Introduction

The Aims of This Volume

This volume, the second of the set, contains passages of British Latin writing from the time of the Norman Conquest in 1066 to approximately 1500, a period when Latin was used more widely and when it developed in a more or less distinct manner, depending on the type of text involved.[1] The aim, as in the first volume, is to provide a broad sample of literary (mainly prose but some verse) and documentary texts. These will include excerpts from some of the most famous historical documents, such as the Domesday Book and Magna Carta, from administrative and legal documents underpinning the society of the time, from eyewitness accounts of people and events, and from a variety of literary genres, many of them inherited from Roman and Christian antiquity. The passages are selected to demonstrate the range of social contexts, genres and registers, for the overall aim is to provide an overview of the characteristics of British medieval Latin and a degree of chronological perspective. The passages are presented against the backdrop of the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (*DMLBS*), whose completion in 2013 opened the door to a more comprehensive and comparative study of the complete lexis of British medieval Latin (BML) than has hitherto been feasible. This connection means that the principal focus in the linguistic analyses of the texts will be on the vocabulary. However, beside the lexis, the syntax and morphology of the Latin can also be studied across the various authors and registers; in many of the passages included here, the reader will be able to appreciate fine sentence structures with sounds and rhythms created out of the words, constructions and clauses the author has selected.

Each year sees the production of new editions of medieval Latin texts, supplemented by handbooks and edited collections of individual essays on particular themes in this area of scholarship. Few of these engage with the nature of the language, apart from some recent editions of Latin texts, e.g. in the Oxford Medieval Texts or *Corpus Christianorum* series, which might include a short section on the style and language of the author. However, scholars such as Jacques Fontaine, Pascale Bourgain and Peter Stotz have realised the need to overturn longstanding departmental barriers, and for historians and philologists to collaborate in engaging with the Latin of medieval texts.[2] There is now the opportunity to do so

---

1 For a caveat about the use of the complex and somewhat fluid terms *Britannia* and *Anglia*, see the Preface to Volume I.

2 *Fontaine (1970); *Bourgain (2005); *Stotz (1996–2004), with a section on England at 1.680–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in the context of British Latin, taken as referring predominantly to the Latin written in England, Wales and Scotland; the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from Celtic Sources*, being compiled in Dublin, deals mainly with the Latin written in Ireland. The study of BML should prove extremely interesting as part of the history of the Latin language across millennia, and also for the history of Anglo-Norman (the term usually applied to the Norman French dialect in England) and of English, from the first charters after the Conquest, but especially from the Domesday Book of 1086, which contains many new Latin words drawing on French and English.

Close engagement with first-hand evidence from the period allows the reader to perceive rather than preconceive. Many have been daunted by the plethora of Latin sources surviving in post-Conquest Britain and by a belief that the Latin of this period is sub-standard (judged from the viewpoint of the Latin of an earlier age), or unpalatable (as the language of power, used predominantly by a male elite).[3] However, modern bibliographical information makes it much easier to find one's way around the sources, and the sources themselves, in their variety, reveal Latin of many kinds, each suited to its context. There are examples of texts aimed at a wider audience, such as the Magna Carta, historical writings and sermons; there are also the slightly formulaic texts concerned with administration and the law, and there are writings dealing rather with technical or scientific subjects.[4]

And then there are those in which the author has greater freedom of expression and in which questions of personal style, level of education and purpose in writing come into play. An underlying aim in these volumes has been to highlight the more personal texts, and those relating to specific people and places. Although the texts may mostly be the work of male writers, of a small minority within the population as a whole, in many of the passages it is possible to glimpse details of the lives of thousands of men, women and children, often named individuals who were not members of the elite: the world of BML is more open and diverse than it is given credit for. The texts fascinate, too, because of the frequent mention of place names that tie the people and events to specific locations, in town or countryside, from castles to villages, churches and particular features of

3 Condemnation through condescension is not limited to medieval Latin; for equivalent comments applied to regional Koine Greek, cf. T. V. Evans (2020) 'Not overstrong in his Greek: modern interpretation of "Egyptian" Greek texts in the Zenon archive' in *Papers in ancient Greek linguistics*, ed. M. Leiwo, M. Vierros and S. Dahlgren, Helsinki.

4 A few passages from such writings have been included in this volume, but the decision has been taken to leave to others the linguistic investigation of works whose subject matter is so specialised that it requires a dense commentary even in English translation, or works in which neither the Latin nor the content is distinguished as peculiarly British. These would include many of the philosophical and theological works written in Britain: readers interested in the works of such writers as Duns Scotus, Ockham and Wyclif, or less well-known ones, are advised to consult the *DMLBS* bibliography or the list of authors in *Sharpe (1997), both of which also include Latin works that are as yet unedited.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the landscape, most of which can be located and explored today. The topographical information can itself be helpful in analysing the language in which it occurs and thereby providing clues as to the inhabitants of a specific place at a particular time.[5]

The Linguistic Background to British Medieval Latin after the Conquest

The Norman Conquest changed the course of British society in many ways as William the Conqueror introduced powerful elements of Norman French culture into a society that had already combined British Celtic, Anglo-Saxon and Norse (Viking) elements.[6] Since the beginning of the seventh century British society had predominantly used Latin (initially the language of the Roman settlers until the Romans departed in the fifth century and then the language of the Roman Church) and the language of the Anglo-Saxons (English) for writing.

Soon after the Conquest comes one of the surprising developments that will be noted during this period. The Normans do not impose their French dialect (which would also have contained elements of other dialects, as well as a few terms from Norse, brought into Normandy by the Vikings when they settled there in the tenth century) on the whole of British society, but it does remain the first language of royalty and aristocracy for about two centuries[7] and is likely to have filtered down into parts of the existing population of Britain as the result of intermarriage.[8] Anglo-Norman is also less common than Latin in written form until the second half of the thirteenth century, when it gradually became instead a non-mother tongue and predominantly a written language in a limited range of (mainly legal, governmental and educational) contexts, while maintaining a

5 See M. Gelling (1997) *Signposts to the past: place-names and the history of England*, 3rd ed., Chichester.

6 See *Garnett (2007) for questions of change and continuity in government. Garnett does not discuss the linguistic situation, apart from a reference to the fact that Orderic Vitalis records that King William did attempt to learn English (*HE* 2.256) *ut sine interprete querelam subiectae gentis posset intelligere* ('so that he could understand the complaints of the subject people without an interpreter').

7 Even at the end of the twelfth century the French-born Bishop Hugh of Lincoln (1186–1200) needed an interpreter to understand an English *mulier rusticana* (Adam of Eynsham, *Life of St Hugh* 5.8), possibly because of her dialect; at the same period the Chancellor of England, William de Longchamp, was said to be utterly ignorant of English (see Section II.20).

