial, R: cardomomum, B: — CARDAMOM
805 Cischinzariz, R: spicanardus, B: — SPIKENARD
806 Diziana, R: liquaricia, B: — LICORICE
807 Bagiziz, R: piretrum (B: bertram) FEVERFEW, PELLITORY OF SPAIN
808 Lanischa, R: cristiana, B: — CHRISTMAS ROSE
809 Muzimia, (R: nuzmuscata, B: —) NUTMEG
810 Gulgia, (R: galgan, B: —) GALINGALE
811 Gareiza, (R: gariofel, B: —) CLOVE
812 Kunx, (R: zitdewar, B: —) ZEDOARY, SETWALL
813 Barschin, (R: gingebern, B: —) GINGER
814 Cririschia, (R: lorbere, B: —) BAY LEAF
815 Zusguel, R: piper, B: — PEPPER
816 Galigiz, R: ciminum, B: cuminum (—) CUMIN
817 Ginzia, R: bibinella, B: — PIPERMELL
818 Culgeia, (R: meigelana, B: —) LILY OF THE VALLEY
819 Gurizama, R: millefolium, B: — YARROW
820 Magizima, (R: sitderuurz, B: —) BLACK HELLEBORE, CHRISTMAS ROSE
821 Bruschia, R: centauria, B: — CENTAURY, CORNFLOWER
Kirischia, R: entiana, B: — YELLOW GENTIAN
Fauz, R: enula B: enela HELENIUM or HORSEHEAL
Gausia, R: menewa, B: — HORSE RADISH
Bischia, R: ugera, B: — MEADOW SAFFRON
Saxia, (R: zucker, B: —) SUGAR
Scukuriz, R: celidonia, B: — CELANDINE
Zischio, R: plantago, B: — PLANTAIN
Gischiz, (R: grensich, B: —) POTENTILLA (or WATERLILY?)
Pluschia, R: poleia, B: — PENNYROYAL
Pigizia, (R: kuuenela, B: —) WILD THYME, or SAVORY
Dugrul, (R: binewrz, B: —) LESSER CELANDINE
Bouizia, (R: boberella, B: —) WINTER CHERRY
Sizia, (R: melda, B: —) BEET ROOT
Cuz, R: papauer, B: — POPPY
Cauzia, R: sisimbra, B: — THYME, or WATERCRESS?
Graudiko, R: reumatica, B: — GERANIUM, CRANESBILL
Bitrianz, R: marrubium, B: — HOREHOUND
Baiezinzia, R: abrotanum, B: — SOUTHERNWOOD
Pabruz, (R: pfeffercrut, B: —) SAVORY
Ruzia, R: rosa, B: — ROSE
Chorischia, R: lilium, B: — LILY
Monischia, R: agrimonia, B: — AGRIMONY
Scaliziz, R: salbeia, B: — SAGE (see Scaliziz, n. 389)
Raiz, R: ruta, B: — RUE
Garoz, R: isopo, B: — HYSSOP
Liniz, R: lauendela, B: — LAVENDER
Guris, (R: venechil, B: —) FENNEL
Fulzia, (R: ringela, B: —) MARIGOLD
Flauzia, (R: bathenia, B: —) BETONY
Dizia, R: dictama, B: — DITTANY (see Dizia, n. 887)
Orris, (R: vvllena, B: —) MULLEIN
Gauriz, (R: gundereba, B: —) GROUND-IVY or ROCKROSE
Nischil, (R: nebeta, B: —) MINT, or CATNIP
Luschia, R: lubisticum, B: — LOVAGE (see Luschia, n. 990)
Grischol, R: satureia, B: — SAVORY
Agonzia, R: aquileia, B: — COLUMBINE
Maschin, (R: denmarka) VALERIAN
Framiz, (R: steivvarn, B: —) POLYPODIUM (a fern)
Dagezia, (R: douwrz, B: —) DAUWURTZ
Grimizia, R: brionia (B: schitwurz) WHITE BRYONY
Spiriz, (R: sprincwrz, B: —) SPURGE
Daschia, (R: wolfsgelegena, B: —) ARNICA
864 Karinz, (R: minnewrz, B: —) MAIDENHAIR (see Karinz, n. 191)
865 Pursiaz, R and B: bisanzia ??
866 Brumz, (R: berewrz, B: —) COW PARSNIP, HERACLEUM
867 Perschil, (R: berewinka, B: —) PERIWINKLE
868 Firmizima, R: consolda, B: — COMFREY
869 Sanschul, (R: sanikela, B: —) SANICULA
870 Fenisgronz, (R: huswrz, B: guthwurz) HOUSE LEEK
871 Clanzga, R: tenacetum, B: — TANSY
872 Karischua, (R: wermuda, B: —) WORMWOOD
873 Guska, (R: smergela, B: —) LESSER CELANDINE
874 Nascuil, (R: natscado, B: nahtscato) SOLANUM, NIGHTSHADE
875 Laufrica, (R: huflatdecha, B: —) COLTSFOOT
876 Bulchzia, (R: girol, B: —) LAMB’S LETTUCE, CORN SALAD?
877 Gluziaz, (R: romessemancia, B: —) SPEARMINT, ROSEMINT
878 Marizima, (R: matra, B: —) FEVERFEW
879 Gurizlaniz, (R: hircescunga, B: hirzeszunga) WILD MINT
880 Pulicha, (R: lunchwrz, B: —) LUNGWORT
881 Gaxuurrinz, (R: nessewrz, B: —) HELLEBORE
882 Flichziz, R: cepe (unelouch) ONION
883 Duziliuz, (R: snitdelouch, B: —) CHIVES
884 Clarischil, R: allium, B: — GARLIC
885 Prurziz, R: surio, B: — CHICORY
886 Philzia, (R: priseloch, B: —) CHIVES (see n. 883)
887 Dizia, (R: planza, B: —) SPROUT (see Dizia, n. 851)
888 Pazia, (R: bilsa, B: —) HENBANE
889 Magriz, (x) This unglossed word is found only in the Berlin MS.
890 Fluischa, (R: bachminze, B: —) MARSH MINT, WATER MINT
891 Iuziz, (R: louch, B: —) LEEK
892 Basin, R: pepo, B: — MELON
893 Grachia, (R: cresso, B: —) CRESS
894 Mixaziz, R: raphanum, B: — WHITE RADISH, or HORSE RADISH
895 Lozunz, R: ascolonium (B: ascelouch) SHALLOT
896 Kirinz, R: cucurbita (B: curbeiz) CUCUMBER
897 Gruginz, R: rapa (B: ruapa) TURNIP
898 Dunschia, R: lapacium (B: latdacha) DOCK
899 Grachia, (R: cresso, B: —) CRESS
900 Scurithil, (R: morcruth, B: —) PARSNIP
901 Felischa, (R: kiruela, B: —) CHERVIL
902 Zugezia, (R: dille, B: —) DILL
903 Kauschin, R: caulis, B: — CABBAGE
III.C. Birds, a bat, and a gryphon

ARGUMZIO, (R: grife) GRYPHON
Laschiz, B: aquila (R: aro) EAGLE
Riuschiz, R: uultur, B: — VULTURE
Scaruz, (R: elbiz, B: —) SWAN
Balbunz, (R: bubo, B: —) HORNED OWL
Flauriz, R: pellicanus, B: — PELICAN
Bozibo, R: herodius, B: — PEREGRINE
Balfciz, R: picus, B: — WOODPECKER
Hauscuz, R: accipiter, B: — HAWK
Zirunz, R: nisus, B: — SPARROWHAWK, KESTREL
Moguz, R: larus, B: — BUZZARD
Sculez, (R: weho, B: —) KESTREL, SPARROWHAWK
Warnaz, R: ardea, B: — HERON
Nozia, R: ulula, B: — SCREECH OWL
Glamzia, (R: hehera, B: —) JAY
Noizbiz, R: nocticorax, B: — NIGHT RAVEN
Aschia, (R: stara, B: —) STARLING
Dorinschiz, (R: dorndrewe, B: —) BUTCHER-BIRD, SHRIKE
Drozima, (R: drosla, B: —) THRUSH
Asgriz, (R: isfogil, B: —) KINGFISHER
Brauz, R: turdus, B: — THRUSH
Bachiz, R: ruch, B: —) ROOK, CROW
Bauscha, (R: snepfa, B: —) SNIPE
Wilischio, (R: upupa, B: —) HOOPOE
Gabia, (R: quahtila, B: —) QUAIL
Scalia, R: merula, B: — BLACKBIRD
Duschio, R: mergus, B: — GULL
Wiuia, R: paris, B: — TITMOUSE
Waschiz, (R: roudil, B: —) ROBIN
Zanczia, R: laudula, B: — LARK
Noisca, (R: nachdegala, B: —) NIGHTINGALE
Agrizia, (R: wazerstelza, B: —) WAGTAIL
Mosiz, (R: uinco, B: —) FINCH
Ermosiz, (R: disteluinco, B: —) GOLDFINCH
Birischa, (R: grasemugga, B: —) WARBLER
Glisgia, R: amarellus, B: — BUNTING
Roischio, (R: cunigelen) WREN
Viperiz, (R: warcgengel) SHRIKE
Loginx, (R: gruo, B: —) JACKDAW
Ninxia, R: cornix, B: — CROW
Urchieo, R: ciconia, B: — STORK
Gugurunz, R: strucio, B: — OSTRICH
Bilzinus, R: psitacus, B: — PARROT
Zamzit, R: pauo, B: — PEACOCK
Ualueria, R: vespertilio, B: — BAT
Alxia, R: pica, B: — MAGPIE
III.D. Insects

1001  **Sapiduz**, R: apis, B: — BEE
1002  **Amzia**, R: uespa, B: — WASP
1003  **Cruza**, (R: wibel) WEAVIL; B: brucus (grasshopper)
1004  **Ariz**, R: papilio BUTTERFLY; B: wibel (weavil)
1005  **Luxzia**, R: locusta LOCUST; B: papilio (butterfly)
1006  **Virenz**, R: musca FLY; B: locusta (locust)
1007  **Arschia**, R: culix GNAT; B: musca (fly)
1008  **Mizia**, R: cinomia FLEA; B: culix (gnat)
1009  **Kanzia**, R: glimo GLOW WORM; B: cinomia (flea)
1010  **Boiz**, R: bruchus GRASSHOPPER; B: glimo (glow worm)
1011  **Diezo**, R: hurniz, B: — HORNET
1012  **Cauiz**, R: cicado, B: — CRICKET, CICADA
NOTES TO THE TRANSLATION

The abbreviations for the following references are found at the beginning of the book. I give no page numbers for dictionary entries; those for SHR-H follow the volume number (I or II); those for other commentators are in parentheses.

1, 2. Aieganz. Aleganz in B, but Aieganz in V. Given the conformity of R and V, it seems that the B text miscopied or saw a need to distinguish these words “angel” and “God.”

16. Steinmeyer’s emendation (Vrizoil) of Roth’s Vrizoil is incorrect (p. 390). The single “r” precedes an “i” in both texts.

23, 24, 26. The initial or “notable” letters “H” and “N” present a problem in both the R and B texts, and requires me to make decisions about transcription. Notable “N” has two versions: the commonly seen dropped or “rustic” “N” with slanted cross bar and hooked descender that, if not exaggerated enough, is sometimes hard to distinguish from the initial “H”——and the rounded version, prevalent in the latter part of the R text, which is basically an enlarged miniscule “n”: ți. R uses the dropped or, as I will called it, the “h-N” for Nilzpeweriz (“stepfather”) in 23, and Nilzciriz (“stepson”) in 26, but the enlarged miniscule N for Nilzmaiz (“stepmother”) in 24, and B follows suit. Yet these prefixes are clearly all the same, but they have confused former editors. These distinctions are important because they give vital information about Hildegard’s rational compounds. A preferred form of notable “H” is the enlarged miniscule “h,” which distinguishes it from h-N (for instance, Haurizpia [455] on folio 463r of the R text—see plate 2). I note, too, that the R-scribe exhibits some fluctuation in other notable letters: M is most often lobed (or rounded) in Malkunz (31) and Miskila (33) 牝, after the fashion of the times, but straight in Maizfia (37) 牝, below it. Since enlarged miniscules for “h” and “n” are used more frequently in the second half of the manuscript, I treat all h-Ns as “N”s. Hoil, “head,” clearly begins with an “h” because it has a phonic similarity to its German equivalent hoibet, because it doesn’t have the characteristic hook on the right
descender as this scribe uses, and because it is a bold capital marking a section:.

36. Steinmeyer reads Pieniza (p. 390); the B text has Pleniza; the “l” in the R text is shortened by the proximity of the preceding P. The gloss is incorrectly read by WUS and Schnapp (“Virgin Words,” p. 286) as amīca, “mistrīss.” A common c/t confusion that context would have clarified.

40. In B’s sueiger the “i” is superscripted over the “e.”

42. Neniz (nepos, nefo) with the h-N. The word in both Latin and German can mean “grandson (=daughter),” “nephew,” or merely “descendent.”

46. blint. These and other words among the sufferers are adjectives in German and Latin. Because the Lingua is clearly meant to be a list of substantives, I translate them thus.

46, 47, 48. Nochziz, Nosinz? Niszin. Where words with notable N are grouped in threes, the middle word will feature a variant notable as embellishment. See 88, 89, and 90 later. Here, the pattern is h-N, notable N, and h-N. In B, the pattern for these same words is reversed (notable N, h-N, notable N). Nochziz echoes naht, OHG “night,” and of course L. nocte, nocturnus, a suitable association with blindness. However, there is a Nosinz (or Hosinz) in 181 (“scab”) that begins with the h-N and its little hook. This spelling is repeated in B. I have kept them homonyms, seeing that several other words are repeated with different glosses.

70. L. extrex for “neck” is probably a variation of estracus, strictus, as in “narrow (thing).” One would expect collum. It is found, however, in SHSS 69 with nāc as its gloss in the “C” or Trier recension (also SHRH I.124).

