LINGUISTICS

MORE ON THE HISTORY OF *SHIT* AND *SHUT*

Laura Wright

University of Cambridge

1. Introduction

This paper presents some data which supports Lass (1980) and Platzer (1996) in their contention that taboo cannot be the reason for the resolution of the supposed homophonic clash between the reflexes of OE *scītan* 'to shit' and OE *scyttan* 'to shut'.

The topic was discussed by Samuels (1972: 142ff), refuted by Lass (1980: 75ff), and taken up again by McMahon (1994: 333). Platzer (1996: 76) demonstrates that the merger between the Middle English and Early Modern English reflexes of OE *scītan* and *scyttan* (both spelled <shit> and, it has been assumed, pronounced [ʃɪt]) "was firmly established for 250 years, without it causing any embarrassment." He shows, with data taken from the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts, the Oxford English Dictionary, the Middle English Dictionary and the English Poetry Full-text Database, that SHUT was spelled with an <i> graph in texts dating from the 1360s to the early 1600s, and that it occurred variably with other spellings (not given in his appendix). He concludes that homophony of <shit> SHIT and <shit> SHUT cannot have caused speakers to unscramble the merger about 250 years later.

1.1. Objections to taboo as an explanation for demerging[1]

a. According to traditional Middle English dialectology, the Northern and East Midlands reflex of OE /y/ was spelled <i>, the South Western and South West Midlands spelling was <u> and the South Eastern spelling was <e> (Lass 1992: 54). Thus we could expect the North, East Midlands variant of SHUT, <i>, to

---

[1] See Lass (1980: 76-79) and McMahon (1994: 333) for further objections.

have an underlying /i/. But, as Platzer (1996: 70) points out, this would still not be homophonous with the Middle English reflex of OE *scītan* SHIT, as that would have a long vowel, /ʃiːt/, as opposed to the Middle English reflex of OE *scyttan* [ʃit].[2]

b. How would speakers have known to add backing to the by-then-unbacked reflex of OE *scyttan* ([ʃit] > [ʃut] > [ʃʌt]), unless they had a memory of about 250 years?[3] In other words, why does SHUT have a back vowel, rather than, say, a mid front vowel? If taboo were the only motive for 'inventing' a new pronunciation it seems fortuitous, at least, that an older pronunciation should be chosen. It could be argued that [ʃut] was borrowed from nearby South Western dialects, but then why not borrow [ʃait] for SHIT and leave SHUT as it was?[4]

c. How can we tell how taboo a word had become at any point in time? Platzer (1996: 76) argues that as SHUT had been spelled <shit> for a couple of centuries in the most prestigious written texts (such as two translations of the Bible, Chaucer), <shit> had become, by the Early Modern period, a codified spelling for SHUT.

I agree with Lass and Platzer's view that taboo is not a sufficiently powerful motive for ceasing to write <shit> and starting to write <shut>. I give here some data from a London archive 1479-1535, in order to demonstrate that the switchover between <i> and <u> was in fact rather more complicated, and the spoken reality behind the <i> and <u> spellings may always have been more varied than the interpretation of those graphs would lead us to believe. I conclude that one possible interpretation is that SHIT/SHUT never merged in spoken London English.

2. The data: vowel-graphs in SHUT 1479-1535

London Bridge was an inhabited bridge during the relevant period, and halfway along it was a chapel, dedicated to St Thomas the Martyr. Maintainance of the bridge and the buildings upon it was (and still is) under the care of the Bridge House Estate, which employed a large workforce. The accounts of this workforce survive, and one of the tasks of one of the chapel clerics was to open

and shut the doors of the chapel, for which he was paid, and payment duly noted in the accounts. Thus each year, from 1479 until 1535, there is an entry 'for the opening and shutting of the chapel doors'. Prior to this date the entry is in Medieval Latin; after this date the entry becomes less specific. See Section 4 for the relevant extracts, and Table 1 for the vowel-graphs in SHUT:

Table 1: The vowel-graphs in SHUT 1479-1535
in the Bridge House Accounts

Year	i	y	u	e	o
				Vowel-graph	
1479	i				
1480	i				
1481	i				
1482	i				
1483	i				
1484	i				
1485	i				
1486			u		
1487	i				
1488	i				
1489	i				
1490	i				
1491	i				
1492	i				
1493	i				
1494				e	
1495	i				
1496	i				
1497	i				
1498	i				
1499	i				
1500	i				
1501					o
1502					o
1503					o
1504					o
1505					o
1506				e	
1507					o
1508				e	
1509				e	