8 Both the historians William of Malmesbury (*GR* Book 3, pref.) and Orderic Vitalis, for example, had one Norman and one English parent. William believed this gave him a balanced point of view (*temperamentum dicendi*), allowing him to praise William the Conqueror's achievements without suppressing his errors.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lower academic status than Latin.[9] Meanwhile, English remained the mother tongue among the majority in Britain, alongside Celtic languages such as Welsh (often referred to as *lingua Britannica*, e.g. in Gerald of Wales (*IK* 1.2) with reference to the Welsh word 'aber') in certain regions. These vernaculars do continue as literary languages, but English becomes less prominent as a written language than it had been in the Anglo-Saxon period, until the flowering of English literature in the mid-fourteenth century with the writings of Gower, Chaucer etc. and the gradual increase in the use of English in official documents. It is Latin that becomes the primary written, administrative language soon after the Conquest, while continuing as the language of the Church. In short, from around 1100, Latin, English and French developed over the following centuries not so much side by side as in a complex choreography of linguistic contact, intertwining in close intimacy, as first Latin, then French and finally English assumed the dominant cultural and linguistic role. By the third quarter of the fourteenth century, the author of the *Speculum vitae* could defend his use of English by claiming that only the educated knew Latin, apart from those who might know just a bit, while those who had lived at court might know French, but not Latin: English, however (so he claimed), was understood by all.[10]

The closeness of this contact is clear from the great extent of the borrowings between these languages, as will be explored below.[11] Such borrowings support the suggestion that Latin was a very active language that needed to extend its lexis to deal with changes in society. Certain features link the Latin of Britain to the Latin of the Continent, while others distinguish it. It definitely bears similarities to the Latin of countries where it was learned as a non-mother tongue, as was the case in Germanic regions. However, the fact that after 1066, the French dialect of Anglo-Norman was a key element in the linguistic mix of Britain suggests that BML was in some ways similar to the Latin of countries where the underlying vernacular was a Romance language. One should bear in mind that the Continental regions bordering the English Channel and North Sea were multilingual from an early stage, with strong Germanic influence on the developing Romance language.

The complexity of the linguistic situation in multilingual Britain and the amount of documentary evidence make this an attractive and intriguing period

9 On questions relating to Anglo-Norman, see *Ingham (2010) and (2012).

10 *Speculum vitae* (2008) ed. R. Hanna, EETS, Oxford, lines 61–78. Cf. Alfred the Great, who, in his preface to the OE translation of Gregory the Great's *Pastoral Rule*, speaks of English as 'the language we can all understand'.

11 For borrowings into English and the relation between English and Latin, see P. Durkin and S. Schad, 'The *DMLBS* and the *OED*: medieval Latin and the lexicography of English' in *Ashdowne and White (2017); P. Durkin (2020) 'The relationship of borrowing from French and Latin in the Middle English period with the development of the lexicon of Standard English' in *The multilingual origins of Standard English*, ed. L. Wright, Berlin.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for linguistic study, but these factors do mean that one should beware of generalisations, repeated from one generation of scholars to the next without reference to the sources.[12]

The Sources of the Texts

The passages in this volume derive from such sources as administrative documents and from manuscripts preserved mainly in archives and libraries throughout Britain, and occasionally elsewhere in Europe and in the United States. Large numbers of administrative documents were preserved for centuries at Westminster and in the Tower of London and then transferred to the Public Record Office, and in 2004 to the National Archives at Kew in London. Most of these documents can be consulted, and many have been published over the last two hundred years (or at least calendared, i.e. summarised in English, to assist historians), but work continues on making more available in printed and digital form. Meanwhile there remain texts in manuscripts, especially among the philosophical and theological writings of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, that await editing and publication, for which library catalogues can be supplemented by *Sharpe (1997), providing basic information about editions, or the lack of them. The majority of the texts in this volume have been selected from printed editions. The accompanying translations are, however, the work of this editor.

Communication and Record

These medieval texts were primarily intended to communicate and to record. Written works were needed to an even greater degree in British society in the post-Conquest period as communication became enormously important, between the king and his officers, between the pope and the members of his Church, between individuals collaborating on some project or seeking to inform others of important events, and of course between instructors and learners. Record became increasingly part of everyday life as the royal administrative machine expanded from the late twelfth century to deal with every walk of life, requiring royal writs and charters, statutes and accounts, as well as a wide range of legal decisions to be recorded, as Michael Clanchy made clear in his book *From Memory to Written Record*. Monastic houses also produced historical works, recording their own history as well as local and national events. The sophistication and effectiveness of these systems, lasting for centuries, indicate that the linguistic skills of those com-

12 Cf. Gervase of Canterbury, *Gesta regum* 2.60 and Ralph Higden, *Polychronicon* 2.156–62, for medieval perspectives on the post-Conquest linguistic situation.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

municating and recording were usually of a high order: those writing Latin would hardly have continued to do so in the ways that developed after the Conquest if their Latin had failed in its purpose. Nevertheless, sufficient texts survive to allow us also to perceive misunderstandings which may only be apparent, sometimes occasioned by similarities between different languages or within one language, and this can be of interest in itself. An example of the linguistic complexity is the fact that CL *scamnum*, meaning a bench, also occurs in the sense of 'embankment' (Section II.10): in this case the Latin equivalent for AN 'banc' ('stool' or 'bench') has been given the sense of the English 'bank', both of which had in fact developed from the same early Germanic word.

The Writers of These Texts: Gaining an Education

So who was writing these texts? While Latin may have been learned as a first language by some in Britain during the period of Roman settlement in the first four centuries of the common era, once the Romans withdrew it was largely the Celtic and then Anglo-Saxon vernaculars that remained as the native languages of the inhabitants of Britain. When Latin was in effect reintroduced into England on the arrival of Augustine of Canterbury's mission from Rome in 597, it was now learned as a second language (L2), through the education provided primarily by churches and monasteries, but also in the home and by schoolmasters, often priests, who might teach the children of the parish.[13] In the early Middle Ages the emphasis was on an ability to recite and read the Scriptures, starting with the Psalms. The next stage was to understand the language of the Bible, and to write, using the Bible (rich in stories and as a source of metaphors and allegories) and the writings of the Church Fathers. This education was supplemented by those texts of classical literature that were accepted as part of the curriculum to be grammatical models and sources of a wide vocabulary, but also, at higher levels, to teach rhetorical skills admired by writers of antiquity. By the twelfth century, access to education was increasing at all levels and a more secular syllabus was also available, as outlined in Alexander Neckam's work *The Priest at the Altar* (see Section II.28B).[14] Roger Bacon appears to indicate (*Tert.* 10 p. 34) that many lay people could speak Latin well without the use of grammar books: this no doubt allowed them to understand more than they could compose in written

13 Cf. Gilbert of Sempringham, who taught *scolaria rudimenta* and *morales et monasticae disciplinae* ('basic school subjects' and 'moral and monastic teaching') to boys and girls in Lincolnshire (*The Book of St Gilbert* 3); also W. Cant. *Mir. Thom.* 5.30, where a five-year-old girl, whose parents send her to school for a good education, is stabbed with a penknife, but healed by praying to Thomas Becket.