73. For uash read vahs, fahs, “head hair,” cognate with OE feax.

87. Grimm: orcros and nasecros refer to the cartilage of ear and nose (325 n. 5). Köbler: Krosila/krostila is mod. G. Knorpel, “cartilage.”

88, 89, 90. Nascutil, Nascuriz, and Nascumisil: the first and third word are written with an h-N notable, and the middle one with notable N. As before, there is pressure to see Hildegard using consistent components here, and adhering to her penchant for repeating the first letter or syllable of the word she relexes. The B scribe follows suit, this time not reversing the characters.

102. L. faux: “gullet, throat, pharynx, maw,” but G. gūmo seems to mean palate or roof of the mouth (mod. G. Gaumen). Since we have guttur in n.104 (“gullet”), I took the German meaning, since it comes between “molar” and “uvula.”

108. cervix, halsadra; cervix is “nape of the neck” in classical Latin, but glossed in the SH by halsad[e]ra (SHRH I.128, II.5, 217,) a compound meaning “throat-vein,” perhaps the carotid artery. Note Hildegard’s conflation of Kolezia (105) and Tabeializ (174).
130. Lexer: *warza* is Brustwarze, “nipple,” but also “wart.” The *Einzelglossare* (SHSS. 431) gives *warza* as a gloss for *papilla*. *Inpetigo*, a skin eruption, is glossed in SHRH II.333 by *rida*. The word seems strangely out of place in this context.

133. G. *brustlefel* (“breast spoon” MHG lefel/leffel, mod. G. Löffel) glosses *cartilago* “cartilage,” in SHRH I.130 and II.217: *molle os, et sine medulla* [“soft bone without marrow”] *id est crustila / crostilla / brustlefel*. Köbler glosses “breastbone,” with some reservation. What may be described here is the xiphoid, the little sword-shaped cartilage hanging down from the sternum that provides the delicate “spoon” for the bony “handle” or sternum. Hildegard’s *Burbefeleiz* is a perfect calque for “breast spoon,” given that her word for “spoon” is *Feleiz* 737.

135, 140. *venter* (buch); following *ubera* (“breast”), L. *venter* could be “womb,” but is more often described as that which takes in food (SHRH I.136, II.7). *Uterum* is unglossed by a German word in SHRH I.136 and II.7: *uterum sole mulieres habent, in quo concipiunt*, but as this phrase follows the definition of *venter/buch* in both places, I have translated “womb.” *Ventriculus* in 140 is external belly, to be distinguished from *stomachus* in 147.

137, 150. There are two Latin glosses for “kidney” in the Lingua, the plural form in 137, and the singular in 150. Read *renuncula* in 150 as *renicula*, “kidney.” The German gloss seems to be “loins” for 137, which make better sense between “navel” and “thighbone”; singular “kidney” can be found after words for “spleen” and “gallbladder.”


165. Amzglizia is a compound with *Lizia* in 164, imitating *druos* (“glans,” *glandula*) and *hegedruos* (“penis,” “pudendum”). Sensitive or uncertain terms often get separate glosses in Latin and German in the Lingua.

169. R combines the Latin and German word into one: *osbein*. B separates them in its superscript *os* with *bein* above it.

170. In R., *menschen* is written directly above *Cruniz*, and above that are the two words *crus bein*. B: *meinschenbein* is written above *crus*.

172. For *sures* read L. *sura*, “calf.”

178. Read *arcula* as L. *artula*, diminutive of *artus*, “member, joint,” and *ceha* as mod. G. Zehe. B reproduces this misspelling.

180. Grimm (326 n.26) advises *hruf* for *ruaf* and glosses “scabies” (Krätze). Köbler: *ruf* glosses mod. G. Schorf (“scab”).

185. Tabo, from *tabum*, “corrupt moisture, infectious disease” or *tabes*: “decaying substance” (Murray).

195, 197. Both *sacerdos* and *presbiter* mean “priest” but the B gloss for the former (erwartdo) suggests that the scribe regarded *sacerdos* as higher in rank. Köbler: *ewawart*, Priester, Hoher Priester.
202. Another H/N confusion. I follow the B scribe, who uses the rounded notable N.

209. Steinmeyer following the B scribe emends to Agiziniz (391).


227. L. porticus here means “chapel or minor altar,” and acquiring the meaning “portico” or “arcade” (Latham1).

235. SW glosses henga with ansa ("handle"), pessulus ("bolt"), and suggests mod. G. Henkel or Riegel. In SHRH II.409, henga glosses pesselum.

237. grindel; Köbler has grintel, “barricade,” “bolt,” “latch.” SHRH II.82: repagulum.


252. celatura (grafi). Read caelatura, “engraving.” Köbler translates Schnitten, Graben, that is, “carving,” “engraving,” noting that it glosses caelatura but also sculpture (see SW and also SHRH II.10), sepultura (“burial place”), and vorago (“hole,” “chasm”). Given the dual meanings of engraving and sepulcher I assume this describes a sculptured likeness on a tomb.

253. exedra; The B-gloss seems to be L. ex(h)edra, “apse,” “inmost shrine.”

255. tribunal; Souter: “sanctuary, the part containing the high altar.” Dinestul glosses tribunal in SHRH II.10.

257. L. scüarium is an abbreviation of sanctuarium, which had the meaning in the twelfth century of “reliquary” or “relic.” The context is places within the church, so I prefer “reliquary.”


268. laquearia: a paneled or decorated ceiling. SW: himeliza as a gloss for laquear. See SHRH I 266, II 10.

269. L. pictura; presumably the religious paintings on the walls of a church.

285. Read turibulum as tus liberum, sometimes written tribulum: a thurible or a box for incense (Latham2).

286. wi(h)rouchfaz and wihofofaz gloss L. acerra in SHRH I.371, II.11 and wirchofaz in SHRH I.371. SW identifies it as mod. G. Weirachkästchen.

288. unslit glosses sepum (SHRH II.488).

301. Fistula: “eucharistic reed” (Latham2): a musical pipe, presumably for prompting the priest when singing the mass, or Hildegard’s choir when singing an antiphon.
304. Cruet (ampulla) for consecrated oil (Latham2).

312. cursere may be latinate German for cursus, a round of sermons or a book of sermons, but this is uncertain. See the next note. Lexer gives cursus as a translation for curs.

313. Guziminz. The suffix -ere in the German glosses corresponds to -arius in the Latin terms, and seems to be used here to mean collection; so, a collection or book of collects. The suffix forms a group (along with leczenere, awanierere, antiphenerere, ymnere, and seldere) of German words for books featuring lections, gospels, antiphons, hymns, psalms, and collects.

321. B is an abbreviation for canticus psalmi, according to Steinmeyer (395, n.2), written above the other Latin word.


330. subtile: germanicized Latin for a vestment made of or worn under fine cloth (sub tilem, Latham2). In SW subtil glosses colubium, a short-sleeved tunic (Souter), perhaps the alb worn under the chasuble in 331.

339. Nestela glossing ansa seems to mean Kopfbinde according to SW, a kind of headband. In SHRH II.12, II.92, 94, hanthaba glosses ansa and manubrium, the latter meaning “that which is grasped or held in the hand.”

351. Tronziol has three glosses in the B text in ascending order: R’s patronus, then above it bescirmere (“protector”), and above that fethderlicher (“one who is fatherlike”).

366. L. uildicus: estate manager. For sultheizo read sculdheizo (SHRH II.506), glossing tribunus qui mille viris preest (“an official in charge of a hundred men”). Villicus is glossed in the alphabetical list (SHRH II.547) by ambetman, and meier (SHRH I.285). Hildebrandt notes that ambetman glosses actor, curator (SHRH I.287, II.19), “manager, overseer.” A meier is one who is in the service of the lord of the manor (Lexer: “der im auftrage des grundherrn”), so a kind of reeve or steward.

367. Both exactor and clegere have wide ranges of meaning: an exactor is an extortionist (of taxes, goods, service). Mod. G. Kläger”: “accuser,” “demander,” “plaintiff”; Clegere glosses querelosus (SHRH III.25), “plaintiff, complainer.” Following the estate manager is one who must police the estate, who evicts tenants, collects taxes from them, or brings suit against them.


410. fidicen: a lyricist, probably a minstrel; but this word is translated by seithspilere in B: a player of a stringed instrument such as the fiddle (Lexer).

421. cloacarius (lenguekere). A fascinating lemma, coming as it does in the middle of a list of sinful speaking. The Latin word means “privy cleaner,” but I wonder if this is a metaphor for a “filth talker” or “swearer.” It fits the
context of the users of unholy language (following the chatterbox, the detractor, the whisperer, and the flatterer). I am unsure of the meaning of lengewëitere—lengë: “length,” “extent” combined with OHG fëgon (Köbler also gives MHG vegen, “sweep, clean”)—so “length cleaner”? One who uses a pole to clean out privies? It is not listed in the SH, nor can I find cloacarius there, a sign of its sordidness. But a lengewëitere could be one who verbally pores over every filthy subject he can think of (Mod. G. wecken, “awaken,” “arouse,” “irritate”). WUS gives “Trunkenbold” (“drunkard”), which I don’t support; but I am reminded of Chaucer’s Pardoner, who speaks of the glutton (and drunkard) as one who makes of his throat a privy—by both vomiting and swearing.

428. *gygas*, read *gigans*.


446. *proprius*: L. substantive adjective (“one’s very own”). B has four glosses: an abbreviation for proprius, a word that is crossed out, herro (“master”) above that, and eigen above that. Eigen glosses fundus, predium in SHRH I.230 (“farm,” “estate”), but the word appears in a list of persons.

456. *matutinum*: if this is matins (and we already have “morning” in *mane*), it is strangely separated from the other canonical hours.

478. *beinnich*: a word that Grimm associates with medieval beinwät, “legging” (326 n.45). B has no gloss: narua/sachela is crossed out and written above the next word.

488. *narua/sachela*. Grimm lists narua as a German word and suggests *fibulatura*—“clasp,” “fastener,” “buckle”—but declares that it cannot be ascribed with certainty to this period (326 n.46). Köbler: narua, from narawa/narawo, “slings,” “loop,” “buckle,” *fibulatura*. B’s sachela seems at odds with R, if narua means “buckle” or “fastener.” Sechel glosses marsupium (SHSS 191, SHRH II.361), so it could either be a fastener for hose (loop, sling), or a pouch or pocket worn with trousers.

503. *pilleus* in classical Latin: a close-fitting felt hat, and in medieval Latin “caul,” part of the amnion that covers an infant’s head when it is born. We have three hats in a row and I am uncertain what distinctions Hildegard is making: German *cappa* in 501; some kind of turban (mitra) or hood (huba) in 502, and here, perhaps, a “close-fitting hat.”

504, 505. Coins are listed in the SH among metal objects (*De ferramentis*), which this section seems to be devoted to.

506. *digel*: precursor for mod. G. Tiegel (“crucible,” “pan,” “platen,” or “metal plate,” so something flat, probably from L. tegula, “cover”). What it means here, following the coins and preceding the working implements, is uncertain; I prefer “crucible,” in which one melts metal.

508. Both Latin and German words mean “scoria,” the metal scrapings remaining after the smelting out of metal from its ore (SHRH I.245, II.37).
510. *forceps*; described in SHRH I. 249 as *quod ferrum candens capiat*, “which seizes glowing iron,” appropriate here among the tool-making instruments, and glossed by B as *zanga*, “tongs.” See 515.


523. *sniudesahs* glosses *biduvium* in SHRH I.252) along with *rebemezzer*, so “bill-hook” or “hedge-bill,” meant for trimming hedges and vines.

527. Late L. *andena/andela*: “andiron” (*andela* is glossed by *brandtreita*, SHRH I.252; Köbler: *branterita*, “firedog”).

529. *Sulcatorium* is obscure here, if we are still dealing with iron implements, as the *-ium* suffix, “having to do with” is often loosely applied. Here it attaches to *sulcator*, “furrower” or “plowman.” Since we have “plowshare” in 533, I translate “coulter,” the wheel that creates the furrow in advance of the plowshare.

535–537. These items in a list of vocational tools seem to belong in the group under kitchen tools, but are included here in the metal implements. This large group of trade tools is the least orderly in the Lingua.

538. read *fiscimula*: a three-pronged spear (Latham2).

551. for *runga* Grimm offers Wagenrunge (326 n.61).

552. *cadevize* does not appear in SHRH. Grimm: part of a wagon (“Stück a.e. Wagen” 326–327 n.62). B: *catuvizza*; Köbler notes *caderive* with a question mark and suggests nothing more specific than Wagenteil. It seems to be a compound with *vizza* (see 588).

553. *lancwit*: not in SHRH. Lexer gives mod. G. Langwiede, which DW translates as “das lange Holz, des vorder- und hinter gestell eines rüstwagens verbindet,” basically the beam running vertically under the wagon that supports the frame. Köbler gives for *languid* L. *vinculum plaustrī*, “wagon chain.”

555. *storrun*: not in SHRH. Grimm suggests vaguely that it is some part of a wagon (327 n.65). The B text has *storvun*, not in either SHRH or Lexer. Köbler glosses “Klotz” and “Stumpf” for *storro* (“block,” “stump”—perhaps for mounting or braking the wagon).

556. *spannagel* seems to be a compound with the word “nail” in it, as in wooden nail, a fastener of some sort. In SHRH I.368 it glosses L. *dentale,*
from *dentalius*, “the share beam of a plough,” that is, the beam the share is fastened to. As it comes before *aratum*, this makes sense.


562. *silo*: SHRH I.367 glosses L. *traheria vel epiredia* (“that which draws,” or a “thong to fasten a horse to a carriage”); Lexer gives mod. G. Seil, “rope,” but also Siele, “sluice.”