---

[2] That SHIT did have a long vowel in some dialects, at least, is confirmed by those Scottish and Northern dialects that pronounce SHIT as [ʃait] in P-DE, showing that *scītan* underwent the Great Vowel Shift. That SHIT was pronounced [ʃit] in the South is evidenced by P-DE [ʃit]. The usual explanation for the transition /ʃiːt/ > [ʃit] in the South is derivation from other parts of the paradigm, especially the past participle, or the noun (see Platzer 1996: 73 fn. 7).

[3] See Lass (1980: 79).

[4] It would be possible to adduce other parts of the paradigm here, and then invoke analogy (ie. backing and rounding was 'borrowed' from the past participle). But it would still be a *post hoc* argument.

Year	i	y	e
1510			e
1511			e
1512			e
1513			e, e
1514			e
1515			e
1516	i		
1517	i		
1518			e
1519	i		
1520			e
1521			e, e
1522			e
1523			e
1524			e
1525	i		
1526		y	
1527			e
1528	i		
1529		y	
1530			e
1531	i		
1532	i		
1533	i		
1534	i		
1535		y	

Five vowel-graphs are used to represent the vowel in SHUT over a period of fifty-six years.

3. Interpretations of the spellings

The scribes of the accounts were paid each year, and their names recorded, e.g.:

> And to William Bouchier of Rewarde to hym allowid for his attendaunce in his seide office and for writyng and dowblyng of the bookes of this acounte wherof on booke remayneth within the Bridgehous and a nother booke of the same remayneth in the Chambre of the yelde halle. as it hath be alowid in acountes passid lxvjs viijd[5]

The following clerks were paid[6] for writing and copying out the accounts for the following periods:

William Bouchier   1479-1481
John Pees   1482-1487
John Normavyle   1488-1501
Walter Smyth   1502-1521
John Halmer   1522-1535

Under the tenure of William Boucher, only <i> was used in three tokens of SHUT; under the tenure of John Pees, <i> was used in 5 tokens and <u> in 1; John Normavyle used <i> (12), <o> (1); Walter Smyth used <o> (5), <e> (14), <i> (3); and John Halmer used <e> (5), <i> (6), <y> (3).

Platzer (1996: 72) accepts that the many <i> spellings for both SHIT and SHUT must indicate a spoken merger: "homophony must be accepted as a matter of course from c. 1500 onwards". The problem with this view is that there are only five vowel graphs: <i>, <y>, <e>, <o>, <u> for a possible multiplicity of realisations, and it is generally believed that <i, y> held the same value by this date. Hence, for example, [ʊ] and [u] couldn't be visually distinguished, nor [e] and [ɛ], nor [i] and [ɪ], nor [ə]. Yet in London 1300-1600 it is possible that there was some movement from generation to generation of the high and mid short vowels. The underlying phonetic reality of a short stressed vowel spelled, say, with an <e> in London in 1400, 1500 and 1600 was not necessarily static, although we tend to interpret it as though it was.

The point I'm driving at is that a temporary graphic merger, that had two separate Old English inputs, and that has two separate Present-Day English outputs, doesn't have to indicate a temporary phonemic merger for all speakers. It is possible that there was always a distinction between SHIT and SHUT, and that this was not maintained in writing, anymore than <lead> visually indicates a distinction between [liːd] and [led] today, or <th> between [θ] and [ð]. As the Bridge House Accounts show <i>, <y>, <o>, <u> and <e> for the vowel in SHUT 1479-1535, we can conclude that either the clerks all came from different parts of the country;[7] the vowel in question changed position several times, ranging from front–back, high–mid; or that the vowel in question

---

[5] Guildhall, Corporation of London Record Office, MS Bridge House Accounts Volume 3, fo 320v 1479x80. The 'x' notation means that the documents are dated internally.

[6] This does not mean that these individuals *certainly* wrote the relevant years' accounts, as they could have delegated, but over the 56 years of SHUT appearing in the accounts, five clerks were at least *responsible* for five spellings between them.