14 Cf. J. Murphy (2005) 'The teaching of Latin as a second language in the twelfth century' in *Latin rhetoric and education in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, Aldershot.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Latin.[15] After a basic education in literacy, children who had not been entrusted to the monastic life might move to the household of a high-ranking secular or ecclesiastical person to continue their education, learning to use their Latin for administrative purposes to fill the increasing number of posts in this field. It is striking how many of the celebrated writers of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries had been educated in this way. As a further step in their education, some, like John of Salisbury and Walter Map in the twelfth century, might go to Paris for a few years, to attend the nascent university there before returning to England: John of Salisbury later took the post of personal secretary of Thomas Becket, while Walter Map worked for King Henry II, while others, especially in the thirteenth century, returned to teach, for example at Oxford University.

Increasingly, no doubt, clerks would be trained by means of an apprenticeship in the Latin skills they needed for a specific task, such as compiling business accounts.[16] It is certainly the case that there existed a range of educational levels, but education always centred on the learning of Latin, albeit for various purposes. An idea of what was regarded as a good education can be gained from the writings of a number of authors, such as John of Salisbury and Gerald of Wales, who sometimes express slight contempt for those who have not benefited from one. In exploring educational levels and varieties of register, the use of *illiteratus* applied to a person, and *communis*, *popularis*, *usitatus* and *vulgaris* applied to language, can be significant. However, one needs to be aware of semantic ambiguities in some of these terms, just as one must beware of the imprecision of such English terms as low-register, colloquial, or sub-standard in linguistic discussions. Social distinctions existed as much between ecclesiastical or monastic and lay people as between upper and lower social levels. It is clear that the question of education with regard to social standing and whether one is a cleric or a lay person is a fraught one, particularly in the twelfth century when education was expanding in different directions.

Medieval Literary Tastes: What the Sources Reveal

It is possible to learn about literary standards and tastes from the comments that writers make about other authors, as when William of Malmesbury (*GP* 1.15) says of the challenging tenth-century writer Frithegod that he uses verses *non ita improbandis nisi quod Latinitatem perosus Grecitatem amat, Grecula verba frequentat, ut merito dictis eius aptetur illud Plautinum, 'haec quidem preter Sibyllam leget nemo'* (that are not totally without merit, except that, hating Latin, he loves Greek

15 See *Stotz (1996–2004: 1.149–54) on spoken Latin.

16 N. Orme (1989) *Education and society in medieval and Renaissance England*, London; for the later period, see R. Hanna (2011) 'Literacy, schooling, universities' in *The Cambridge companion to medieval English culture*, ed. A. Galloway, Cambridge, 172–94.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and uses lots of Greek words, so that one might rightly apply to his poetry the words of Plautus, 'No one will read this apart from the Sibyl').[17] A critical view of other writers is also apparent when writers consider it appropriate to produce a revised version of an earlier text they deem insufficiently clear or elegant. In the preface to his *Life of St Ninian*, for example, Ælred of Rievaulx writes with characteristic elegance that he has been asked *ut clarissimi viri* (i.e. of Ninian) *vitam, veraci quidem sed nimis barbarico a prioribus exaratam stilo, a sermone rustico quasi a quibusdam tenebris eruens, in lucem latine locutionis educam* ('to bring the life of a distinguished man, written by earlier writers with an accurate but rather barbarous pen, into the light of Latin locution, pulling it out of its clumsy style as if out of darkness'). Here, too, the reader should beware, for the references to *stilus barbaricus* and *sermo rusticus*, contrasted with *locutio latina*, may mislead, seeing that *barbaricus* and *rusticus* could refer to the vernacular. It is therefore unclear whether Ælred, alongside his use of Bede's account of Ninian, is translating a lost vernacular version of the Life, or upgrading a previous Latin version; both translation and revision were widespread. At other times, when writers quote not only from classical texts and the Bible but from other medieval Latin authors, whether predecessors or contemporaries, this is usually a sign of approval, as well as an interesting indication of what texts were known to them.

Encountering the Medieval Texts in Their Physical Medium

When first encountering the medieval Latin texts produced as the result of such varied educational opportunities, readers may be puzzled by various features, particularly if they have studied the Latin usually labelled 'classical', distilled from the writers of the Roman Republic and early Empire into a somewhat unrealistically homogeneous language, with rules prescribed by late Roman grammarians who did not always follow their own advice. In their original form, in manuscripts and documents, the medieval texts are usually written on parchment, usually by a scribe other than their author. However, occasionally a manuscript contains the autograph version of a text: for example, MS 341 in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, contains two loose leaves from Eadmer's work *A History of Recent Events in England* and his *Life of Anselm*, written by the author, while the *History of the English Bishops* in a manuscript (MS 172) preserved in Magdalen College, Oxford, is written by its author, William of Malmesbury (for which see the cover to this volume). Many of these manuscripts can now be viewed digitally. The handwriting is often extremely beautiful, in contrast to that written by administrative clerks, which can initially be hard to decipher, particularly at certain

17 Here William cites Plautus, *Pseudolus* 25, probably culled from the opening to Jerome's well-known work *Against Jovinianus*, given that Jerome was a rich (and occasionally the only) source of classical quotations.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

periods of the later Middle Ages. Abbreviations are common, as is the use of symbols to replace particular words of high frequency. Furthermore, the multiple downward strokes ('minims') of certain letters can be confusing, as Roger Bacon points out (*CSPhil* 479), giving the example of the words *inviolati* and *inmolati* as potentially hard to distinguish *quia tres lineae sunt in m litera sicut in v et i et multi errant ibi* ('because there are three lines (downward strokes) in the letter m as also in v and i, and many people make a mistake here').The spelling can be confusing (as when *hiems* is spelled *yem*- or even *gem*-, mirroring the pronunciation), particularly for words adopted from the vernacular: in some cases, every surviving instance of the word seems to be spelled in a different way, examples of this being the words for 'sugar' and 'scaffolding', as is evident in the entries for *succarum* and *scaffaldus* in the *DMLBS*. Matters improve once the reader is aware that s and f are easily confused in the script, t is often replaced by c, and that the diphthong ae is very often flattened to e (and even *aequus* turning into *equus* can briefly throw the reader, as Gerald of Wales indicates in his *Gemma ecclesiastica* 2.36). The reverse, termed hypercorrection, when a short e is written as a diphthong, e.g. *aecclesia* for *eccl*-, is also evident, as also in earlier Roman inscriptions. Homonyms are frequent, often the result of the variety of languages on which BML draws, as in the case of *planus*, which can be the CL word meaning 'flat' etc., or can signify 'wandering', derived from Greek, via Latin, or can bear the sense of 'plane tree', springing up in the thirteenth century at about the same time as AN 'plane' (while ME 'plane (tree)' is first attested in the fourteenth century), having come via Latin *platanus* from a Greek word. Further problems may be caused by the fluidity of gender characteristic of later BML, as can be seen from the complexity of homonyms around *polus* and *pola*.