565, 566. *egerda*, *bracha*. These words seem synonymous and both are glossed by WUS as Brachland, “fallow land,” that is, plowed but kept free of weeds until it can be seeded during the growing season. *Egerda* (not in SHRH): perhaps a compound with *egge* and *erda* (“harrow,” “earth”), and related to *egeda* (see 561 earlier). In Köbler and Lexer, *egerda* is Brachland; the one entry for *bracha* in SHRH I.233 glosses *proscissio est aratio prima*, *cum adhuc durus est ager*: “a pro-scissio [“land for cutting”] is the first plowed field, when the ground is nearly hard.” Lexer glosses *brache* as “ungebrochen (unbroken, unplowed) liegendes, unbesätes Land,” which runs counter to what “fallow land” means today, and opposes the association of *brach* with *brechen* (“to break”—see Kluge on “Brach”: “turning up the soil after harvest”). I translate *egerda* to mean “first broken land,” and *bracha*, following its German descendant, as “fallow land.”

559, 560. *Ziginz* and *Zinz* repeats 533 and 534, with a variation on the earlier *Zonz*, but with identical translations in Latin and German. *Ligo* is “mattock,” but we already have “pickaxe, mattock” in 520, so I have opted for WUS’s “hoe” (Hacke), an all-purpose cutting/hacking implement.

579. *presdela*; Pressel in MHG means a seal (pressed into wax): Sigelpresse (Lexer). This seems sensible, and Steinmeyer references this translation (398 n.18).

585. *rama*: B: *tama*. Rama glosses L. *sustentaculum* (“nourishment,” “support”) and *columen* (“support”) in SHRH I.267, but these come in a list of architectural terms. In Lexer *rame* is “prop” (mod. G. Rahmen), “rack,” or “support” for weaving or embroidery (“rahmen zum sticken, weben, bortenwirken”).

588. *uizza* glosses *licia . . . quibus stamina ligantur* (“a thread hanging from its distaff” (SHRH I.328). But Köbler gives *Fitze* (“knot of yarn”) and also *L. licium* (“length of yarn,” “thread,” “thrum,” Latham2, SHRH II.349). Lexer and SW define *vitze* as “eine beim haspeln durch einen quer darum gewundene zwischen-faden abgefeilte u.für sich verbunden anzahl fäden”: “A number of threads on a reel, filed off and bound together by an intermediate thread wrapped at right angles.” This describes a gathering of unused threads from the thrum or the distaff to form a ball of yarn.

590. Lexer gives “der einschlag beim gewebe” for *weuel*, so “weft,” or “woof.” Köbler for *wefel*: Einschlag, “woof,” the threads that run length-wise in a fabric at right angles to the warp.

591. *bligarn*; Köbler notes mod. G. Bleigarn, “leaden thread,” which may refer to the wires of a heddle, “through which the warp is passed in a loom after going through the reed, and by means of which the warp threads are separated into two sets so as to allow the passage of the shuttle bearing the woof” (OED), or the wire frame of an embroidery hoop.

592. Grimm declares that *scinun* is plural for *scina*, “needle” (327 n.82). Köbler gives mod. G. Schiene (“rail”). *Scin* in SHRH II.448 glosses L. *radius* (“rod”). I have translated “pin.”

593. for *driun* Steinmeyer suggests MHG *drîhen* (399 n.1), the plural perhaps of *drihe*, glossed in Lexer as Sticknadel, “embroidery needle.” Not in Köbler or SHRH.


602. *wirden*; identified by Grimm: mod. G. Wirtel, the fly-wheel on a spinning wheel (327 n.28).


616. Grimm: *nethde* is pl. for *nât* (327 n.98); mod. G. Naht, an “elaborate seam.”

617. *soum*; Lexer: “seam” [Saum], and “hem” [Rand eines Gewandes]. As we have “seam” in the former entry, I opt for “hem.”

620. *risa*; Lexer: Schleier, “veil.” It glosses *theristra palliola* (woman’s head covering”) in SHRH I.324.
624. *Oiralbriu* in R. The macron could indicate a following “m” as well as “n,” so I have followed the B version.
628. Grimm: *bortdun* is plural for *borto* (328 n.105); Lexer: *borte*, mod. G. *Borte* (“border”). Coming after ring, and in a context with jewelry, it serves well as “setting(s).”
633. *vezzel*; Lexer: leather strap or thong used to secure swords or shields. In Köbler *fezzil* is Gürtel (“belt”).
637. *Buckela*, probably German from L. *buccula*, “cheek strap of a helmet.”
645. *phil* is closer to modern German *Pfeil* (“arrow”) than is *strala* in 644 (compare OE *stregl*: “arrow, shaft, dart”); but there must be some distinction here: it may derive from L. *pilum*, “spear,” and that is what I have suggested.
646. *Graphfo* (B: *crapfo*) is a bit of a puzzle. Krape in mod. G. is a hook, barb, clamp, spar, or rafter. *Krapho* (vel *hako*) glosses *uncinus* (“hook”) in SHRH I.372; Köbler: Haken, Krälle (“hook,” “claw”) for OHG *krapfo*. *Shefecrapho* glosses *uncinus* (“hook”) in SHRH I.372; Köbler: Haken, Kralle (“hook,” “claw”) for OHG *krapfo*. So a spearhead, I gather, especially since the next entry is “shaft.”
649. *Scando/scandere*: “to climb”; as it comes after “saddle” I wonder if this is “stirrup,” that by which one mounts (cf OE *stigan rap* “mounting rope,” BT).
650, 651. Steinmeyer suggests that *suzel* is from *soussele*, “Decke unter dem Sattel” and that *sugir* is “ein romanische Wort” (399 n.13, 14). *Sezl* glosses L. *subsellium* in SHSS 360. *Sugir* may be a misspelling of *sigul*, and under *De Instrumentis Equorum*, *zugil/ zuhil/ zohel* are glosses for L. *habena*, “halter, bridle, rein” SHRH I.354.
652. Grimm: *bambest* is a Dutch variant of *wambis, wamsbeis, wambas*; he identifies it as a piece of armor (328 n.120); Lexer: “doublet,” a tunic worn under armor next to the torso or belly (“bekleidung des rumpfes unter dem panner; wams”): mod. G. Wams, “doublet,” “jerkin.”
654. G. *furhuge*, listed in Lexer (*vürbüge*) as “brustriemen der pferde.” The formal term for the part of the harness that crosses the horse’s breast is a “breastplate.” *Furhuge* glosses L. *antela* in SHSS 162 and SHRH I.354, which Latham2 defines as “breast girth or forepeak of a saddle.” We have moved from saddles to harnesses, here, so my guess is with the former.

661. Grimm (328 n.127) amends *swerca* to *swerze melanteria* (“black color or stain”) *Melanteria*, glossed in SHRH II.127 by *corium sverza*, “black leather”). As it comes after *lo*, I suggest a product of tanning: the coloring of a leather shoe; shoe polish.

662. R. has mistakenly written *flif*. Interestingly, B follows suit.

663. *addermince*; this German word (some kind of mint) belongs in the section on herbs, unless it is a plant used for a special dye.

664. *pin*; Grimm identifies this word as Dutch in origin (328 n.130) meaning “wooden nail”; coming before *torcular* (“winepress”) it may mean the wooden pin used to turn the screw in a screw-driven wine press. Köbler gives for *pin* *Pflock* (“peg,” “plug”) and Nagel.

665. L. *torquular* B emends to *torcular*, “winepress.”

666, 667. *suuella*, *pressere*; not in SHRH. *Suuella* is perhaps mod. G. Schwelle, “sill,” “barrier,” “threshold” (Köbler). Lexer defines *suwelle* as a “balken zum hemmen” (“constraining beam”—probably for a door or a window), but I wonder if *suuella* here refers to the vertical wooden rod between the pin and the *pressere* in 667 and operated by a screw. *Pressere* glosses *prelum* in SHRH I.270, “wine or oil press,” with modified meanings *pfresserboum* and *kelterboum*: “pressing-wood,” perhaps the horizontal plate that crushes the grapes.

688. *gebutda*, presumably related to mod. G. Bütte, “tub.” In Köbler *gebita* is Gefäß, “vessel.” Gebita glosses L. *catinum* in SHRH I.341, 343, “deep vessel for serving up or cooking food” (Murray): tub into which the grape juice flows?

670. *ingebutden* looks like the preposition *in* with the word for “tub” expressed here in the plural; perhaps the vertical openings in a basket press (the oldest mechanical press) through which the juice runs into the tub.

672. *bersiha*; *bersia* glosses L. *qualus*, “wicker basket” in SHRH I.270. *Gellita* glosses *gallida* (latinized German) in SHRH I.343; in Köbler it is translated Gelte, Eimer, Gefäß, that is, “pail,” “bucket.”

673. *sester* in OE is “measuring cup” (BT).


683. *reif* is the band (mod. G. Reifen, “tire”) around a barrel (Lexer). Köbler: Fassreifen.

684. Grimm: Fassdaube (“barrel stave”) for *duga* (329 n.148); Köbler concurs.
688. zapfo; mod. G. Zapfen, “spigot”; L. broca is “broach,” already expressed in the prior entry.

695. G. schufa is glossed by Grimm as Schöpfeimer, “scooping vessel” (329 n.156); Lexer: schuše, “gefäß zum schöpfen, schöpfgelte, wassereimer”: vessel for drinking water or beer; so beermug?

700. bercorn; Lexer: Blüte, Frucht for ber-, so I venture that this means “grapeseed” as it follows uua/drubel, “grape.” Köbler: berikorn, with “raisin” as the gloss.

701. rappo; SHRH II.65 glosses corvus and corax with rapbo, but “raven” does not fit the context here. Both Lexer and Köbler have early mod. G. Traubenkamm: “grape cluster” (DW: from Diefenbach’s racemus and Maaler’s botrus).

707. Read caminata. From caminus, “fireplace.”


720. sichelinch glosses L. manipulus (“harvest”) in SHRH II.56, and sih-hiling in Köbler: Garbe, “sheaf.” As we have “sheaf/bundle” in the previous entry, I prefer “harvest.”


744. L. moretum. Ovid uses this word to mean a “salad”—a dish made with vinegar and garlic (Murray). Moretus (in Latham2) is “fermented mulberry juice,” which is the more likely translation following “water” in a list of medieval beverages. Not in SHRH.

784. L paliurus is peculiarly written in the R script with two abbreviations—paliu9rs. The curl in the middle seems redundant. B: paluirus. Palivirus glosses agaleia in SHRH I.195, hagen (SHRH II.46), and hagenbutte, “rosehip” (SHRH II.406). The Latin dictionaries give “Christ’s thorn,” a plant imagined to have fashioned Christ’s crown of thorns.

785. riscus; glossed by holandir (SHRH II.444); so, modern G. Holunder. Holder also glosses L. sambucus (SHRH II.444) of which genus the elder is said to be included. Köbler: “elder-bush” for Holunder (holuntar).

790. Both R and B have jubex/iubex, an inversion of uibex (Steinmeyer corrects to uibex, 401). SHRH II.45: birca (“birch”) for vibex. The suffix -baz for Gulizb[uz] is repeated by B (another possible indication of copying), and the following two entries have –az endings.

798, 799. L. dumi from dumnus, “briar patch,” and uepres, “thorn tree.” Doma, “thorns, brambles,” glosses spine vel dumi in SHRH I.181, and
brama/bramo (Köbler; Dornbaum, “thorntree”) glosses vepres there and in II.525. Brema occurs in the Physica (I. 169).


812. zitdewar. Zedoary is used as a substitute for ginger and is appropriate in a list of spices.

818. WUS gives Meiglöckchen, “May Bells,” or “Lily of the Valley.” Not in SHRH.

819. Garwa; garewa glosses millefolium in SHRH I.193.

820. sidteruurz; sitirwrz glosses elleborum nigrum in SHRH I.189.


825. L or G ugera, Phys. I. 137. Steinmeyer (402 n.7) notes the Physica remarking that Georg August Pritzel and Karl Jessen (Die deutschen Volksnamen der Pflanzen [Hanover: 1882]) identifies it as colchicum auctumnale, a Eurasian/African flower that is highly poisonous: “autumn crocus,” “meadow saffron,” or “naked ladies.” Köbler suggests “meadow saffron.”

829. grensing, in Phys. I. 147. Throop offers “silverweed” as a translation; silverweed, cinquefoil, and tormentil are all associated with potentilla (OED). Grensinc glosses nympha in SHRH I.194, which are water lilies, at least in modern botanical terms, so I offer it as a second possibility.

831. G. kwenela may be L. quenula, mentioned in Phys. I. 32 and identified by Priscilla Throop as “wild thyme.”

832. bineurzw, benniwurz and beinwrz gloss celidonia minor in SHRH I. 191; Köbler concurs. Chelidonium Minus (DW) is Scharbockskraut, or “lesser celandine.”


849. ringula, in Phys. I. 122. Throop translates “calendula,” the generic name for “marigold.” SHRH I.190, II.325: ringila/ringela glosses
heliotrope and solsequia. Köbler gives English “marigold” for ringila, and
mod. G. Ringelblume.

851. dictamus, in Phys. I. 115. Throop also suggests “fraxinella” as a
translation, of which dittany, a fragrant herb, is a member.

854. nebetta, in Phys. I. 143. Nebeta is glossed by simiza in SHRH I.193;
siminza in Köbler: Minze, Katzenminze (“catnip”: nepeta cataria).
Grimm: same.

856. satureia, in Phys. I. 155. Apparently a distinction is being made in
both the Physica and the Lingua between the Latin and German words for
“savory.” See 840 earlier.

857. agleya, in Phys. I. 132; Throop translates “columbine,” a member
of the aquilegia family of flowers. SHRH I.195 identifies acoelia with
L. paliurus, but we already have Christ’s Thorn in 784. B: acoelia.

858. denemarcha in Phys. I. 142, which Throop identifies as “valerian.”