[7] The traditional dialectal view would probably be something like the entries 1479-1500 were written by a clerk from the North or East Midlands, that perhaps a Western clerk did a stint 1501-1507, a South Eastern clerk took over from 1508 until about 1524, and then a clerk who had been raised, say, in the North, but who had moved to the South East had a go. I have discussed elsewhere (Wright 1996a: 112) why I do not find this to be a satisfactory explanation. The argument is circular: because there is a <u> spelling, *therefore* the clerk is from the West; rather than an acceptance that the progression over real time from <i>

did not have a single settled graphic representation (for example, [ʊ, ɛ, ə]) and any one of <i>, <y>, <o>, <u> or <e> would do the job equally well. It should be noted that SHUT is not the only OE /y/-derived word to make it into RP as [ʌ], so we know that OE /y/ did not necessarily unround in the South. If it is felt necessary to 'explain' the [ʌ] in SHUT, then surely it is also necessary to 'explain' the [ʌ] in all the other OE /y/-derived words too.[8]

Present-Day RP has three reflexes of OE /y/: /ɪ/ (busy), /e/ (shed), /ʌ/ (cudgel). I suggest that some speakers in Early Modern London used the /ɪ/ vowel in SHUT, some the /e/ vowel, and some the /ʊ/ vowel. As time went on, the three vowels became lexically marked in OE /y/-derived words, and so nowadays they are not in free variation. This scenario posits a merger of SHUT and SHIT for some speakers in London, but not all. It accounts for the etymologically 'correct' P-DE /ʌ/ in SHUT. If a scenario of variation is accepted, then it is no longer necessary to explain the vowels in SHIT and SHUT, anymore than in any other OE /y/-derived words. They can all be expected to show variation between the graphs which represent /ɪ/ (<i, y>), /e/ (<e>) and /ʊ/ (<u, o>) in the Early Modern period, and to have one established spelling post-standardisation.[9]

4. Extracts from Guildhall, Corporation of London Records Office MS Bridge House Accounts volumes 3-6, 1479-1535

3, fo 318, 1479x80
And to the same Robert Tye for Reward to hym allowid for kepyng of the Organs and attendaunce in Openyng and shittyng the Chapell dores and kepyng the Jewelles and ornamentes of the same Chapell this yere xxs.

3, fo 334v, 1480x1481
To the same Robert Tye in Rewardᵉ to hym allowed for kepyng of the Organs

---

and <u> to <o> and <e> and back to <i> and on to <y> in the same manuscript is evidence of how several professional Londoners wrote the reflex of OE /y/, regardless of their ancestral origins. It is only possible to accept the traditional dialectal view as an explanation, if one accepts that all clerks spell the reflexes of given Old English vowels the same way in the same place. Further, notice how this interpretation means that variation will *necessarily* lead one to conclude that the clerks were raised in other parts of the country, as all variation will be in need of 'explanation'.

[8] For example, why isn't P-DE *rush*, [rʃʃ]? RUSH v. 'to hurry' (< A-N /y/) and RUSH n. 'sedge' (< OE /y/) (see Lass (1980: 76-77) merged, even though there was plenty of opportunity (and a functionalist reason) for them to separate, as there are at least three spellings attested: RUSH n. is spelled with an <i> graph in 1419, 1420, 1421, 1463; with a <y> graph in 1420x21, and with a <u> graph in 1444 and 1472 in Corporation of London documents (see Wright 1996: 130, 149). So the "normal" development could have given *rish* n. and (according to functionalist argument) *rush* v. Arguing along the lines of what 'should' have happened in such cases will always be *ad hoc*.

[9] A version of this paper was presented at the Language and Style in Early Modern England Symposium, May 1997, University of Cambridge. I am most grateful to Roger Lass for clarifying and expounding this point.

and attendance in openyng and Shittyng the Chapell dores/ and kepyng the Jewelles & ornamentes of the same Chapell this yere xxs.

3, fo 353, 1481x82
To the same Robert Tye in Reward to hym allowed for kepyng of Organs & for his attendaunce in openyng & shittyng the Chapell dores & kepyng the Jewels and ornamêtᵉ of the same chapell this yere xxs.

3, fo 372v, 1482x83
Itm̃ to Roƀt Tye in Rewarde to him allowed for kepinge of the Organs & for his gode attendaunce in openynge and shitting the Chapell dores & keping of the Juellᵉ and ornamentes of the Chapelle this yere xxs.