Language Contact

Although one should be wary of imposing too many labels on a language which cannot be divided into strict chronological or social categories, one might broadly say that the language resulting from the combination of classical, Christian and Late Latin, as transmitted in written form, becomes the standard language of the Middle Ages. However, neither in pre- nor post-Conquest Britain did Latin function in a vacuum. It interacted not only with earlier written texts but also with the surrounding vernaculars, as is evident from the texts and from the glossaries compiled throughout the medieval period in Britain and on the Continent. After 1066, this version of Latin as it developed in Britain became a linguistic storehouse, from which the developing vernaculars adopted words over the next centuries, to a greater degree than during the Anglo-Saxon period. At the same time, the Latin storehouse was added to by an increasing number of Latin words formed from the contemporary vernaculars, again to a greater degree than previously. These new words were adopted in the same manner as classical Latin

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

had borrowed from Italic languages, from Greek and Gaulish, for example, and in the same way as contact languages all over the world frequently borrow from each other.

Adoption from the vernacular should be seen against the complex background of the relation between the languages on either side of the English Channel from around the fourth century. This background includes Latin and the developing Romance forms, as well as the Germanic languages. In Britain the Germanic language par excellence was of course Old English, which developed from the west Germanic language of the Angle and Saxon immigrants, but Latin was also affected by other Germanic languages such as Continental Frankish, another west Germanic language, and occasionally by Gothic, an east Germanic language, as in the later Latin *tubrucus* for a type of leggings, which existed alongside the earlier, Gaulish-derived CL *bracae* ('breeches').

Investigation of the contacts between these languages can throw light on all of them. At an early stage of contact, it would seem that Germanic languages had adopted some Latin words, such as *caseus*, *vinum* and *cucina*, which were eventually to lead to modern English 'cheese', 'wine' and 'kitchen', and modern German 'Käse', 'Wein' and 'Küche'. In their new Germanic form they are likely to have been already present in OE when the Anglo-Saxons came to Britain. Other words were borrowed on contact with Christian culture, either on the Continent or in Britain: words such as *angelus* and *monasterium*. In reverse, words from the Germanic languages, mainly Frankish, were transmitted into Latin and the developing Romance vernacular (including the Norman dialect) and into English over the centuries. Finally, in the post-Conquest period, Latin also draws from spoken Anglo-Norman and English words which may themselves be derived from Germanic and earlier Latin vocabulary. David Trotter described the 'complex routes of transmission' in terms of 'multiple etymology' to explain how a word like BML *warda* could have different etymologies, associated with its various senses.[18]

A further feature of BML, resulting from the vagaries of language contact and development, is that it often contains doublets (as does English when deriving words such as 'ward' and 'guard' from the different forms in AN and OF). In such instances one form may derive directly from Latin while another has moved from early Latin into Romance to reappear in the Romance form in BML. There is indeed constant movement between French and BML in both directions. For example, there are forms for the word 'drain' that are based on Latin components, e.g. *exaquia* appearing in the twelfth century, but also related forms that have flowed from Latin through Romance to issue in a different Latin form, e.g. (*es-)sewera* in the thirteenth century. English 'sewer', however, remains underground until the fifteenth century. Another example of multiple etymological

18 D. Trotter, 'Anglo-Norman, medieval Latin and words of Germanic origin' in *Ashdowne and White (2017).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

strands is provided by the three related verbs *trahere*, *tractare* and *trainare*: *trahere* is classical Latin, and so is *tractare* except that the latter is not attested in the first nine senses in which it appears in BML (senses which largely overlap with the basic meanings of *trahere*, i.e. 'to drag or draw'), while *trainare* comes through AN trainer, in the sense of 'to drag', but also applied to luring or training (a hawk).

The reader will quickly observe that medieval Latin is even more lexically rich in the extant texts than classical Latin, although the earlier Latin lexis has recently been enriched by such non-literary linguistic discoveries as those at Vindolanda or in curse tablets, for example.[19]

Lexis

In general it is striking how many words found in classical Latin appear in BML. In addition there are numerous words confidently formed from a CL stem, with the addition of productive affixes to create words that may not be attested in the surviving CL literature but will be perfectly comprehensible to a reader of that literature.[20] Then there are those words usually labelled as Late Latin (many of them included in the massive *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* dictionary being produced in Munich to cover the period down to about AD 600). This does not imply that these words were not used in classical Latin, only that they are unattested there: it should be remembered that a great deal of writing in Latin from the classical period has been lost. Admittedly certain words and senses, in particular those applied to specific Christian concepts, could not have appeared before a certain date. Indeed, the term Late Latin is given to many words first found in the Latin translations of the Bible, words sometimes drawn from Greek which become part of the ever-expanding lexical repository of the Middle Ages.

First in this brief overview of the different kinds of lexical items in BML is the large category of words attested in CL sources, including rare words only attested once or twice in those sources. William of Malmesbury is perhaps the supreme example of a writer familiar with a wide variety of words and a range of senses as used by classical authors, a familiarity no doubt gained from wide reading. For example, he is the only writer of BML to use the CL *tumultuarius* in the sense of 'makeshift' or 'unplanned' (*GR* 3.245). In fact, it is remarkable how many of the writers are aware not only of the vocabulary but of any particular rules that govern a word in its grammatical context. It is not just a question of using the correct case after a preposition (which medieval writers are often said to fail to do), but of knowing how a particular verb behaves in a particular form, as with the deponent

19 J. N. Adams (1995) 'The language of the Vindolanda writing tablets: an interim report', *JRS* 85: 86–134.

20 Cf. *Stotz (1996–2004: 2.231–482) on the creation of words without borrowing from other languages.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mederi with the dative in the *Liber custumarum* listing fire regulations after the London fire of 1212: *civitati mederi volentes* (Section II.47B); or how it behaves in a particular sense, as for example *intendere* ('to apply oneself to') with the dative in the *Life of Frideswide A* (4): *vigiliis et orationibus … intendens* (Section II.13A); or *obtinere* used absolutely, by Gerald of Wales, in the sense 'to win one's case, prevail' (Section II.21B).

With the classical vocabulary one can include the semantic extensions, as in the early fourteenth-century records of Elton Manor where the fourth declension CL *tractus* is extended to mean the straps on a horse's collar, for which cf. modern English 'traces' (Section II.45E), or in many financial accounts in which CL *onerare* comes to be used to mean 'to charge with, hold accountable for' (e.g. Section II.48E). Semantic extensions can be traced by comparing the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* and the *DMLBS*. Some classical terms are used in a British context with a slightly new sense, especially words relating to appointed officials, e.g. *senator*, *satrapa* and *fetialis*. Greek words occur, as they had done in classical Latin, sometimes apparently taken directly from Greek, sometimes via Latin, and sometimes as technical terms.