859. B has steinuarn; Köbler glosses polypodium for steinwurz and gives
the obscure English “stonebreak” (something ferns do to walls); polypodium in
Phys. I. 205. Throop translates “female fern.”

860. G. dauwrz; not listed in SHRH and I can find no equivalent term
in English. The Physica. I. 53 has dauwurtz, which Throop translates unhelp-
fully as “dauwurtz.” Grimm suggests tofwurz, glossing basilisca (a plant used
to ward off the basilisk—331 n.216); but elsewhere I find basilisca/basilica
glossed by madelger (SHRH I.192, II.51, 201). Köbler: madalger is mod.
G. Enzian, Kreuzenzian, so another kind of gentian.

862. springwurtz, in Phys. I. 133. Throop has “garden spurge.”

863. R’s wolfesgelegena; Köbler gives “wolfwort.” Throop has “arnica”
for wolfsgelegena. Grimm: wolfes gele (331 n.218), Wolfsbart. Arnica is
“leopard’s bane” in English and well-known for treating bruises; arinca (a
minim confusion throughout SH) glosses wolueszesila/wolviszeisala in
SHRH I.195.

864. Grimm identifies minnewurz with minwenkraut or paonia (“peony”—

865. The translation bisanzia sounds more like one of Hildegard’s words
(with its -zia ending) than it does a Latin or German word. It might be bis-
sanica, “cyclamen” (Souter), and the -zia ending a scribal error. B copies it.

“hog’s fennel.” “Hog weed” in the OED is cow parsnip, presumably
favored by pigs and cows.

867. berewinke; not in any of the glossaries or the Physica. WUS give
Benediktenkraut. Benedica is an entry in the Physica (I. 163), which Throop
translates as “bennet.” I suggest the b/p alternation in the lower Rhineland,
perewinke, which may derive from L. pervincus, “periwinkle,” cognate with
OE pervice. Hildegard’s Perschil suggests a connection.


873. *smergela*, glossed by Köbler as Scharbockskraut, “lesser celandine.”

878. This word *matra* may be *matrana/matrena*, which glosses the latinate German word *febrefugia* or “feverfew,” but also centauria minor (SHRH I.189–190): *Centauria minor vel febrefugia vel multiradix vel elleborites id est matrana/matrena.*


894. WUS gloss Rettich, “white radish.” *Rafanum* in the SHRH II.55 is glossed by *merraatich*, “horseradish”; this poses a problem in that *meneua* of 824 also seems to mean “horseradish.” *Merrich* is the word given in the *Physica*. For *retich*, in Phys. I. 89, Throop gives “radish.”


911. *frideles*, in Phys. I. 134. R adds -och(ouga), so “truelove’s eyes” (from MHG *vriedel*). Indeed, forget-me-nots do seem like clusters of little blue eyes.


918. *simeza*; we seem to have returned to *simiza/nebeta* (see 854 earlier). Throop lists *symes* in the *Physica* (I. 157), and translates it as “Indian chickweed,” but gives no source.


929. *uersbotdo*; Köbler identifies this with “a kind of weed,” but gives L. *zizania*, glossed in SHRH I.286 by *durt* (dorth? seen in the prior entry). Also *lolium* in SHRH II.56. I find “zizany” (OED).

936. *uiselun*. I cannot find any inversions or permutations for this word. The *-zia* suffix suggests that it is an herb.


948. *weho* provides mod. *G*. with Weihe, “kite,” but *wannaweho* is found in the *Summarium*, meaning “kestrel” (SHRH II 146). *L. miluus* in 995 is “kite.”


963. read *L. parix*.


966. for *laudula* read *alauda*, “lark.” Lericha glosses *laudula* in SHRH I.166.


975. *gnoe*; in SHRH II.146 *gnoe* glosses *L. graculus*, “jackdaw.”

983. *stocharo* glosses *‘gradipes’ grece* in SHRH I.161 (*latine ‘tarda’*) in context with long-legged birds of the crane family. Köbler and SW have Adler, “eagle”; but a bird of prey does not fit, here. *Avis tarda* is the origin of the term “bustard,” a wading and walking game bird.

HILDEGARD’S LINGUA ALPHABETIZED

The Latin and German glosses following each of Hildegard’s invented words are from the Riesencodex only. The column to the right indicates the generic divisions indicated by my taxonomy (pp. 157–158).