3, fo 392v, 1483x84
To the same Robert Tye in re/ward [sic] of hym allowed for kepyng of the Organs and for his diligent attendauncs in opeynyng and shittyng of the Chapell Dores and kepyng the Juelx and ornamentᵉ of the said Chapell this yere xxs.

4, fo 14v, 1484x85
Itm̃ paide vnto the said Robert Tye of Reward to hŷm allowed for kepyng of the Organs and for his dilygent attendaunce in openyng and shittyng the Chapell dorres and kepyng the dorres and Ornamentᵉ [sic] of the said Chapell wᵗin the tyme of this Accompt xxs.

4, fo 34, 1485x86
Itm̃ paid vnto the seid Roƀt Tye of Reward to hym allowed for kepyng of the Organs and for his diligent attendaunce in openyng and shittyng the Chapell dores and kepynge the godes and ornamentᵉ of the Chapell wᵗynne the tyme of this accompt xxs

4, fo 54, 1486x87
Itm̃ paide vnto the seid Robert Tye of reward to hym allowed for kepyng of the organs and for his diligent attend^unce in openyng and shuttyng the Chapell doris and kepyng the godᵉ and ornamentᵉ of the seid Chapell wᵗynne the tyme of this Accompte xxs.

4, fo 75v, 1487x88
Itm̃ to the said Robert Tye of Reward to him Allowed for keping of the Org^unce And for his Diligent Attend^unce in openyng and shitting of the Chapell dores And keping the Jewelles and Ornamentes of the same Chapell this yere xxs

4, fo 94, 1488x89

To the same Robert ligh [sic] of Reward to him Allowed/ for openyng & shittyng of the chapell dores/ keping of the Orgaunce/ the Jewellis & ornamentis of the same Chapell this yere/ xxs/.

4, fo 105v, 1489x90

to the same Robert ligh of Reward to him allowed for openyng and shittyng of the Chapell dores. kepyng of the orgauns and of the Jewellis and ornamentis of the same Chapell xxs/

4, fo 117v, 1490x91

To the same Robert Rodmeridge of rewarde to him allowed for openyng and shitting of the chapell dores attending vpôn the orgauns and keping the Jewellis & ornamentis of the same chapell xxs/

4, fo 129, 1491x2

to the same Robert Rodmeridge of Reward to him Allowed for openyng and shitting of the chapell dores/ attending vpon the orgaunce/ and keping of the Jewell*e* and ornamentis of the same chapell this yere xxs/.

4, fo 139v, 1492x3

to Robert Rodmeridge ooñ of the said iiij. clerk*e* of Reward to him allowed for openyng and shittyng of the chapell dorys And kepyng of the Jewellis and ornament*e* of the same chapell xxs/

4, fo 148v, 1493x4

to Robert Rodmeridge ooñ of the said iiij. clerkis of reward to him allowid for openyng and shittyng of the chapell dores/ kepyng of the Jewellis and ornamentis of the same chapell xxs.

4, fo 159v, 1494x5

To Robert Rodmeridge ooñ of the said iiij clerk*e* of reward to hyṁ allowed. for keping of the Jewell*e* & ornament*e* openyng & shettyng of the said chapel dores. xxs

4, fo 171, 1495x6

To Robert Rodmeridge oōn of the said iiij Clerkis of Rewarde by cause there is cômitted vnto him the keping of the Jewellis And ornament*e*/ and also the openyng and shitting of the chapell dores xxs

4, fo 178v, 1496x7

to Roƀt Rodmeridge oon of the same clerkis in rewarde/ by cause there is cômitted vnto hym the keping of the Jewellis & ornament*e*. openyng & shitting of the same chapell doores this yere xxs

4, fo 189, 1497x8

To Robert Rudmarige ooñ of the same iiij clerk*e* of rewarde/ by cause there is cômitted vnto hym/ the openyng and shitting of the same Chapeʃl dores/ keping the orgaunce the Juelx and ornamentis there this yere xxs.