In the text embroidered on the Bayeux Tapestry two words appear that are regarded as characteristic of Late Latin, and indeed spoken Latin: *parabolare* (in the sense 'to converse') and *caballus* ('horse') are both closely associated with modern French ('parler') and Spanish words ('caballo') that developed from these Latin forms. Interestingly, *parabolare* occurs only here in BML, except in Wyclif's treatise on blasphemy where he uses it in the sense 'to tell by means of a comparison or parable': the different Latin senses seem to derive from various words connected to the Greek verb *paraballein*. Christian and biblical vocabulary, mainly deriving from the Late Latin period, is of course woven more or less densely into many texts, particularly such works as the sermons of Thomas of Chobham (e.g. Section II.38A).

The second major feature of post-Conquest BML is the number of neologisms. Many words are created with prefixes and suffixes used in CL and LL according to a recognised semantic system, not unlike the system of derived forms for Arabic verbs or of affixes to the three-letter roots, allowing the language to coin new words without necessarily borrowing foreign words. In Latin this usually involves creating nouns ending, for example, in *-ura* or *-tio* or *-men,* adjectives with productive endings such as *-bilis* or *-osus*, and verbs with different conjugational terminations. Occasionally this can lead to homonyms with opposite meanings, e.g. *inhumatio*, which can mean both burial and non-burial as the result of the different senses inherent in the two CL prefixes *in-* with intensive and negative sense respectively: indeed, even in CL one finds similar ambiguity in the adjective *inauratus*.

Throughout the history of Latin, attitudes to neologisms varied, not only from one period to another, but from one writer to another, and even within the writings of a particular author. The widespread use of neologisms seems often to

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

be regarded as a negative characteristic of medieval Latin. And yet, despite their rejection by the grammarians, writers as respected as Cicero, Jerome and Dante appreciated the need for neologisms: indeed, Dante went as far as believing that neologisms were one of the linguistic tools for transcending the limitations of human language and bridging metaphysical dichotomies.[21]

Loanwords

If the majority of BML words can be labelled as CL or LL – or at least are morphologically connected with such – the next largest group consists of borrowings from the vernacular.[22] As noted in the Introduction to the first volume of this anthology, borrowings from the vernacular were rare in the pre-Conquest period, though there are examples of Latin words probably derived from Irish, Cornish, Frankish, Gothic and English. In the post-Conquest period, on the other hand, loanwords are one of the major distinguishing factors, particularly in certain genres.

Most of these are formed from French (itself very frequently drawing on Latin and Germanic languages) and, increasingly over the period and in certain registers, from English. Sometimes it is unclear whether the source word is French or English because of morphological similarity between the languages at that stage of development. An example is ML *hameletta* from the vernacular 'hamelet', which is the form both in AN and ME, a double diminutive via AN 'hamel', from a Frankish word 'haim' meaning a house or small village, related to modern German 'Heim' and English 'home'. Similarly, one finds the form 'werre' (modern English 'war') in both AN (from around 1120) and early ME (in the *Peterborough Chronicle*), though 'guerre' is the more common form in AN and OF: the word derives from a Germanic form 'werra' and appears in Latin as both *werra* and *guerra* at the same period, with *guerra* already employed by William of Malmesbury. Another example is the common BML word *wikettum*, for a small gate (which gives modern English 'wicket (gate)' and '(cricket) wicket'): appearing at the end of the twelfth century, it is found in the form 'wiket' in both Anglo-Norman (from the late twelfth century) and Middle English (around 1300). This word is likely to be the source also of modern French 'guichet', applied to a small ticket office.

Borrowings occasionally occur in an unassimilated vernacular form within the Latin matrix, either as a gloss on a Latin word, or embedded in a kind of code-switching. Examples of both are found in a building contract from 1405

21 *The Dante Encyclopaedia* (2010) ed. R. Lansing, New York, *s.v.* neologisms.

22 Cf. *Stotz (1996–2004: 1.503–723) on medieval Latin borrowings from different languages.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Section II.47E): '*duas fenestras … vocatas* Bay Wyndowes' and '*cum uno* Upright Roof'. This text also provides instances where the Latin word is derived from a vernacular but given a Latin ending, as in the case of the verb *gettare* ('to jut'), cognate with AN 'geter' ('to throw'), ultimately derived from CL *jactare*, and the noun *garita* in the sense of 'garret', though originally it applied to a watchtower, deriving from the Frankish 'warjan', meaning 'to defend'. This is in fact the most common way in which borrowed words appear, for the vernacular word is more likely to take root in the language if it is given a Latin termination. When being made into a verb, vernacular words are usually given a first-conjugation form, but other conjugations are evident, too. Most frequently a noun is accorded a termination of the first or second declension, but sometimes three declension forms are found for a single word, as in the case of *galo*, *-onis*, which appears in BML at the end of the twelfth century; here the third declension is more common than the forms *galona* or *galonus*. This word, of unknown origin, occurs in AN as 'galun' and other spellings around 1285 and is taken into English by 1300 to become the modern English liquid measure, a gallon.

Vernacular words can also be given CL productive affixes to extend their semantic range, but this is far less common than with CL and LL nouns. One example is AN 'trusse': attested from c.1130, it occurs as a Latin noun (*trussa*) around 1165 and in ME in the *Ancrene Wisse* around 1200, in the sense of 'bundle' or 'parcel', i.e. modern English 'truss'. The Latin word then produces various useful forms over the next couple of centuries through the addition of familiar endings, e.g. *trussare* ('to tie in a bundle'), *trussabilis* and *-tilis* ('suitable for packing', usually applied to a packing chest), *trussatio* ('act of packing') and *trussura* ('act of, or equipment for, packing'), all of which occur in different texts over a period of time. Another example is *daubare*, in the sense of 'to daub or plaster', deriving from French 'dauber', itself a development from CL *dealbare*: the CL suffixes *-arius, -tio, -tor* and *-tura* added to the stem *daub-* also provide related nouns and adjectives in the expected senses. Examples with such affixes are frequently based on an English word connected with domestic activities, sometimes occurring in a single example, e.g. *sincatio* ('sinking of a pit') or *watelatio* ('covering a wall in wattle'), words found in account rolls that list domestic expenses (e.g. Section II.48). A search in *DMLBS* demonstrates that neologisms ending with *-tio* were particularly common in the fourteenth century.