183  Abiliz, bladera; BLISTER  II.A.4
214  Abiol, abbas; ABBOTT  II.B.1
279  Abiza, domus; HOUSE  II.B.2.a
210  Agilarchiniz, magister-scolarum; SCHOOL-TEACHER  II.B.1
209  Agiziniz, magister; MASTER, TEACHER  II.B.1
857  Agonzia, aquileia; COLUMBINE  III.B
968  Agrizia, wazzerstelza; WAGTAIL  III.C
747  Agruiz, senef; MUSTARD  II.E.11
  2  Aieganz, angelus; ANGEL  I.A
  1  Aigonz, deus; GOD  I.A
983  Alechiz, stocharo; BUSTARD? CRANE?  III.C
596  Alegrinz, scrinum; CASE, PORTFOLIO  II.E.5
453  Aleziz, feria-III; WEDNESDAY  II.D.1
699  Alischol, uua; GRAPE  II.E.8
604  Almiz, hasbel; REEL  II.E.5
982  Alxia, pica; MAGPIE  III.C
  62  Ambila, occipit; BACK OF THE HEAD  II.A.3
652  Amizdel, bambest; ARMOR  II.E.7
325  Amlizima, superhumerale; LITURGICAL ROBE  II.B.2.d
469  Amnizo, aprilis; APRIL  II.D.2
732  Amolic, olla; SAUCEPAN  II.E.10
298  Amozia, eucharistia; EUCHARIST  II.B.2.b
165  Amzglizia, hegedruse; MALE PUENDUM  II.A.3
1002  Amzia, uespa; WASP  III.D
  70  Amzil, extrex; NECK  II.A.3
315  Amziliz, omelia; HOMILY  II.B.2.c
693  Anic, hopfo; HOPS  II.E.8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>Anischiz, sexta; SEXT</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.D.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>Aniziz, erin; BARN FLOOR, SOIL</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.E.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>Anziur, agricola; FARMER</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Archindolis, iunius; JUNE</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.D.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>937</td>
<td>Argumzio, grife; GRYPHON</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Ariz, papilio; BUTTERFLY. B: wibel; WEAVIL</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Arrezenpholianz, archiepiscopus; ARCHBISHOP</td>
<td></td>
<td>II.B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1007</td>
<td>Arschia, culix; GNAT. B: musca; FLY</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td>Arziaz, cals; CHALK</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.E.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>953</td>
<td>Aschia, stara; STARLING</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676</td>
<td>Aschuanz, hama; WATERBUCKET (for quenching fire)</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.E.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>919</td>
<td>Aseruz, hanif; HEMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>956</td>
<td>Asgriz, isfogel; KINGFISHER</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Auiriz, nauclus; SHIP’S CAPTAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>Auizel, aqua; WATER</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.E.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>Ausiz, cicuta; HEMLOCK</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>Azil, annus; YEAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.D.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>958</td>
<td>Bachiz, ruch; ROOK, CROW</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694</td>
<td>Baczanz, malz; MALT</td>
<td></td>
<td>II.E.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>Bagiziz, piretrum; FEVERFEW, PELLITORY OF SPAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>839</td>
<td>Baiezinzia, abrotanum; SOUTHERNWOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>Baischur, proprius; PROPRIETOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.C.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>Baiz, pannus; CLOTH</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.E.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>Balbunz, bubo; HORNED OWL</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Baleuinz, ioculator; JOKESTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>944</td>
<td>Balfciz, picus; WOODPECKER</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>Banchzenuz, follis; BELLOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.E.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>Banziax, penna; QUILL PEN</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.E.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813</td>
<td>Barschin, gingebern; GINGER</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>892</td>
<td>Basin, pepo; MELON</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Bauiriz, textor; WEAVER</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>959</td>
<td>Bauscha, snepfa; SNIPE</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>Bauschuz, acer; MAPLE TREE</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>Bauzimiz, pabulum; FODDER</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.E.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>993</td>
<td>Bazima, birchun; BLACK GROUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>III.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>Beluaiz, uenator; HUNTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.C.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Benizscia, dextra; RIGHT HAND</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738</td>
<td>Beoril, beccharium; BEAKER</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.E.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Bezelen, uellun; SKIN DISEASE</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.A.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741</td>
<td>Bibibaiz, mensale; TABLE WINE</td>
<td>II.E.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>Bichzin, buckela; CHEEK STRAP, BUCKLE</td>
<td>II.E.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Bilidio, celatura; ENGRAVING</td>
<td>II.B.2.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>Bilischiz, incaustum; INK</td>
<td>II.E.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>979</td>
<td>Bilizinus, psitacus; PARROT</td>
<td>III.C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>Biminzsta, cos; WHETSTONE</td>
<td>II.E.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>971</td>
<td>Birischa, grasemugga; WARBLER</td>
<td>III.C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>Biriz, werch; HEMP</td>
<td>II.E.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>988</td>
<td>Birizo, gallinacius; CHICKEN</td>
<td>III.C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Birscheiz, esca; FOOD</td>
<td>II.C.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825</td>
<td>Bischia, ugera; MEADOW SAFFRON</td>
<td>III.B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bischiniz, adolescents; ADOLESCENT</td>
<td>II.A.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>Bisianz, argentarius; SILVERSMITH</td>
<td>II.C.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838</td>
<td>Bitrianz, marrubium; HOREHOUND</td>
<td>III.B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>767</td>
<td>Bizarmol, fraxinus; ASH TREE</td>
<td>III.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>Bizbio, pin; PIN (used to turn the screw in a winepress)</td>
<td>II.E.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>Bizeris, callicula; LEATHER BOOT (short)</td>
<td>II.E.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Bizimonz, fundamentum; FOUNDATION</td>
<td>II.B.2.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Bizioliz, potator; DRUNKARD</td>
<td>II.C.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Blanschil, scoria; SCORIA, SLAG</td>
<td>II.E.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591</td>
<td>Blanschinz, bligarn; LEAD WIRE (in a heddle or embroidery hoop?)</td>
<td>II.E.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Blanzio, ciborium; ALTAR CANOPY</td>
<td>II.B.2.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Blinchzia, dolabrum; PICKAXE, MATTOCK</td>
<td>II.E.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>Bluschantz, scheftde; LACE (for a boot?)</td>
<td>II.E.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Boil, genu; KNEE</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010</td>
<td>Boiz, bruchus; GRASSHOPPER. B: glimo; GLOW WORM</td>
<td>III.D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>Bolis, lo; TANNING AGENT</td>
<td>II.E.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td>Bonizimnz, herth; HEARTH</td>
<td>II.E.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Borschil, telonarius; CUSTOMS OFFICER, TAX COLLECTOR</td>
<td>II.C.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>Bosinz, bubulcus; OXHERD</td>
<td>II.C.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>833</td>
<td>Bouizia, boberella; WINTER CHERRY</td>
<td>III.B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>943</td>
<td>Bozibo, herodius; PEREGRINE</td>
<td>III.C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Braiz, uersus; VERSE</td>
<td>II.B.2.c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>Braliz, bolz; BOLT</td>
<td>II.E.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>Branischiaz, pergamenenum; PARCHMENT</td>
<td>II.E.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Branizel, brachium; ARM</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Branzin, calx; LIME</td>
<td>II.B.2.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656</td>
<td>Brascha, subula; AWL</td>
<td>II.E.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>957</td>
<td>Brauz, turdus</td>
<td>THRUSH</td>
<td>III.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>Brazchia, andena</td>
<td>ANDIRON</td>
<td>II.E.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691</td>
<td>Briczinz, ceruisia</td>
<td>BEER</td>
<td>II.E.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>Brisianz, bercorn</td>
<td>GRAPESEED?</td>
<td>II.E.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>Brizimaz, stilus</td>
<td>STYLUS</td>
<td>II.E.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>908</td>
<td>Brumsil, buierwrz</td>
<td>BIRTH WORT, ARISTOLOCHIA</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>866</td>
<td>Brumz, berewrz</td>
<td>COW PARSNIP, HERACLEUM</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>821</td>
<td>Bruschia, centauria</td>
<td>CENTAURY, CORNFLOWER</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>686</td>
<td>Bubenez, kufa</td>
<td>SKID, RUNNER (for a barrel)</td>
<td>II.E.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>Buchziz, naba</td>
<td>HUB</td>
<td>II.E.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Buenz, antiphona</td>
<td>ANTIphon</td>
<td>II.B.2.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Bugeziol, anthonphonarius</td>
<td>ANTIphon</td>
<td>II.B.2.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Buianz, uesica</td>
<td>BLADDER</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>Buinz, lignum</td>
<td>FIREWOOD</td>
<td>II.E.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>876</td>
<td>Bulchzia, girol</td>
<td>LAMB’S LETTUCE, CORN SALAD?</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Bulizin, pixis</td>
<td>OFFERTORY BOX</td>
<td>II.B.2.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>Bulschaiz, plumbum</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td>II.E.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>Bumberiz, plastrum</td>
<td>WAGON</td>
<td>II.E.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>761</td>
<td>Bumbirich, corilus</td>
<td>HAZEL TREE</td>
<td>III.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Burbefeleiz, brustleffel</td>
<td>STERNUM, XIPHISTERNUM?</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Burbeiscal, pectus</td>
<td>BREAST, CHEST</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td>Burizindiz, ignis</td>
<td>FIRE</td>
<td>II.E.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777</td>
<td>Burschiabuz, murica</td>
<td>TAMARISK</td>
<td>III.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649</td>
<td>Bursich, scandipola</td>
<td>STIRRUP, MOUNT?</td>
<td>II.E.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>673</td>
<td>Burksalbuz, seckere</td>
<td>SHEARS</td>
<td>II.E.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>Burzimbuz, prinus</td>
<td>PLUM TREE</td>
<td>III.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>Buschibol, paneficus</td>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td>II.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>689</td>
<td>Buschinz, mustum</td>
<td>MUST, JUICE (unfermented wine)</td>
<td>II.E.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>Buininz, truha</td>
<td>CABINET</td>
<td>II.E.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>Buzbin, mensa</td>
<td>TABLE, MEAL</td>
<td>II.E.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645</td>
<td>Buzion, phil</td>
<td>SPEAR</td>
<td>II.E.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742</td>
<td>Buziz, baccinum</td>
<td>BASIN (for washing dishes?)</td>
<td>II.E.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923</td>
<td>Cachxis, triticum</td>
<td>WHEAT</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>Cauenel, cadevize</td>
<td>WAGON PART?</td>
<td>II.E.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012</td>
<td>Cauiz, cicado</td>
<td>CRICKET, CICADA</td>
<td>III.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>Cauizeil, kuchelin</td>
<td>CAKE</td>
<td>II.E.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648</td>
<td>Cauz, sella</td>
<td>SADDLE</td>
<td>II.E.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>836</td>
<td>Cauzia, sisimbra</td>
<td>THYME, or WATERCRESS?</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Ceril, cerebrum</td>
<td>BRAIN</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692</td>
<td>Cherin</td>
<td>gruz; GRAIN</td>
<td>II.E.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842</td>
<td>Chorischia</td>
<td>lilium; LILY</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>935</td>
<td>Circhza</td>
<td>wichum; VETCH</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805</td>
<td>Cischinzariz</td>
<td>spicanardus; SPIKENARD</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Clainzo</td>
<td>claustrum; CLOISTER</td>
<td>II.B.2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771</td>
<td>Clamizibuz</td>
<td>laurus; LAUREL TREE</td>
<td>III.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>871</td>
<td>Clanzga</td>
<td>tenacetum; TANSY</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884</td>
<td>Clarischil</td>
<td>allium; GARLIC</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Cluanz</td>
<td>os; BONE</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Cliuinx</td>
<td>magus; MAGICIAN</td>
<td>II.C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>Clizio</td>
<td>uades; BAILSMAN, GUARANTOR</td>
<td>II.C.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>Cloisch</td>
<td>clulft; CLEAVER</td>
<td>II.E.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Clonischol</td>
<td>campana; BELL (big)</td>
<td>II.B.2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>Coindanz</td>
<td>camenata; ROOM WITH FIREPLACE</td>
<td>II.E.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Colinoko</td>
<td>laquearia; CEILING</td>
<td>II.B.2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>Comzimaz</td>
<td>domus; HOUSE</td>
<td>II.E.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>Conchsis</td>
<td>tenebrae; DARKNESS</td>
<td>II.D.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Conix</td>
<td>cnugel; KNUCKLE</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675</td>
<td>Corizin</td>
<td>uierdel; QUARTER (measurement)</td>
<td>II.E.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>Cranischil</td>
<td>cruselin; EARTHEN JAR</td>
<td>II.E.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>Creiza</td>
<td>lanth; LAND</td>
<td>II.E.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Creuenuiz</td>
<td>urile-membrum, ueretrum; MALE MEMBER</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Criberanz</td>
<td>cesaries; LONG HAIR</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>Crichzial</td>
<td>cardomomum; CARDAMOM</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814</td>
<td>Cririschia</td>
<td>lorbere; BAY LEAF</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Crizia</td>
<td>ecclesia; CHURCH</td>
<td>II.B.2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Croich</td>
<td>dich; THIGH</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Crouiz</td>
<td>talus; ANKLE</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Cruniz</td>
<td>menschen, crus bein; LEG</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>Cruniziol</td>
<td>uicedomnus; DEPUTY</td>
<td>II.C.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>Cruza</td>
<td>wibel; WEAVIL. B: bruchus;</td>
<td>III.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GRASSHOPPER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>818</td>
<td>Culgeia</td>
<td>meigelana; LILY OF THE VALLEY</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Culginz</td>
<td>uillicus; ESTATE MANAGER</td>
<td>II.C.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>Culumendiabuz</td>
<td>cornus; DOGWOOD</td>
<td>III.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>Cumeriz</td>
<td>suzel; SADDLE BLANKET?</td>
<td>II.E.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Cunzio</td>
<td>mentellum; MANTLE</td>
<td>II.E.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Curchozia</td>
<td>huba; HOOD, TURBAN (or tall hat)</td>
<td>II.E.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>Curizan</td>
<td>bortdun; JEWELRY SETTINGS</td>
<td>II.E.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646</td>
<td>Curschinh</td>
<td>craphfo; SPEARHEAD?</td>
<td>II.E.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>Curschul</td>
<td>rappo; GRAPE CLUSTER</td>
<td>II.E.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>904</td>
<td>Cursez,</td>
<td>milium; MILLET</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835</td>
<td>Cuz,</td>
<td>papauer; POPPY</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>Dagezia,</td>
<td>douwrz; DAUWURTZ</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Dalscil,</td>
<td>caupo; INNKEEPER</td>
<td>II.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>Danis,</td>
<td>denne; THRESHING FLOOR.</td>
<td>II.E.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Dariz,</td>
<td>intestina; INTESTINES (large)</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Daschia,</td>
<td>wolfoesgelegen; ARNICA</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>Deiezio,</td>
<td>nanus; DWARF</td>
<td>II.C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Denizimo,</td>
<td>december; DECEMBER</td>
<td>II.D.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>Diezo,</td>
<td>hurniz; HORNET</td>
<td>III.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Dilimischol</td>
<td>feniseca; MOWER (of hay)</td>
<td>II.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Dilisch,</td>
<td>sepum; TALLOW</td>
<td>II.B.2.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Dilizanz,</td>
<td>gladius; SWORD</td>
<td>II.E.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>Dilzio,</td>
<td>dies; DAY</td>
<td>II.D.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Dioranz,</td>
<td>fornix; VAULT, ARCH, or ARCADE</td>
<td>II.B.2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Dirischil,</td>
<td>potus; DRINK</td>
<td>II.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Diriz,</td>
<td>rinch; RING (for the bell rope?)</td>
<td>II.B.2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Discol,</td>
<td>musculus; MUSCLE</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Discula,</td>
<td>feria-II; MONDAY</td>
<td>II.D.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Diuloz,</td>
<td>tribunal; SANCTUARY</td>
<td>II.B.2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Diuueia,</td>
<td>caliga; LEATHER BOOT (long)</td>
<td>II.E.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Diuueliz,</td>
<td>diabolus; DEVIL</td>
<td>I.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>Diuz,</td>
<td>marsuppium; POUCH</td>
<td>II.E.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>887</td>
<td>Dizia,</td>
<td>planza; SPROUT</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>851</td>
<td>Dizia,</td>
<td>dictama; DITTANY</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806</td>
<td>Diziama,</td>
<td>liquaricia; LICORICE</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>Dizol,</td>
<td>dominica-dies; SUNDAY</td>
<td>II.D.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Dolemiz,</td>
<td>ganeo; GLUTTON</td>
<td>II.C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Donix,</td>
<td>acerra; INCENSE BOX</td>
<td>II.B.2.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>954</td>
<td>Dorinschiz,</td>
<td>dorndrewre; BUTCHER-BIRD, SHRIKE</td>
<td>III.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Dorniel,</td>
<td>culus; BOTTOM, ASS</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Douizio,</td>
<td>carpentarius; CARPENTER</td>
<td>II.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>Doziz,</td>
<td>exactor; TAX-COLLECTOR or</td>
<td>II.C.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PLAINTIFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>955</td>
<td>Drozima,</td>
<td>drosla; THRUSH</td>
<td>III.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832</td>
<td>Dugrul,</td>
<td>binewrz; LESSER CELANDINE</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926</td>
<td>Duixia,</td>
<td>ordeum; BARLEY</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713</td>
<td>Duliric,</td>
<td>necessariurn; PRIVY</td>
<td>II.E.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>Dulschiliz,</td>
<td>turba; MOB</td>
<td>II.C.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Dulsielz,</td>
<td>facies; FACE</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Dunaz</td>
<td>responsorium; RESPONSORY</td>
<td>II.B.2.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>Duneziz</td>
<td>camisia; UNDERGARMENT</td>
<td>II.E.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>913</td>
<td>Duniz</td>
<td>distel; THISTLE</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>898</td>
<td>Dunschia</td>
<td>lapacium; DOCK</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Duoliz</td>
<td>nates; BUTTOCKS</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>Durziol</td>
<td>miles; SOLDIER</td>
<td>II.C.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>Durziuanz</td>
<td>mergus; FOLLOWER, HENCHMAN</td>
<td>II.C.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>Duschio</td>
<td>mergus; GULL</td>
<td>III.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>883</td>
<td>Duziluz</td>
<td>distelunco; CHIVES</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Eioliz</td>
<td>dominus; LORD (secular)</td>
<td>II.C.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Enpholianz</td>
<td>episcopus; BISHOP</td>
<td>II.B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>Ermosiz</td>
<td>distelulино; GOLDFINCH</td>
<td>III.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Falschin</td>
<td>uates; SEER</td>
<td>I.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>677</td>
<td>Famigol</td>
<td>carrada; JAR, BOWL</td>
<td>II.E.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Fanschol</td>
<td>auunculus; MATERNAL UNCLE</td>
<td>II.A.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Faraliz</td>
<td>caluicium; BALD HEAD</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Farischomil</td>
<td>pinnaculum; SPIRE</td>
<td>II.B.2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Fasinz</td>
<td>caluaria; SKULL</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>823</td>
<td>Fauz</td>
<td>enula; HELENIUM or HORSEHEAL (elecampane).</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737</td>
<td>Feleiz</td>
<td>coclear; SPOON</td>
<td>II.E.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td>Felischka</td>
<td>kiruela; CHERVIL</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870</td>
<td>Fenisgronz</td>
<td>huswrz; HOUSE LEEK</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Figirez</td>
<td>pictor; PAINTER</td>
<td>II.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>Filisch</td>
<td>aulicus; COURTIER</td>
<td>II.C.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Firanz</td>
<td>saliuia; SALIVA</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Firmaniz</td>
<td>lapicida; MASON</td>
<td>II.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>868</td>
<td>Firmizima</td>
<td>consolida; COMFREY</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728</td>
<td>Flagur</td>
<td>flama; FLAME</td>
<td>II.E.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672</td>
<td>Flanischianz</td>
<td>bersha; WICKER BASKET</td>
<td>II.E.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717</td>
<td>Flanus</td>
<td>flegel; FLAIL (for threshing)</td>
<td>II.E.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>942</td>
<td>Flauriz</td>
<td>pelicanus; PELICAN</td>
<td>III.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td>Flauzia</td>
<td>bathenia; BETONY</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>882</td>
<td>Fliezhiz</td>
<td>cepe; ONION</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>Florisca</td>
<td>carpobalsamum; BALSAM</td>
<td>III.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Fluanz</td>
<td>locium [sic], harn; URINE.</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>Fluischa</td>
<td>bachminze; MARSH MINT, WATER MINT</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>Flusez</td>
<td>cle; CLOVER</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Folicio</td>
<td>mercator; MERCHANT</td>
<td>II.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Fonix</td>
<td>pupilla; PUPIL (of the eye)</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forinz, maritus; HUSBAND II.A.1
Forischial, sinciput; FOREHEAD II.A.3
Foriz, drium; EMBROIDERY NEEDLES II.A.3
Fragizlanz, locus-uerecundie mulieris; FEMALE PUDEUM II.A.3
Fraizola, conuiuia; LODGER, GUEST II.C.2
Framiz, steivvarn; POLYPODIUM (a fern) III.B
Franix, huobo; UVULA. B: yuula. II.A.3
Frazinz, cazenzagel; HORSETAIL III.B
Frens, vertex; CROWN OF THE HEAD II.A.3
Fronich, frenum; BRIDLE, BIT II.E.7
Fronix, frater; BROTHER II.A.1
Fronzios, fenerator; MONEYLENDER, USURER II.C.2
Fugenz, brache; TROUSER, BREECH II.E.1
Fugizlo, cloacarius; FILTH-TALKER (privy-cleaner/ракер). B: lengeuekre. II.C.3
Fulscaioliz, auceps; FOWLER II.C.4
Fulzia, ringela; MARIGOLD III.B
Funiz, planta pedis; SOLE (of foot) II.A.3
Funschiol, gener; SON-IN-LAW II.A.1
Furanz, storrun; WAGON BLOCK? II.E.2
Fuscal, pes; FOOT II.A.3
Fuschalioz, bases; PEDESTAL II.B.2.a
Fuziz, bracile; GARTER II.E.1
Gabia, quahtila; QUAIL III.C
Gacniz, gelleta; PAIL II.E.8
Gagria, anser; GOOSE (GANDER) III.C
Galantiz, henga; HANDLE II.B.2.a
Galich, membrum; LIMB II.A.3
Galigiz, ciminum; CUMIN III.B
Galizima, galea; LEATHER HELMET II.E.7
Galschia, gamandria; GERMANDER (veronica; see galschia, n. 996) III.B
Galschia, columba; DOVE III.C
Galschiriz, bipennis; BATTLE AXE, DOUBLE AXE II.E.2
Ganguzia, cappa; CAP II.E.1
Ganzian, sugir; REIN? II.E.7
Ganzida, egeda; HARROW II.E.2
Garazin, subulcus; SWINEHERD II.C.2
Gareiza, gariofel; CLOVE III.B
Garginz, hortulanus; GARDENER II.C.2
Gargischol, augustus; AUGUST

Garoz, isopo; HYSSOP

Gasinz, cancellarius; CHANCELLOR

Gauimiz, circinus; COMPASS

Gauriz, gundereba; GROUND-IVY or ROCKROSE

Gaurizio, fidicen; MINSTREL, FIDDLER

Gauschin, scriptorium; SCRIPTORIUM

Gauschuliz, camera; ROOM

Gausia, menewa; HORSE RADISH

Gaxuurinz, nessewrz; HELLEBORE

Gazun, pullus; PULLET

Gigunz, beneficium; BENEFICE, FIEF (leased land)

Gigunzibuz, ficus; FIG TREE

Gimeldia, pinus; PINE TREE

Ginschiz, prima; PRIME

Ginzia, bibinella; PIMPERNELL

Giruschaz, harsta; GRILL

Gischiz, grensich; POTENTILLA

Giszia, tribulus; CALTROP

Giza, R: sinza, B: simeza; meaning unknown.