4, fo 198, 1498x99

To Robert Rodmeridge oôn of the same iiij. Clerkis of Rewarde/ by cause there is cômytted vnto hym/ the openyng & shittyng of of [sic] the same Chapell dores/ kepyng of thorgaunce the Jewellis & ornament*e* there this yere. Smᵃʳ xxs./

4, fo 205v, 1499x1500

To Robert Rodmeridge oôn of the same iiij Clerkis of Reward to hym allowid by cause there is committid vnto hym the openyng And shittyng of the same Chapell dore. Playng at the orgaunce and kepyng of the Jewellis and ornamentis the this yere [sic] Smᵃʳ xxs

4, fo 214v, 1500x01

to Roberd Rodmeridge oôn of the same. iiij clerk*e* of reward to him allowed. for openyng & shitting of the chapell dores. Playng at the orgaunce. keping of the iewellis & ornament*e* there. xx.s./

4, fo 225v, 1501x2

To Robert Rudmarige oôn of the same iiij clerkis of Reward bycause there is cômytted vnto hym the openyng and shottyng of the dores of the said Chapell kepyng the Organs Juelx and ornament*e* there this yere .xxs.

4, fo 234, 1502x3

to Robert Rudmaridge ooñ of the same iiij clerkis of rewarde by cause there is cômitted vnto hym the openyng and shotting of the dores of the said chapell keping the Organs Juelx and ornamentis there/ this yere xxs.

4, fo 246, 1503x4

to Robert Rudmarige oôn of the same iiij clerkis of rewarde by cause there is cômytted vnto hym the openyng and shotting of the dores of the said Chapell keping the Organs Juelx and ornamentis there/ this yere xxs.

4, fo 259v, 1504x5

to Robert Rudmarige oôn of the same iiij Clerk*e* of rewarde by cause there is cômytted vnto hym the openyng and shotting of the dores of the same Chapell keping the Organs Juell*e* and ornament*e* there this yere xxs

4, fo 272, 1505x6
to Roƀt Rudmarige ooñ of the same iiij clerkys of rewarde by cause there is cômytted vnto hym the openyng and shotting of the dores of the same Chapell keping the organs Juelx and ornament℮ there/ this yere xxs

4, fo 283v, 1506x7
To Robert Rudmarige of rewarde to hym allowed for openyng and shetting of the Chapell dores/ attending vpõn the organs/ and keping of the Juellis and ornamentis of the same Chapell this yere xxs

4, fo 298v, 1507x8
To Roƀt Rudmarige oôn of the same iiij Clerk℮ of rewarde to hym allowed for openyng and shottyng of the dores of the sayd Chapell/ attending vpõn the Organs/ and keping of the Juellis and ornament℮ of the same Chapell this yere xxs.

4, fo 313v, 1508x9
To Robert Rudmarige oôn of the same iiij Clerkys of Rewarde to hym allowed for openyng and shettyng of the dores of the sayd Chapeɫɫ/ attendyng vpõn thorgans and kepyng of the Juellis and ornamentis of the same Chapeɫɫ this yere xxs

5, fo 12, 1509x1510
To Robert Rudmarige oon of the same iiij Clerkys of Rewarde to hym allowed for openyng and shetting of the dores of the sayd Chapell/ attending vpon thorgans and kepyng of the Juellis and ornament℮ of the same Chapell thus yere xxs (sic)

5, fo 30, 1510x11
To Robert Rudmarige oon of the same iiij clerkes of Rewarde to hym allowed/ for openyng and shettyng of the dores of the sayd chapell/ attendyng vpoñ thorgans and kepyng of the Juelx and ornamentis of the same Chapell thus yere xxs

5, fo 47v, 1511x12
To Joħn fferrys ooñ of the sayd iij clerkys of Rewarde to hym allowed for openyng and shettyng of the dores of the sayd chapell/ attending vpõn thorgans̃ and kepyng of the Juelx and ornamentis of the same chapell thys yere xxs

5, fo 67, 1512x13
To Joħn fferrys oõn of the same thre Clerk℮ of Rewarde to hym allowed/ for openyng and shettyng of the dores of the sayd Chapeɫɫ/ attending vpõn thorgans/ and kepyng of the Juelx and Ornament℮ of the same Chapeɫɫ this yere xxs

5, fo 86, 1513x14
To hym [John fferrys] for a Rewarde for openyng and shettyng of the dores of the sayd Chapeɫɫ attendyng vpõn thorgans/ and kepyng of the Juelx and ornament℮ of the same chapeɫɫ by the sayd fyrst half yere xs
fo 86 To the sayd Raynolde Blake of Rewarde for openeng and shettyng of the dores of the sayd [fo 86v] Chapeɫɫ/ attendyng vpõn thorgans kepyng of the sayd Juelx and ornament℮ of the same Chapell/ and fyndeng of alle maner of syngeng brede/ wyne/ wax/ lampe ligħte/ and wasshyng of the sayd chapeɫɫ stuf from the sayd fest of the Annûciacõn of oʳ lady. vnto the sayd fest of seint Migheɫɫ by the sayd half yere xs