While some neologisms and borrowings are rare, others become key words for aspects of life in medieval Britain. An example of a key word is *saisina* ('seisin', possession of land) which comes into Latin after the Conquest, with AN *saisine*, *seisine*, probably cognate with Frankish **sakjan* ('to lay claim to') and related to English 'to seize'. In this case, too, related words are formed, e.g. *saisire* ('to put a person in legal possession') as a fourth-conjugation verb, alongside *dissaisire* ('to dispossess') and *resaisire* ('to resume possession'), both formed with CL prefixes.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It is true that the adoption – in other words the intentional borrowing of lexical items from a native language into an L2, i.e. a secondary language – occurs in different ways in different kinds of texts/registers and at different periods. At one end of the scale there are literary and theological works which continue to draw almost wholly on classical and biblical vocabulary in a way that must have been perfectly comprehensible to their readers. Then there are, for example, saints' lives and historical writings, which, from the late eleventh century, incorporate the occasional vernacular-based word which has presumably already become part of the Latin lexicon. Goscelin's *Life of Edith* contains an early example of *perla* ('pearl'), a word of complex origin, probably coming into BML around 1080 from French, here specifically to refer to an English pearl, as opposed to CL *margarita*, taken from Greek. A slightly later example is *herciare* ('to harrow') in Orderic Vitalis' *Ecclesiastical History* (5.20): the Romance form (AN 'hercer') probably developed from the LL noun *herpica*, a version of CL (*h)irpex*. Eadmer (*V. Anselmi* 2.58) uses *strivile* (*equus … hominem tergo dejecit eumque uno pede per strivile pendentem … per terram longius traxit* ('the horse threw the man from his back and dragged him a long way over the ground, hanging from the stirrup with one foot')). This derives from a Germanic word (related to OE 'stigráp', i.e. 'climb-rope', which developed into modern English 'stirrup') but passed through a (now invisible) French form that first becomes visible at the end of twelfth century as AN 'estrivele'. Sometimes an author adds a specific comment to show he is conscious of giving a non-Latin word in a Latin form, as when William of Malmesbury speaks of the tidal bore in the Severn as *higram* (*GP* 4.153) using the feminine accusative singular, from the OE form 'egor'. William comments on *higra*: *sic enim Anglice vocant* ('for this is what they call it in English'), even though he has used the word in a Latin form. Similarly, Matthew Paris (*Maj*. 5.709) writes *dispersis predonibus quos bedeweros vocant*, and Gervase of Canterbury (*Combust*. 6) *columpnae … ecclesiae quae vulgo pilarii dicuntur*, adding what amounts to a quasi-technical term apparently associated with AN 'piler'.[23]

Some of these words had entered BML soon after the Conquest, and many appear throughout the Domesday Book. Another early source for the study of such words are the Latin translations of Anglo-Saxon and AN law codes, collected in **Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*. In a document of 1136 King Stephen assures the Church that he will maintain its freedom, using such words as *foresta* and *murdrum* which were to become very common in BML and in current English. Gradually an increasing number of technical terms were required, predominantly drawn from the French vernacular in use at the royal court: words such as

23 Cf. the sixteenth-century Scottish historian John Major, discussing oats (*Historia Majoris Britanniae* 1.2), writes of the bannock as *panem … prope cineres coctum, quem 'bannokam' (a vulgari Latinum fingendo) nostri appellitant*. Here the vernacular he refers to may be Gaelic. There is room for further investigation of the widespread use of such comments as *vulgares appellant* or *vulgariter vocatus*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

escaetum ('escheat') and *essartum* ('assart') which have left their mark on English legal terms and place names. The second half of the twelfth century, especially from the 1180s, when Henry II and his chancellors expanded the role of royal administration, and right through the thirteenth century, is the period when most AN words are adopted into BML. From the mid-thirteenth century an increasing number of agricultural and construction terms for tools, materials and practices, some of them the result of technological advances, turn up in customaries, accounts and manuals, with more adopted from English words in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

A further source of linguistic interest for the relationship between BML and the vernaculars is provided by the bilingual texts, such as glossaries, or some of the sermons of the fourteenth century that use elaborate code-switching. In addition, it should be remembered that contact borrowing comes about not only when people speaking different languages are in prolonged contact, but also when languages meet in written translation, as when Latin borrowed terms from Arabic and Greek scientific texts. Calques, i.e. literal translations, were a useful means of dealing with technical terms found in foreign languages, as an alternative to transliteration of the foreign term.[24] Roger Bacon's theories on translation in the context of scientific and philosophical works are of interest in this context (Section II.28C).

The unusual flexibility and openness of BML after the Conquest has not been fully explained and requires further investigation. Certainly the use of neologisms and borrowings varies according to genre and register, apparently suitable in one context but less so elsewhere. An awareness of such differences is seen in the comment made by Gerald of Wales (*V.Galfridi* 2.9) – a multilingual writer sensitive to delicate nuances of sense and tone as well as being interested in etymology – in his account of the disgrace of the chancellor William de Longchamp (cited with reference to Hugh Nonant's account in Section II.20). Gerald uses the CL word *communio* first to refer to the rights of the governing body, but adds *vel ut Latine minus, vulgariter magis loquamur, communa seu communia eis concessa*, where *communa* and *communia* are both commonly attested forms of a medieval Latin word deriving from the French 'commune'. In general BML offers an unparalleled source for the study of loanwords in various genres, registers and contexts, providing information about semantic and cultural changes in a multilingual society.[25]

24 Latin *sinus*, for example, was chosen as the trigonometrical term now referred to in English as 'sine', because it was a loan translation of an Arabic word meaning 'bosom' or 'breast', paralleled in one sense of *sinus*: however, the Arabic word was in fact a misunderstanding, due to a confusion between the similar Sanskrit and Arabic forms, of the correct Sanskrit term 'jya-ardha', meaning 'half-chord'.

25 On loanwords cf. D. Trotter in *Ashdowne and White (2017), and E. Dickey (2018) 'What is a loanword? The case of Latin borrowings and codeswitches in Ancient Greek', *Lingue e linguaggio* 17.1: 7–36.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Morphology and Syntax: the Texture of British Medieval Latin

If post-Conquest BML is striking both for the confidence with which the classical word stock is applied and for the multiplicity of vernacular-based words in certain contexts, one might also claim that it is striking for the general regularity of its morphology and syntax (as is the case also in the pre-Conquest period), while nevertheless characterised by great variety across a broad range of possibilities. This might surprise those who tend to regard medieval Latin merely as a debased form of classical Latin or as valuable only as a source for Romance forms. It is true that there are greater differences in the texture of the Latin between different genres than in the pre-Conquest period, mainly because Latin was used in the post-Conquest period in so many hitherto unattested genres, largely connected with administration at every level of society. One characteristic of the Latin of these genres is that a Latin word, often a neologism or loanword, can be used in any of the three genders, but that is hardly something to worry about. However, in general there is remarkably little deviation from the classical rules of morphology and little evidence of evolution from a synthetic to an analytic language, apart from the very occasional use of prepositions instead of plain cases, where indeed the use of *de* may parallel the development of French 'de'. In general one finds an impressive awareness of the correct forms of irregular declension and conjugation (e.g. the different participles *insertus* and *insitus* for the two CL homonym verbs *inserere*), even in rare words.

With regard to syntax, there is certainly plentiful evidence of usages that have long been stamped as non-classical and non-standard.[26] Some of these usages can indeed unsettle the reader, as with irregular tense sequences or when the reflexive *suus* and the genitive pronoun *eius* are occasionally confused, both of which are easy errors to make in certain complex sentences.[27] However, in recent years the work of, for example, J. N. Adams has demonstrated that many of these features (as for example, occasional interchangeability between active and deponent verbs) in fact occur in the writings of the standard authors of classical antiquity, where there is far more fluidity and continuity in morphological and syntactical usage than the textbooks have hitherto led one to believe. The commonest examples of such variants are the continued use of *quod* or *quia* with the indicative or subjunctive for object clauses after verbs of saying or knowing, as in Orderic

26 A summary of some characteristics regarded as typical of the Latin of the medieval period can be found in the chapter on medieval Latin by Greti Dinkova-Bruun in *Clackson (2011). However, many of these are less applicable to BML.