Glachxa, spelza; SPELT

Glamzia, hehera; JAY

Glanz, clungelin [sic]; FINE LINEN

Gliaz, gladiolus; IRIS (the flower)

Glinziz, soum; HEM

Glisgia, amarellus; BUNTING

Gloggizil, messor; REAPER

Gloiz, renunculus; KIDNEY

Glosinz, acies; VANGUARD

Glucziminiz, gebutde; TUB (for pressing grapes)

Gluiuiz, arundo; REED

Gluaz, romseseminza; SPEARMINT, ROSEMINT

Golinzia, platanus; PLANE TREE

Golzio, silo; THONG (for drawing the plow)

Gonizla, studa; SHRUB?

Goniz, lectionarius; LECTIONARY

Gorinz, trabs; RAFTER

Gospilianz, dapifer; DISH BEARER, WAITER
589 Gozionz, goltbracha; TOOL (for working gold or gold thread) II.E.5
899 Grachia, cresso; CRESS III.B
626 Gragischon, armilla; BRACELET II.E.6
893 Gragiz, rathdich; ROOT, RADISH III.B
259 Gramizel, gradus; STEP II.B.2.a
759 Gramzbuz, castenea; CHESTNUT III.A
837 Grauiko, reumatica; GERANIUM, CRANESBILL III.B
909 Graxia, uiola; VIOLET III.B
861 Grimizia, brionia; WHITE BRYONY III.B
856 Grischol, satureia; SAVORY III.B
641 Grizianz, senewa; STRING (for a bow) II.E.7
544 Grogezin, carbo; COAL II.E.2
897 Grogiziz, rapa; TURNIP III.B
907 Gruizia, haselwrz; HAZELWORT III.B
579 Gruschiaz, presdela; SEAL PRESS II.E.4
104 Gruzia, guttur; GULLET, ESOPHAGUS II.A.3
763 Gruzimbuz, cerasus; CHERRY TREE III.A
588 Guchiz, vizza; BALL OF YARN II.E.5
548 Gugiziz, axis; AXLE II.E.2
722 Guguniz, palea; CHAFF II.E.9
681 Gugurez, stoutf; GOBLET II.E.8
978 Gugurunz, strucio; OSTRICH III.C
71 Guia, nuolla; NAPE (of the neck) II.A.3
810 Gulgia, galgan; GALINGALE III.B
682 Gulginz, trehdere; FUNNEL II.E.8
233 Gulioz, cardo; HINGE II.B.2.a
790 Gulizbaz, jubex; BIRCH III.A
933 Gullox, kichera; CHICKPEA III.B
669 Gulsich, zubeda; BUCKET II.E.8
102 Gulzia, faux; PALATE? ROOF OF MOUTH? II.A.3
392 Gulzianz, figulus; POTTER II.C.2
695 Gunguliz, schufa; BEER MUG II.E.8
245 Gunschula, murus; WALL II.B.2.a
658 Guraix, bursta; BRUSH II.E.8
848 Guris, venechil; FENNEL III.B
914 Guriz, kartdo; TEASEL (a kind of thistle) III.B
819 Gurizama, millefolium; YARROW III.B
879 Gurizlaniz, hircescunga; SCOLOPENDER, WILD MINT III.B
598 Guruz, flahs; FLAX, LINEN II.E.5
873 Guska, smergela; LESSER CELANDINE III.B
Guskaibuz, esculus; WINTER OAK
Guuniz, conus; HELMET CREST
Guzim, meizel; CHISEL
Guziminz, collectenere; BOOK OF COLLECTS
Guzimiz, cista; BOX, CHEST
Guzinz, collecta; COLLECT
Haischa, turtur; TURTLE DOVE
Halgia, hagelgans; SNOWGOOSE
Hamischa, alnus; ALDER
Harzima, ager; FIELD
Haurizpia, feria-VI; FRIDAY
Hauschia, cornu; INKHORN
Hauscuz, accipiter; HAWK
Hoil, caput; HEAD
Hoilbaiz, hoibetdouch; HEAD COVERING
Hoilzirier, houbetlovc; OPENING (in garment)
FOR THE HEAD
Iamischiz, ymnarius; HYMNAL
Iaschua, beinnich; LEGGING, HOSE.
Idiez, fel; GALLBLADDER
Ieuriz, iecur; LIVER
Imschiol, martir; MARTYR
Inbiz, cletdo; BURR
Inchscola, manutergium; TOWEL
Inmois, homo; HUMAN
Inpelziaz, subtalares; SHOE
Ioinz, nona; NONES
Ischiazin, speicha; SPOKE
Ispariz, spiritus; SPIRIT
Iugiza, uidua; WIDOW
Iuncxoil, fémur; THIGH-BONE
Iunix, ascella; ARM PIT
Iur, uir; MAN
Iuriz, iudex; JUDGE
Iurstaniz, cubitus; FOREARM
Iuziz, louch; LEEK
Izimziolibiz, euangeliorium liber; GOSPEL BOOK
Izziroz, uepres; THORN TREE
Kachzia, uselun; meaning unknown.
Kaido, delubrum; SHRINE
Kailamanz, torquular; WINEPRESS
709 Kalchizin, cellarium; STOREROOM, CELLAR II.E.9
240 Kalirinz, quadrus; STONE-BLOCK, ASHLAR II.B.2.a
482 Kalizin, uespera; VESPERS II.D.3
522 Kalziga, hepæ; SCYTHE II.E.2
361 Kanchziol, expeditio; EXPEDITION II.C.1
207 Kanesilis, cantor; CANTOR II.B.1
526 Kanfur, hamus; FISH HOOK II.E.2
503 Kanscho, pilleus; HAT II.E.1
623 Kanulzial, wil; NUN'S VEIL II.E.6
1009 Kanzia, glimo; GLOW WORM B: cinomia; FLEA III.D
362 Kanzil, conmilito; COMRADE-IN-ARMS II.C.1
864 Karinz, minnewrz; MAIDENHAIR III.B
191 Karinz, cardinals; CARDINAL II.B.1
872 Karisha, wermuda; WORMWOOD III.B
44 Kaueia, uxor; WIFE II.A.1
903 Kauschin, caulis; CABBAGE III.B
536 Kazinz, lebes; KETTLE, CAULDRON II.E.2
190 Kelionz, papa; POPE II.B.1
50 Keliz, blesus; LISPER II.A.2
553 Kichsis, lanchwith; WAGON POLE or SHAFT II.E.2
581 Kilmindiaz, crocus; SAFFRON (for coloring manuscripts?) II.E.4
292 Kinchscalis, candelabrum; CANDLESTICK II.B.2.b
291 Kinchzia, candela; TALLOW CANDLE, LIGHT II.B.2.b
350 Kinchziol, aduocatus; ADVOCATE II.C.1
896 Kirinz, cucurbita; CUCUMBER III.B
822 Kirischia, entiana; YELLOW GENTIAN III.B
306 Kirzanzlibiz, missalis-liber; MISSAL II.B.2.c
787 Kisanzibuz, chinus; COTTON TREE III.A
107 Kolecruzziz, halssbein; NECKBONE II.A.3
108 Koletabeiaz, cervix; VEIN IN NECK II.A.3
105 Kolezia, collum; THROAT II.A.3
242 Kolezin, sabulum; SAND II.B.2.a
335 Kolgira, pastoralis-baculus; BISHOP’S STAFF II.B.2.d
52 Kolianz, claudus; CRIPPLE II.A.2
247 Kolinzia, columpna; COLUMN II.B.2.a
197 Kolscanz, presbiter; PRIEST II.B.1
433 Kolsinzie, uerewere; TRADESMAN II.C.4
340 Korischol, pfellel; SILK II.B.2.d
11 Korzinthio, propheta; PROPHET I.C
142 Kosinzia, costa; RIB II.A.3
Kulzphazur, attaus; ANCESTOR
Kunx, ztidewar; ZEDOARY, SETWALL
Lachzim, fascinula; FORK
Laiganz, R: addermince; B: aderminze; meaning unknown.
Laizscia, tilia; LINDEN
Laminic, duga; BARREL STAVE
Lamisch, lateres; TILE
Lamischiz, abies; FIR TREE
Lamschiz, riscus; ELDER
Laniscal, ubera; MAMMARY
Lanischa, cristiana; CHRISTMAS ROSE (helleborus niger)
Lanschil, analogium; PULPIT, LECTERN
Larchizin, scriptor; Scribe
Larginchzint, artifex; ARTIST, PERFORMER
Larizin, coriarius; LEATHERWORKER, TANNER
Laschiabuz, ornus; MOUNTAIN ASH
Laschiz, aro; EAGLE
Lasinz, capillus; LOCK OR STRAND OF HAIR
Laufrica, huflatdecha; COLTSFOOT
Lauziminiza, terra; EARTH
Liaziz, nurus; DAUGHTER-IN-LAW
Libizamanz, liber; BOOK
Lifiziol,ocus; COOK
Ligeschia, hozduba; WOOD DOVE
Limix, lux; LIGHT
Limizin, scinun; PINS
Limzikol, crux; CROSS
Limzkil, infans; INFANT
Linchz, talentum; POUND
Liniz, lauendela; LAVENDAR
Lischianz, branch; FIREBRAND
Liuionz, saluator; SAVIOR
Liusanz, lucerna; OIL-LAMP
Lizchaz, fusus; SPINDLE
Lizia, glandula; GLANS
Lizo, saltator; ACROBAT
Loginx, gruo; JACKDAW
Logizkal, gygas; GIANT
45  Loiffol, populus; PEOPLE
393  Loinscho, lanarius; WOOLWORKER
461  Loizo, mensis; MONTH
895  Lozunz, ascolonium; SHALLOT
659  Lucza, scuoba; SCOOP
118  Luguriz, elenbogo; ELBOW
212  Lunchkal, discipulus; DISCIPLE
580  Luschanz, minium; RED LEAD, RUBRIC
990  Luschia, aneta; DUCK
855  Luschia, lubisticum; LOVAGE
208  Luschil, sacrista; Sexton
1005 Luxzia, locusta; LOCUST B: papilio; BUTTERFLY
80  Luzcrealz, ougrinch; EYE-SOCKET
77  Luzeia, oculus; EYE
81  Luziliet, cilium; EYELASH
82  Luziminispier, palpebra; EYELID
79  Luzpomphia, ougappel; EYEBALL
820 Magizima, sitderuurz; BLACK HELLEBORE,
889 Magriz, (Berlin MS only) unglossed
127 Magux, pugnus; FIST
93  Maiaz, maxilla; UPPER JAW
22  Maiz, mater; MOTHER
37  Maizfia, matertera; MATERNAL AUNT
109 Maletin, mentum; CHIN
98  Maletinosinz, kinnebacko; LOWER JAW
31  Malkunz, senex; OLD MAN
100  Malskir, dens; TOOTH
415 Maluizia, meretrix; PROSTITUTE
346 Malzienz, marchio; MARQUIS
418 Malzispianz, obtrectator; DETRACTOR
744 Marchildulz, moretum; FERMENTED JUICE
499 Marezia, ciliicum; HAIR SHIRT
878 Marizima, matra; FEVERFEW
679 Marsic, sestere; MEASURING CUP
858 Maschin, denmarka; VALERIAN
507 Mazanz, cultellus; KNIFE
931 Mazma, faba; BEAN
745 Melzimaz, meddo; MEAD
746 Melzita, hunecwirz; HONEY
161 Menguiz, stercus; EXCREMENT
241 Michzio, cementum; CEMENT
173 Milisch, medulla; MARROW II.A.3
73 Milischa, coma; HAIR (head hair of a man) II.A.3
284 Milizamiz, imago; IMAGE II.B.2.b
535 Milzimzia, craticula; GRID IRON II.E.2
370 Milzonzit, pincerna; CUPBEARER II.C.2
323 Mimischonz, capitulum; CHAPTER II.B.2.c
336 Minscal, uexillum; BANNER II.B.2.d
182 Minscol, ulcus; ULCER II.A.4
454 Mirzisil, feria-V; THURSDAY II.D.1
178 Misa, arcula; TOE II.A.3
510 Miska, forceps; FORCEPS, TONGS II.E.2
33 Miskila, soror; SISTER II.A.1
894 Mixaziz, raphanum; WHITE RADISH, or HORSE RADISH III.B
776 Mizamabuz, morus; MULBERRY TREE III.A
1008 Mizia, cinomia; FLEA B: culix; GNAT III.D
224 Miziabiza, oratorium; ORATORY II.B.2.a
278 Mizirzeis, impluuium, rochlog; CHIMNEY II.B.2.a
947 Moguz, larus; BUZZARD III.C
297 Moleziz, oblata; OFFERING II.B.2.b
146 Molliz, pulmo; LUNG II.A.3
843 Monischia, agrimonia; AGRIMONY III.B
95 Moniz, os; MOUTH II.A.3
221 Monzchia, monasterium; MONASTERY II.B.2.a
189 Monzil, scabies; MANGE II.A.4
216 Morizinz, monachus; MONK II.B.1
495 Morschis, corium; LEATHER II.E.1
629 Moruueia, lederhosa; GREAVE (made of leather) II.E.7
407 Moruzio, carnifex; BUTCHER II.C.2
969 Mosiz, uinco; FINCH III.C
172 Mueniz, sures; CALF (of leg) II.A.3
316 Mumizalibiz, matutinalis-liber; MATINS BOOK II.B.2.c
465 Mumizanz, matutinum; MATINS, EARLY MORNING II.D.1
399 Munchzidol, numeralius; BROKER II.C.2
452 Munizza, feria-III; TUESDAY II.D.1
661 Murscha, suerca; BLACK STAIN II.E.8
309 Musgal, graduale; GRADUAL II.B.2.c
809 Muzimia, nuzmuscata; NUTMEG III.B
796 Muzimibuz, nucus; WALNUT TREE III.A
625 Naczuo, monile; NECKLACE II.E.6
739 Nanzoiz, ciplus; CUP II.E.10
619 Naschiz, linede; LINEN CLOTHING II.E.6
874 Nasculi, natscado; SOLANUM, NIGHTSHADE III.B
90 Nascumisil, nasecrosia; NOSE-CARTILAGE II.A.3
88 Nascutil, nasus; NOSE II.A.3
89 Nascuzirz, naselouch; NOSTRIL II.A.3
616 Nasunz, nethde; DECORATIVE SEAMS II.E.6
627 Naurizin, anulus; RING (for the finger) II.E.6
987 Nazia, gallina; HEN III.C
986 Nazischo, gallus; ROOSTER III.C
42 Neniz, nepos; GRAND-CHILD II.A.1
120 Nilzial, rist; WRIST II.A.3
299 Nilziol,uale; FOLDING DOORS II.B.2.a
24 Nilzmaiz, nouerca; STEPMOTHER II.A.1
23 Nilzpeueriz, uitricus; STEPFATHER II.A.1
26 Nilzsciriz, priuignus; STEPSON II.A.1
976 Ninxia, cornix; CROW III.C
202 Niscalnoiz, lector; READER II.B.1
854 Nischil, nebeta; MINT, or CATNIP III.B
48 Niszin, srabo; SQUINTER II.A.2
537 Nochzido, caccabus; COOKING POT II.E.2
58 Nochziz, cecus; BLIND-MAN (repeat of n. 46) II.A.2
46 Nochziz, cecus; BLIND-MAN (repeated in n. 58) II.A.2
532 Nogiz, terebrum; DRILL II.E.2
784 Noinz, paliurus; CHRIST’S THORN III.A
967 Noisca, nachdegala; NIGHTINGALE III.C
952 Noizbiz, nocticorax; NIGHT RAVEN III.C
476 Nolischa, nouember; NOVEMBER II.D.2
456 Norzka, sabatum; SATURDAY II.D.1
181 Nosinz, grint; SCAB II.A.4
47 Nosinz, surdus; DEAF-MAN II.A.2
950 Nozia, ulula; SCREECH OWL III.C
607 Nulsiz, acus; NEEDLE II.E.5
483 Nuschanz, completorium; COMPLINE II.D.3
680 Nusic, kanna; JUG II.E.8
485 Obirischa, manica; SLEEVE II.E.1
539 Ochzia, rastrum; SCRAPING TOOL II.E.2
85 Oir, auris; EAR II.A.3
624 Oiralbriun, inaures; EARRINGS II.E.6
87 Oirclamisil, orcrosla; EAR CARTILAGE II.A.3
715 Oirinschianz, horreum; BARN II.E.9
430 Oirschal, tubicen; TRUMPETER II.C.4
86 Oirunguizol, orsmero; EARWAX II.A.3
Olzimia, mapula; MANIPLE