5, fo 103v, 1514x1515
To the sayd Raynold Blake for openyng and shettyng of the dores of the sayd chapeɫɫ attendyng vpoñ thorgans kepyng of the Juelx and ornamentys of the sayd Chapell/ And for fyndeng of singeng brede/ [fo 104] wyne wax lampe ligħt wyth wasshyng of the sayd Chapeɫɫ stuf by alle the sayd yere Smᵃʳ xxs

5, fo 126, 1515x16
To the said Reynold Blake for opennyng and shetting of the dores of the said Chapeɫɫ/ attending vpoñ the organs keping of the Juell℮ and ornament℮ of the said Chapeɫɫ/ and for fynding of singyng brede wyne/ waxe lampeligħt wᵗ wasshing of al the said Chapeɫɫ stuf by aɫɫ the said yere xxs

5, fo 146v, 1516x17
To the said Raynold Blake for Openyng and shitting of the Dores of the said Chapell attending vppon thorgans keping of the Iuell℮ and ornament℮ of the said Chapell by all the tyme of this Accõm̃pt xxs

5, fo 164, 1517x18
To the said Raynold Blake for openyng and shitting of the Dores of the said Chapell attending vpon the Organs keping of the Juellis and ornament℮ of the said Chapell by all the tyme of this Accõmpte xxs

5, fo 187v, 1518x19
To the said Raynolde blake for openyng and shetting of the Dores of the said Chapell Attending vppon thorgans kepīg of the Juellis and ornament℮ of the said Chapell by all the tyme of this Accõmpte xxvjs viijd

5, fo 206, 1519x20
To the said Raynold blake for openyng and shitting of the dores of the said Chapell attendyng vppon the Orgaynes keping of the Juellis and Ornamentys of the said Chapell by all the tyme of this Accõm̃pte xxvjs viijd

5, fo 228, 1520x21
To the saide Raynolde Blake for openyng and shetting of the dores of the sayde Chapell attending vpon the organis keping of the Juellis and ornament*e* of the saide Chapell by all the tyme of this accompte Sm*ᵃ* xxvjs viijd

5, fo 252v, 1521x22
To the seide Raynolde Blake for openyng and shetting of the Dores of the seide Chapell attending vpon thorganis keping of the Juell*e* and ornament*e* of the seide Chapell ffrom Mighelm*ᵃ*s vnto Candelm*ᵃ*s w*t*in this accompte Sm*ᵃ* vjs viijd To the seide John Heywarde of rewarde for openyng and shetting of the seide Dores and keping of the Juell*e* and ornament*e* of the seide Chapell from the seide Candelm*ᵃ*s vnto Mighelm*ᵃ*s nexte ensueng Sm*ᵃ* iijs iiijd

5, fo 271, 1522x23
To the seide Raynolde Blake for openyng and shetting of the Dores of the seide Chapell attendīg vpon thorganys keping of the Juell*e* & ornamēt*e* of the seide chapell by all this yere xxs

5, fo 294, 1523x24
To the seide Raynolde Blake for openyng and shetting of the Dores of the seide Chapell attending upōn thorganys keping of the Juell*e* and ornament*e* of the seide Chapell by all this yere xxs

5, fo 315, 1524x25
To the seide Raynolde Blake for openyng and shetting of the Dores of the seide Chapell attending upon thorganys keping of the Juell*e* and ornament*e* of the seide Chapell by all this yere xxs

6, fo 16v, 1525x26
To the said Raynold Blake for opennyng and shittyng of the doores of the said Chape*ll* Attendyng vpon the organs kepyng of the Juell*e* and ornament*e* of the said Chape*ll* by a*ll* this yere xxs

6, fo 37, 1526x27
To the said Raynold Blake for opennyng and shyttyng of the doores of the said Chape*ll* attendyng vpon the organs kepyng of the Jewellys and ornamentys of the said Chapell by all thys yere xxs

6, fo 55v, 1527x28
To the said Raynold Blake for opennyng and shettyng of the doores of the said Chappe*ll* attendyng vpon the organs kepyng of the Juell*e* & ornamēt*e* of the said Chappell by all thys yere xxs ·