27 That this was a common source of problems is shown by the fact that the arbiter of Renaissance linguistic taste, Lorenzo Valla, in his little book *De reciprocatione sui et suus*, devotes his ninth chapter to explaining why people mistakenly use *eius*, *ipsius* and *illius* for *suus*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Vitalis' account of the wreck of the White Ship, in Section II.11C, where he writes *audacter quia omnes qui iam precesserant praeiret spondebat*, where *quia* can be translated 'that'; note, however, that in the following sentence, *quia* is equivalent to 'because', despite the presence of *nesciebant*, which is followed by an indirect question: *laeti quia quid eis ante oculos penderet nesciebant*. The use of *quia* and *quod* to introduce object clauses did allow flexibility but could also be a source of confusion because of the various, very common senses of these words. Another variant usage is the past participle with a perfect, rather than present, form of *esse*, to form the past passive, as when William of Canterbury (*Mir.Thom.* 5.30) writes *postquam hec per interpretem patrem locuta fuerat* ('after she had said these things, with her father acting as translator'). It should, however, be borne in mind that one and the same text often contains examples of various forms of expression, showing that the author was aware of a wide range of lexical and syntactic possibilities.

The texts included in this volume have been selected to highlight this range of possibilities and to demonstrate some aspects of the important role Latin played in the culture of medieval Britain. Latin had long been a language of prestige, admired for the calibre of its ancient literature, just as the Romans had admired Greek literature and language. It was also valued as the primary language of education, necessary for the functioning of the Church and providing access to higher positions within society. It might also be found in the briefest of snippets, as embedded in Chaucer's English, introduced to hint at a veneer of learning. And yet it was by no means merely a language of rhetorical flourishes, literary imitation and quotations from a few authoritative texts, a thin layer floating on the linguistic surface of medieval Britain. It is true that its status as a learned and written language had an inevitable effect on it, what with the continuing pull of *consuetudo* (in the sense of 'existing usage'). In addition, there was the respect for *auctoritas* ('authority') and the tendency of education and records to turn to the models and forms of earlier times. The central position of the Bible in medieval culture might be regarded as also having a somewhat conservative influence on the language, given the common practice of interlacing the text with biblical quotations and allusions. Such forces might be expected to produce a limited and artificial language used within the community of the educated, superficially similar to some aspects of the community created in contemporary society among social media users.

Nevertheless, other aspects of the linguistic situation served to create a greater variety of Latin expression within the generally consistent picture. The widespread use of borrowing from contact languages was probably the most important factor, as mentioned, in giving BML a particular identity as well as a certain flexibility. In the more literary writings it is possible that some authors were influenced by the more relaxed attitude to the grammarians' rules evident in earlier Christian writers, such as the highly educated Augustine of Hippo, whose writings are full of interesting linguistic observations. In the *De doctrina Christiana*

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(4.10.24) for example, he points out that clarity and communication are more important than adherence to pedantic rules, particularly when explaining theology to an audience with a more limited education, when he asks pointedly: *quid enim prodest locutionis integritas, quam non sequitur intellectus audientis, cum loquendi omnino nulla sit causa, si quod loquimur non intelligunt propter quos ut intelligant loquimur?* ('What use is correct speech if it does not allow the hearer to understand, since there is absolutely no reason to speak if those for whose understanding we are speaking cannot understand what we are saying?'). Then, as a language of record, Latin was widely used also in mundane contexts, for example in business accounts and legal proceedings necessitating different vocabulary and forms of expression: this would also have affected the Latin in various ways with respect to lexis and syntax.[28] A further contributing factor to the variety of types of Latin was the difference in the provision of education and the amount of contact any individual might have with Latin in their daily lives, which would affect the manner in which they would use Latin.

The Multilingual Context: Latin and the Vernaculars

The use of loanwords alerts the reader to the multilingual context in which BML functions. A consequence of this is that linguistic scholars are in fact dependent on BML for much material relating to the development of the vernaculars, even if few are aware of this. While many scholars mention in passing the trilingual nature of Britain, it is rare for them to delve deeper into the French and Latin of the period. To be sure, the Anglo-Norman scholar William Rothwell wrote widely about the influence of Anglo-Norman, rather than the Continental French which has hitherto been spotlighted in histories of the English language: he not only stressed the way in which AN can help to fill in the gaps in Middle English and Old French, but also the necessity of studying English, Anglo-Norman and Latin together.[29] However, in the context of multilingualism, Latin remains overlooked and undervalued, particularly for the later Middle Ages. The Latin of pre-Conquest Britain, often referred to as Anglo-Latin or Insular Latin, has attracted more scholarly attention, partly as the result of being included in such courses (if not in the title) as that in Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic at the University of Cambridge. And yet the recent publication of such scholarly resources as the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* (https://anglo-norman.net) and the *Bilingual Thesaurus of Everyday Life in Medieval England*, focusing on Anglo-Norman and Middle

28 P. Brand, 'The Latin of the early English common law' in *Ashdowne and White (2017).

29 For example, W. Rothwell (1998) 'Arrivals and departures: the adoption of French terminology into Middle English', *English Studies* 79: 144–65; and 'Aspects of lexical and morpho-syntactical mixing in the languages of medieval England' in *Trotter (2000). For further articles, consult https://anglo-norman.net.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

English, can be more than amply supplemented by the *DMLBS*, also online, for information about the post-Conquest linguistic situation.

An example of the importance of Latin texts for knowledge of the vernaculars and their development is the appearance of Latin forms of vernacular words soon after the Conquest, a feature revealed by the *DMLBS*. This points to a phenomenon that is crucial for the study of all three languages, namely that Latin texts provide evidence of vernacular words that are not documented in vernacular texts until later.[30] With regard to the history of English, during the first century after the Conquest, English was less in evidence as a written language than in the period before 1066, apart from in a few royal writs, in glosses added to scientific works and Psalters (e.g. BL MS Arundel 60) and in the *Peterborough Chronicle*, the one manuscript (Bodleian MS Laud 636) of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* which continues its account in OE into the twelfth century. Around 1200 there appear the (Middle) English *Ancrene Wisse* and Laȝamon's *Brut* (based on Wace's AN epic that itself draws on Geoffrey of Monmouth's Latin *History of the Kings of Britain*).