Omezin, reif; BARREL HOOP

Onez, canticum; SONG, PSALM

Oneziz, ianua; DOOR

Ophalin, templum; TEMPLE

Ordeziz, ianua; DOOR

Oriezio, ianitor; PORTER

Orinschiel, heremita; HERMIT

Ornalz, crinis; HAIR (the tressed hair belonging to a woman)

Ornalzanzia, harsnur; HAIRBAND

Ornalzibuz, sanguinarius; SANGUINARIA, SPURREY?

Ornalziriz, cincinnus; CURLY-HAIR

Ornischo, marcius; MARCH (the month)

Orris, uullena; MULLEIN

Orschibuz, quercus; OAK TREE

Oscilanz, october; OCTOBER

Osinz, mandibula; JAW

Osinzmsalskir, molaris dens; MOLAR

Pabruz, pfeffercrut; SAVORY

Paiox, infula; BISHOP’S MITRE

Pamsiz, patena; PATEN

Pangizo, penitens; PENITENT

Pariziz, eunuchus; EUNUCH

Parreiz, panis; BREAD

Pasiz, lepra; LEPROSY

Pasizio, leprosus; LEPER

Pazia, bilsa; HENBANE

Pazidol, pallium episcopale; BISHOP’S MANTLE

Pazimbu, nespelboum; MEDLAR

Pazuz, indigena; NATIVE

Peranz, princeps; PRINCE

Pereziliuz, imperator; EMPEROR

Perezim, obses; HOSTAGE

Perschil, berewinke; PERIWINKLE

Perzimzio, aduena; GUEST

Peuearrez, patriarca; PATRIARCH

Peuearzet, patriarca; PATRIARCH

Peueriz, pater; FATHER

Peuors, patruus; PATERNAL UNCLE

Pezimil, pessulum; LATCH

Phalidiz, absidun; APSE
218 Phalischer, inclusus; ANCHORITE  
269 Phaliz, pictura; PAINTING  
287 Phamkil, cera; WAX  
290 Phamphziolaz, cereus; WAX CANDLE  
54 Phanizchin, idropicus; DROPSICAL-PERSON  
263 Pharisch, conus; KNOB (for a door? Clapper in a bell?)  
304 Phazia, ampulla; CRUET  
2 Phazur, auus; GRANDFATHER  
281 Philxima, caps; BOOKCASE  
886 Philzia, priseloch; CHIVES (see Dulziliuz, n. 883)  
302 Phinziol, urna; URN  
301 Phirzianz, fistula; PITCH PIPE  
126 Pidago, unglossed in both manuscripts  
831 Pigizia, kuuenela; WILD THYME, or SAVORY  
249 Pillix, capitellum; CAPITAL (of a pillar)  
83 Pilsemia, supercilium; EYEBROW  
464 Pinchzi, sero; DUSK  
236 Pioranz, clauis; KEY  
905 Pischir, apium; CELERY  
123 Pixel, pollex; THUMB  
932 Pixiz, pisa; PEA  
273 Pizimanz, asser; FLOORBOARD  
705 Planizunz, curtis; PEN, ENCLOSURE (for animals)  
385 Planzimor, uinitor; VINTAGER  
36 Pleniza, amita; PATERNAL AUNT  
506 Pligizil, digel; CRUCIBLE  
594 Ploniz, spelt; TORCH (for lighting a room?)  
644 Ploschinanz, strala; ARROW  
685 Plucz, bodun; BOTTOM (of a barrel)  
830 Pluschia, poleia; PENNYROYAL  
232 Poiniz, postes; DOORPOST  
775 Pomziaz, malus; APPLE TREE  
225 Praiz, chorus; CHOIR  
906 Pransiz, petrosilinum; PARSLEY  
712 Preschaz, presepium; MANGER  
445 Primischol, liber-homo; FREEMAN  
995 Prinscho, miluus; KITE  
205 Proizez, prepositus; PROVOST  
734 Pruianz, amphora; JUG  
885 Prucziz, surio; CHICORY
749 Pufeia, flado; FLATCAKE, PANCAKE II.E.11
880 Pulicha, lunchwrz; LUNGWORT III.B
985 Purizimo, rebestuchil; POISONOUS BEETLE III.C
865 Pursiaz, R. and B; meaning unknown III.B
91 Pusinzia, catarrus; SNOT II.A.3
425 Rabiniz, predo; ROBBER II.C.3
845 Raiz, ruta; RUE III.B
994 Raiza, rephun; PARTRIDGE III.C
721 Ralzoiz, stramen; STRAW II.E.9
557 Ranchil, aratrum; PLOW II.E.2
523 Ranchmaz, snitdesahs; BILL-HOOK II.E.2
417 Ranshil, loquax; CHATTERBOX II.C.3
59 Ranzgia, lingua; TONGUE II.A.3
698 Ranziaz, palmes; SPROUT II.E.8
180 Ranzil, ruof; SCABIES II.A.4
620 Rasinz risa; VEIL II.E.6
184 Razil, uenenum; POISON II.A.4
435 Razinthia, interpres; TRANSLATOR, INTERPRETOR II.C.4
217 Reimonz, monialis; NUN II.B.1
551 Reldiaz, runga; STANCHION, WAGON PROP II.E.2
915 Riaz, ritgras; SEDGE, REED GRASS III.B
143 Rinzioz, dorsum; BACK II.A.3
922 Rischal, wildeminza; WILD MINT III.B
343 Rischol, rex; KING II.C.1
939 Riuschiz, uultur; VULTURE III.C
497 Rogazin, pellicium; FUR II.E.1
973 Roischo, cunigelen; WREN III.C
244 Ronzis, perpendiculum; PLUMB-LINE II.B.2.a
156 Rubianz, sanguis; BLOOD II.A.3
638 Ruiz, ranth; SHIELD RIM II.E.7
924 Ruizio, siligo; RYE, WINTER WHEAT III.B
188 Ruschila, ruga; WRINKLE II.A.4
585 Ruszianz, rama; EMBROIDERY STAND or LOOM II.E.5
841 Ruzia, rosa; ROSE III.B
600 Ruziminz, colus; DISTAFF II.E.5
438 Sabonzio, Sagittarius; BOWMAN II.C.4
125 Salziox, unguis; NAIL II.A.3
440 Salziz, domina; LADY II.C.5
261 Sansciumia, cripta; CRYPT II.B.2.a
869 Sanschul, sanikela; SANICULA III.B
1001 Sapiduz, apis; BEE III.D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Sarziz</td>
<td>legio; LEGION</td>
<td>II.C.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>826</td>
<td>Saxia</td>
<td>zucker; SUGAR</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Scabiriz</td>
<td>piscator; FISHERMAN</td>
<td>II.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Scala</td>
<td>sceidela; PART (in hair) or SCALP</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Scoilo</td>
<td>clericus; CLERIC</td>
<td>II.B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Scaintila</td>
<td>scapula; SHOULDER BLADE</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Saing</td>
<td>socer; FATHER-IN-LAW</td>
<td>II.A.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>Scaleis</td>
<td>bracha; FALLOW LAND</td>
<td>II.E.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>Scalgonzuz</td>
<td>cliens; RETAINER</td>
<td>II.C.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>Scalizia</td>
<td>merula; BLACKBIRD</td>
<td>III.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844</td>
<td>Scaliziz</td>
<td>salbeia; SAGE</td>
<td>III.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>Scaliziz</td>
<td>opilio; SHEPHERD</td>
<td>II.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>Scalmiza</td>
<td>ancilla; MAID-SERVANT</td>
<td>II.C.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>Scalio</td>
<td>mane; DAWN</td>
<td>II.D.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Scaltizio</td>
<td>palatinus; PALATINE COUNT</td>
<td>II.C.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Scalzido</td>
<td>sacerdos; HIGH PRIEST</td>
<td>II.B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Scalzio</td>
<td>humerus; SHOULDER</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Scamilin</td>
<td>timpus; TEMPLE (body part)</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Scamizio</td>
<td>mimus; TRICKSTER</td>
<td>II.C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>Scandidoz</td>
<td>september; SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>II.D.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>Scanipla</td>
<td>slistein [sic]; POLISHING STONE</td>
<td>II.E.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>Scantido</td>
<td>februarius; FEBRUARY</td>
<td>II.D.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>Scarduz</td>
<td>dux; DUKE</td>
<td>II.C.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Scarinz</td>
<td>scurliz; UNDER TUNIC</td>
<td>II.B.2.d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Scarpinz</td>
<td>mutus; MUTE</td>
<td>II.A.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940</td>
<td>Scaruz</td>
<td>elbiz; SWAN</td>
<td>III.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>Scatil</td>
<td>tunica; SKIRT</td>
<td>II.E.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>Scaun</td>
<td>essa; FORGE</td>
<td>II.E.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Scauril</td>
<td>stomachus; STOMACH</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>Scaurin</td>
<td>nox; NIGHT</td>
<td>II.D.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>Schagur</td>
<td>roclin; SKIRT</td>
<td>II.E.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>754</td>
<td>Schalmindibiz</td>
<td>amigdalus; ALMOND TREE</td>
<td>III.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774</td>
<td>Schalnihilbuz</td>
<td>juniperus; JUNIPER</td>
<td>III.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>Schaniz</td>
<td>tabula; WAX TABLET</td>
<td>II.E.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>Schaniz</td>
<td>scheida; SHEATH</td>
<td>II.E.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Schicial</td>
<td>latus; FLANK</td>
<td>II.A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Schimischonz</td>
<td>psalterium; PSALTER</td>
<td>II.B.2.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>Schiraizon</td>
<td>camerarius; CHAMBERLAIN</td>
<td>II.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>Schirizim</td>
<td>stucha; WOMAN’S HANGING SLEEVE</td>
<td>II.E.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794</td>
<td>Schirobuz</td>
<td>ahornenboum; MAPLE TREE</td>
<td>III.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Schirzima</td>
<td>foruex; FIRE TONGS, PINCERS</td>
<td>II.E.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736</td>
<td>Schoil</td>
<td>scutella; DRINKING BOWL</td>
<td>II.E.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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769 Schoimchia, picea; SPRUCE III.A
678 Schuldemiz, zober; TUB, VAT II.E.8
575 Schumz, punex; PUMICE II.E.4
662 Schuuarz, slif; SLIP (for polishing) II.E.8
984 Schuwil, onocrotalus; PELICAN III.C
171 Sciacruniz, tibie; SHIN-BONE II.A.3
688 Scilanz, zapfo; SPIGOT II.E.8
498 Scilia, cuculla; COWL II.E.1
405 Scilmiol, nauta; MARINER II.C.2
272 Sciloz, dil; FLOOR II.B.2.a
49 Sciniz, balbus; STAMMERER II.A.2
786 Scinzibuz, sauina; SAVIN, SAVINE III.A
519 Sciria, securis; HATCHET II.E.2