6, fo 74, 1528x29
To the forsaid John fferrys for opennyng and shittyng of the dores of the Chape*ll* attendyng vpon the organs kepyng of the Juell*e* & ornament*e* of the said chape*ll* by a*ll* this yere xxs

6, fo 95v, 1529x30
To the forsaid John fferrys for openliyng and shyttyng the dores of the said Chape*ll* attendyng vpon the organs keping of the Juell*e* and ornament*e* of the said Chappe*ll* by a*ll* thys yere Sm*ᵃ* xxs

6, fo 115, 1530x31
To the forsaid John fferrys for opennyng and shettyng of the doores of the said Chape*ll* attendyng vpon the organs keping of the Juell*e* and ornament*e* of the same Chapell by a*ll* thys yere xxs

6, fo 136, 1531x32
To the forsaid John fferrys for opennyng and shittyng the dores of the said chape*ll* attendyng vpon the organs keping of the Jewell*e* & ornamēt*e* of the said Chape*ll* by all this yere xxs

6, fo 155, 1532x33
To the forsaid John fferrys for opennyng and shittyng the dores of the said Chape*ll* attendyng vpon the organs keping of the Juell*e* and ornament*e* of the said Chape*ll* by all thys yere Sm*ᵃ* xxs ex*ᵃ* cū Jo*r*nali (*nb* probably *examinatur cum jornali* 'examined with the journal')

6, fo 176v, 1533x34
To the forsaid John fferrys for opennyng and shittyng the dores of the said Chapell/ attendyng vpon the organs keping of the Jewell*e* and ornament*e* of the said chape*ll* by all thys yere xxs

6, fo 197, 1534x35
To the forsayd Johñ fferrys for opennyng and shittyng the doores of the said Chape*ll* attendyng vpoñ the orgens keping of the Juell*e* & ornamentys/ of the said Chape*ll* by all this yere Sm*ᵃ* xxs

6, fo 215, 1535x36
To the saide John ferrys for openynge/ and shyttynge the dores of the saide Chapell/ attendyng vpon the orgayns/ kepynge of the Jewelles/ and ornamentes/ of the saide Chapell by all this yere xxs

6, fo 230v, 1536x37
This year the entry is forgotten, and then squashed in at the end in abbreviated form (thereafter the word SHUT no longer appears):

To John fferres for kepyng of the said Chapel & y^e good$e$ & ornam$êt_e$ w^{t}in
y^e same by y^e space of one hole yere w^{t}ī y^e time of this $p$sent accôpt/ xxs

REFERENCES

Manuscript references:

Guildhall, Corporation of London Record Office MS Bridge House Accounts volume 3 (1460-84);
    volume 4 (1484-1509); volume 5 (1509-1525); volume 6 (1525-1541)

Other works:

    1994   *English poetry full-text database*. Vol. 600-1600. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey.

    n.d.   *Helsinki corpus of English texts*. Helsinki: Department of English, University of
        Helsinki.

Blake, Norman (ed.)
    1992   *The Cambridge history of the English Language*. Cambridge: CUP.

Kurath, Hans − Sherman M. Kuhn − et al. (eds.)
    1954   *Middle English dictionary*. Ann Arbor, Mi.: University of Michigan Press.

Lass, Roger
    1980   *On explaining language change*. Cambridge: CUP.

    1992   "Phonology and morphology", in: Norman Blake (ed.), 23-155.

McMahon, April M. S.
    1994   *Understanding language change*. CUP.

Murray, James et al. (eds.)
    1989   *Oxford English dictionary*. (2nd edition.) Oxford: OUP.

Platzer, Hans
    1996   "The temporary merger of OE *scitan* and *scyttan*, or: A case of harmless homo-
        phony", *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 30: 69-82.

Samuels, Michael Louis
    1972   *Linguistic evolution with special reference to English*. Cambridge: CUP.

Tyler, Elizabeth M. − M. Jane Toswell (eds.)
    1996   *Studies in English language and literature: 'Doubt Wisely' Papers in honour of E.
        G. Stanley*. London: Routledge.

Wright, Laura Charlotte
    1996a   "About the evolution of Standard English", in: Elizabeth M.Tyler − M. Jane Toswell
        (eds.), 99-115.

    1996b   *Sources of London English: Medieval Thames vocabulary*. Clarendon: OUP.