185 Scirinz, tabo; RUNNING SORE II.A.4
25 Scirizin, filius; SON II.A.1
791 Scoiaz, uimina; WILLOW III.A
758 Scoibuz, buxus; BOXWOOD III.A
760 Scoica, carpenus; HORNBEAM III.A
479 Scoinz, tercia; TERCE II.D.3
231 Scolioz, superliminare; TRANSOM, LINTEL II.B.2.a
558 Scolmiz, stina; PLOW HANDLE II.E.2
330 Scolmiz, subtile; VESTMENT II.B.2.d
377 Scoltilzio, cellerarius; BUTLER II.C.2
504 Scolzia, marca; MARK (the coin) II.E.2
770 Scoongilbuz, fusarius; SPINDLE-TREE III.A
543 Sconz, incus; ANVIL II.E.2
144 Scorinz, cor; HEART II.A.3
419 Scorinzin, susurro; WHISPERER II.C.3
916 Scorzia, urtica; NETTLE III.B
751 Scraphinz, krepfelin; DOUGHNUT II.E.11
703 Scruiz, sepes; FENCE, HEDGE II.E.8
900 Scururithil, morcruth; PARSNIP III.B
793 Scuanibuz, mirtus; MYRTLE III.A
827 Scukuriz, celidonia; CELANDINE III.B
948 Sculez, weho; KESTREL, SPARROWHAWK III.C
719 Sculiz, scoub; SHEAF II.E.9
524 Sculiz, subula; AWL II.E.2
631 Scurilz, clypeus; SHIELD II.E.7
201 Scurinz, exorcista; EXORCIST II.B.1
295 Scurinz, flama; FLAME II.B.2.b
424 Siccioniz, latro; BRIGAND II.C.3
129 Silisza, sinistra; LEFT HAND II.A.3
55 Siliziz, cardiacus; DYSPPEPTIC (heartburn sufferer) II.A.2
211 Silzimian, scolaris; SCHOLAR II.B.1
251 Sinziol, testudo; ARCHED or HIPPED ROOF II.B.2.a
834 Sizia, melda; BEET ROOT III.A
396 Smaletis, faber; SMITH II.C.2
420 Solchdamiz, adulator; FLATTERER II.C.3
13 Sonziz, apostolu; APOSTLE I.C
647 Spalun, shaft; SHAFT II.E.7
282 Spancriz, dedication ecclesie; CHURCH CONSECRATION II.B.2.b
372 Spaninz, pistor; MILLER II.C.2
509 Spanzol, malleus; HAMMER II.E.2
436 Sparfoliz, explorator; SPY, SCOUT II.C.4
780 Sparinichibuz, persicus; PEACH TREE III.A
234 Sparinzia, sera; LOCK II.B.2.a
215 Spariz, prior; PRIOR II.B.1
303 Sparizin, wedel; BRUSH II.B.2.b
928 Sparzun, dorth; BROME GRASS III.B
720 Spauiz, sichelinch; HARVEST II.E.9
294 Spinzia, lampas; TORCH II.B.2.b
862 Spiriz, sprincwrz; SPURGE III.B
139 Spirizan, ilia; INTESTINES (small) II.A.3
540 Spirilizim, falx; SICKLE II.E.2
702 Splinz, pfäl; STAKE (for a vineyard) II.E.8
381 Sporinizio, rusticus; PEASANT II.C.2
655 Spuz, leist; LAST (for a shoe) II.E.8
640 Squair, arcus; BOW II.E.7
338 Squamel, cortina; CURTAIN II.B.2.d
258 Staltcholz, altare; ALTAR II.B.2.a
704 Stamziz, stecco; STICK II.E.8
711 Stariz, stabulum; STABLE II.E.9
239 Staurinz, lapis; STONE II.B.2.a
69 Sterauinzia, frons; BROW, FOREHEAD II.A.3
549 Stigienz, rath; WHEEL II.E.2
246 Stirpheniz, pauimentum; PAVEMENT II.B.2.a
697 Stogin, uitis; GRAPEVINE II.E.8
708 Stoinz, stupa; BATHING ROOM II.E.9
56 Stragulz, paraliticus; PARALYZED PERSON II.A.2
136 Stranguliz, umbilicus; NAVAL II.A.3
576 Strauimiz, rigelstab; STRAIGHT LINE II.E.4
441 Subizo, seruus; SERVANT II.C.5
157 Suinz, sudor; SWEAT II.A.3
390 Sunchzil, sutor; SHOEMAKER II.C.2
718 Susinna, wanna; WINNOWING FAN II.E.9
556 Suzemel, spannagel; SHARE BEAM (plow) II.E.2
671 Suzgulaz, sruba; BRUSH II.E.8
174 Tabeializ, uena; VEIN II.A.3
280 Talizima, paries; WALL (in a house) II.B.2.a
96 Talzim, labium; LIP II.A.3
206 Telzion, decanus; DEAN II.B.1
614 Tenziz, witede; CLOTHING II.E.6
337 Tilifzia, tapete; TAPESTRY II.B.2.d
199 Tilzeuinoz, subdiaconus; SUBDEACON II.B.1
140 Tilzia, ventriculus; BELLY II.A.3
285 Tinzaloz, turibulum; THURIBLE, CENSER II.B.2.b
230 Tiriix, limen; THRESHOLD II.B.2.a
137 Tirziel, renes; LOINS II.A.3
317 Titilaiz, breuiarium; BREVIARY II.B.2.c
326 Tizzia, alba; ALB II.B.2.d
264 Tonizma, scella; BELL (little) II.B.2.a
276 Tonzion, tegula; SHINGLE II.B.2.a
459 Tonziz, umbra; SHADOW II.D.1
256 Tronischia, cathedra; CATHEDRAL II.B.2.a
351 Tronziol, patronus; DEFENDER, PATRON II.C.1
329 Tunchzil, stola; BISHOP’S STOLE II.B.2.d
981 Ualueria, vespertilio; BAT III.C
299 Uaschiro, calix; CHALICE II.B.2.b
603 Uazimanz, garn; YARN II.E.5
99 Uimzial, ginviue; GUM II.A.3
148 Uiperiz, splen; SPEELEN II.A.3
163 Uirlaiz, testiculi; TESTICLES II.A.3
426 Uirtimanz, fur; THIEF II.C.3
414 Uiruizeniz, fornicator; FORNICATOR II.C.3
696 Uischamil, uinea; VINEYARD II.E.8
434 Uisiscolinz, translator; COPYIST, TRANSCRIBER II.C.4
565 Umbleziz, egerda; FIRST PLOWED LAND II.E.3
1000 Uoxniza, cuculus; CUCKOO III.C
977 Urchio, ciconia; STORK III.C
460 Vaccinaz, ebdomada; WEEK II.D.1
9 Vanix, femina; WOMAN I.B
605 Vazitelz, garnescrago; YARN HOOK II.E.5
135 Veriszoil, uenter; WOMB II.A.3
84 Vguwiz, lacrima; TEAR II.A.3
359 Viliscal, uulgus; PEOPLE (commoners) II.C.1
974 Viperiz, warcengel; SHRIKE III.C
1006 Virenz, musca; FLY B: locust III.D
110 Viriscal, barba; BEARD II.A.3
152 Virzeia, tiscera; ENTRAILS II.A.3
388 Virzunz, mulio; MULE DRIVER II.C.2
789 Vischobuz, taxus; YEW III.A
690 Vischoreiz, uinum; WINE II.E.8
999 Vizzia, hirundo; SWALLOW III.C
270 Vmbrizio, tectum; ROOF II.B.2.a
151 Vnguizol, aruina; FAT II.A.3
723 Vralischiz, fenum; HAY II.E.9
437 Vrizeltin, speculator; WATCHMAN II.C.4
16 Vrizoil, uirgo; VIRGIN I.C
917 Vrsciansz, olus; CABBAGE III.B
121 Vrzial, manus; HAND II.A.3
176 Vrzoia, calcaneus; HEEL II.A.3
792 Wagiziaz, salix; SALLOW III.A
130 Warinz, impetigo; WART, or NIPPLE II.A.3
949 Warnaz, ardea; HERON III.C
965 Waschiz, roudil; ROBIN III.C
960 Wilischio, upupa; HOOPOE III.C
92 Wisanza, gene; CHEEK II.A.3
964 Wiuia, paris; TITMOUSE III.C
610 Wizianz, unglossed in both manuscripts II.E.5
511 Zabla, lima; FILE II.E.2
667 Zabus, pressere; PRESS (for grapes) II.E.8
762 Zaimzabuz, cutinboum; QUINCE TREE III.A
28 Zainz, puer; BOY II.A.1
615 Zamiziz, gerund; FOLDS (in clothing) II.E.6
927 Zamza, auena; OATS III.B
714 Zamzia, dunch; BASEMENT II.E.9
568 Zamzia, eigen; LAND (one’s own) II.E.3
768 Zamzila, faugs; BEECH III.A
980 Zamzit, pauo; PEACOCK III.C
633 Zanchur, uezzel; BELT, LEATHER BAND II.E.7
966 Zanczia, laudula; LARK III.C
525 Zanzil, stilus; STAKE II.E.2
670 Zanzimianz, ingebutden; BUCKETS? II.E.8
15 Zanziuer, confessor; CONFESSOR I.C
312 Zarianz, cursere; BOOK OR COURSE OF SERMONS? II.B.2.c
773 Zaschibuz, lentiscus; MASTIC TREE III.A
397 Zaueriz, aurifex; GOLDSMITH II.C.2
666 Zazilliaz, suuella; SCREW (between the pin and the press) II.E.8
494 Zazimoz, corrugia; SHOE LACE, SHOE CLASP II.E.1
266 Zeia, restis; ROPE (for the bell) II.B.2.a
198 Zeuinoz, diaconus; DEACON II.B.1
634 Zichiz, capulum; HILT II.E.7
349 Zichzienz, pretor; MAYOR II.C.1
521 Zichzimir, bibelio; BATTLE-AXE, DOUBLE AXE II.E.2
348 Zienz, comes; COUNT II.C.1
559 Ziginz, uomer; PLOWSHARE II.E.2
533 Ziginz, uomer; PLOWSHARE II.E.2
472 Zigionz, iulius; JULY II.D.2
363 Zilix, socius; COMRADE II.C.1
274 Zilozion, pluteum, gedile; PARAPET II.B.2.a
40 Zimbia, socrus; MOTHER-IN-LAW II.A.1
512 Zimischil, serra; SAW II.E.2
547 Zimiz, disla; POLE (for a wagon) II.E.2
331 Zimza, casula; CHASUBLE II.B.2.d
29 Zimzial, iuuenis; YOUTH II.A.1
358 Zimzitama, exercitus; ARMY II.C.1
657 Zineuel, drauth; LINE (drawn on leather?) II.E.8
333 Zinfrozia, scandalia; SANDAL II.B.2.d
929 Zingia, uersbotdo; ZIZANY, WILD RICE III.B
339 Zinkia, ansa; HANDLE II.B.2.d
200 Zintol, acolitus; ACOLYTE II.B.1
560 Zinz, ligoo; HOE (variation of Zonz, n. 534) II.E.2
731 Zinzia, cinis; ASH II.E.10
262 Zinzrinz, coclea; SPIRAL STAIRCASE II.B.2.a
122 Zirins, digitus; FINGER II.A.3
67 Zirinschol, ceriuell; CRANUM II.A.3
227 Zirinzil, porticus; CHAPEL or PORTICO II.B.2.a
608 Ziriskans, uingerhuth; THIMBLE II.E.5
470 Ziriszinthio, maius; MAY II.D.2
946 Zirunz, nisus; SPARROWHAWK, KESTREL III.C
781 Zirunzibuz, pirus; PEAR TREE III.A
160 Zirzer, anus; ANUS II.A.3
529 Zisch, sulcatorium; COULTER? II.E.2
586 Zischel, spula; SPOOL, BOBBIN II.E.5
911 Zischia, fridielseocha; FORGET-ME-NOT III.B
828 Zischio, plantago; PLANTAIN III.B
493 Zischion, calcar; SPUR II.E.1
466  Ziuariz, ianuarius; JANUARY II.D.2
3  Zuiuenz, sanctus; SAINT I.A
257  Ziuntoriz, scuarium; RELIQUARY II.B.2.a
528  Zizain, patella; PAN II.E.2
798  Zizanz, dumi; BRIAR III.A
111  Zizia, greno; MUSTACHE II.A.3
531  Zizim, circinum; COMPASS II.E.2
289  Zizimina, oleum; OIL II.B.2.b
488  Zizinel, narua; FASTENER or POUCH II.E.1
590  Ziziniz, weuel; WOOF II.E.5
803  Zizria, cinomonium; CINNAMON III.B
327  Zizzion, cingulum; BELT II.B.2.d
534  Zonz, ligo; HOE (variation on Zinz, n. 560) II.E.2
587  Zubeiaz, herleua; THRUM II.E.5
687  Zuchzizer, punthlouc; BUNG HOLE II.E.8
902  Zugezia, dille; DILL III.B
530  Zuinta, plana; PLANE (the tool) II.E.2
541  Zuzia, falcula; PRUNING HOOK II.E.2
815  Zusguel, piper; PEPPER III.B
654  Zuzian, furbuge; HARNESS II.E.7
639  Zuzianz, wafun; WEAPON II.E.7
934  Zuzil, lenis; LENTIL III.B
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 56, 95–96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“private language” argument, 95–96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superprivacy, 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfson, Louis, 10, 114</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>xenoglossia, 38, 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>See also</em> glossolalia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaguello, Marina, 7, 17, 37, 41, 46, 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fous du langage</em>, 17</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
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<td></td>
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