What is true of English is equally the case for Anglo-Norman. Early written evidence is restricted to the *Leis Willelme* (Laws of William the Conqueror), perhaps dating from the early twelfth century, and then translated into Latin around 1200, and a few AN charters from the same period.[31] The paucity of early AN written texts does explain why contemporary Anglo-Norman scholars focus on the writings of the thirteenth century and beyond. However, they fail to remark on the fact that early attestations of AN words are quite rare, even though Anglo-Norman was spoken in England from the time of the Conquest. Indeed, Norman French had been known to pre-Conquest English kings such as Edward the Confessor, who spent decades in exile in Normandy and may have brought Norman influence to his court in England already in the mid-eleventh century. It is possible that the majority of those who knew Latin also knew Anglo-Norman and could translate between them. More work certainly needs to be done on the question of possible linguistic overlap between the Latin documents of Britain and those of pre-Conquest Normandy, for which one may consult e.g. the *Index rerum* in **Recueil des Actes des ducs de Normandie de 911 à 1066* (1961) and SCRIPTA, the database of Norman documents from the tenth to thirteenth centuries, based at Caen.

30 Cf. M. Goyens and W. Verbeke (ed.) (2003) *The dawn of the written vernacular in western Europe*, Louvain; M. Mostert and A. Adamska (ed.) (2014) *Uses of the written word in medieval towns*, Turnhout; and (2022) *Oral and written communication in the medieval countryside*, Turnhout.

31 Cf. Y. Otaka (1993) 'Sur la langue des *Leis Willelme*' in *Anglo-Norman anniversary essays*, ed. I. Short, London, 293–308; *Clanchy (1993: 218–19); and the Early English Laws website, https://earlyenglishlaws.ac.uk/.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

On the Continent there is a similar picture with respect to the other French dialects of northern France, the 'langues d'oïl', including what developed into standard French. The earliest extended evidence of written French is in the Strasbourg Oaths of 842, given in a Romance and a Germanic Frankish version.[32] This document is followed by a handful of works, mainly in verse, over the next centuries, culminating in the *Chanson de Roland*, which probably dates from the late eleventh century but is preserved in a single Anglo-Norman copy (Bodleian MS Digby 23) from the mid-twelfth century, the period when French took off as a literary language.[33]

During the two centuries after the Conquest thousands of Latin words are derived from these vernaculars. The fact that the vernacular words are found embedded in Latin texts before they appear in vernacular writings gives BML an ancillary usefulness, making it an important resource for the study of the early development of French and English. These vernacular words presumably existed in a spoken form, but their early existence would be unknown had they not been preserved in Latin. This is the case also with words specific to certain geographical areas, preserved in Latin and giving Latin a perhaps unexpected hint of regionalism even within Britain. *Falla*, as a unit of measure, in northern English 'fall', is attested in Latin in 1211 but not until 1388 in English. Latin *croa* derives from a Scottish word (*OED s.v.* cruive) for a fish trap: it appears in 1157 in a Latin document from Scotland, but not until the fifteenth century in a Scottish document. There is also evidence of a medieval Cornish term, 'motlet', embedded in Latin (*DMLBS s.v. motletum*) and of Manx-specific Latin in church statutes of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.[34]

The Question of Spoken Latin in the Context of Written Latin

It is clear from what has been said about BML as a source of knowledge for the history of Latin as well as other languages that the fact that Latin is preserved in writing, in such a wide variety of texts, is of crucial importance. One aspect of our knowledge of the language is the question of whether Latin itself was spoken in medieval Britain. To what extent can this question be answered with reference to written Latin? Latin was undoubtedly spoken in the liturgy in church, where people would have become familiar with the language in a limited way, but as for conversation, scholarly interest has focused primarily on either early BML or on

32 See B. Frank-Job, 'A structural comparison between Latin and Romance' in **The Oxford guide to the Romance languages* (2016) on the earliest sources for Romance.

33 Cf. D. Howlett (1996) *The English origins of Old French literature*, Blackrock; and the website for France-Angleterre: manuscrits médiévaux entre 700 et 1200, https://manuscrits-france-angleterre.org.

34 **Councils and Synods* (1964), for the years 1230 and 1292.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the emaciated Latin resulting from the Italian Renaissance and its tendency to Ciceronianism, rather than on the period in between.[35] However, post-Conquest writers do talk about Latin speech specifically, in certain contexts and within certain communities, whether among monks, school and university students, or educated friends,[36] as well as in less usual circumstances, as between Gerald of Wales and the uneducated Welsh anchorite who could speak Latin using only infinitives instead of inflected verbs, for which see Section II.21A. Some form of Latin is also likely to have been used as a spoken lingua franca by priests, nuns and monks, pilgrims and traders travelling on the Continent, for British travellers could not at that time expect foreigners to speak English. Different standards were perhaps expected when it came to talking to the pope. An instance where a lack of education presented difficulties is found in the *Gesta* (2.113) of St Albans Abbey: in 1308 the abbot Hugh de Eversden is recorded as being second to none in spoken English and French but as having only basic Latin. As a result he dreaded having to visit the pope, but his great munificence to the pope and Curia ensured that he was well treated in Rome.[37]

Written texts not only mention occasions when Latin was used in conversation. Many kinds of texts, such as saints' lives, for example, record what is alleged to be direct speech (as can be seen in a number of the passages selected in these volumes). Although at times the Latin may be a translation of the vernacular speech, the simple, colloquial form in which the conversation is recorded was presumably plausible and comprehensible to the reader. With so many examples there is certainly opportunity for further investigation into the direct speech recorded in BML and its relation to contemporary vernaculars. For example, comparison could be made with direct speech recorded in earlier Latin writings when Latin was a first language.

35 On the early period, cf. M. Lapidge, 'Colloquial Latin in the Insular Latin scholastic colloquia?' and M. Winterbottom, 'Conversations in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*' in *Dickey and Chahoud (2010). On the plentiful post-medieval colloquies, such as those of Erasmus, see T. Tunberg (2020) 'Spoken Latin in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance revisited', *Journal of Classics Teaching* 21: 66–71. For a more general account of the so-called 'Neo-Latin' of the Renaissance and its view of the Latin of the past, see K. Sidwell, 'Classical Latin – Medieval Latin – Neo-Latin' in **The Oxford handbook of Neo-Latin* (2015) and V. Moul (ed.) (2017) *A Guide to Neo-Latin literature*, Cambridge.

36 See for example W. J. Ong (1984) 'Orality, literacy and medieval textualization', *New Literary History* 16: 1–12; J. Barrau (2011) 'Did monks actually speak Latin?' in *Understanding monastic practices of oral communication (Western Europe, tenth–thirteenth centuries)*, ed. S. Vanderputten, Turnhout.

37 Petitions from Hugh de Eversden to King Edward I, in French, survive in the National Archives. For difficulties in communicating with the pope, cf. Willibald of Mainz, *Life of Boniface* (6), cited in the Introduction to Volume I.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Medieval Latin and Modern Sociolinguistic Studies

The question of the spoken language leads to that of whether it is possible to apply to written BML some of the sociolinguistic concepts that have been discussed over the past half-century with regard primarily to spoken vernaculars, particularly English. Terms such as language contact, borrowing and interference, source languages and target or receptor languages, L1 and L2 languages, diglossia, bilingualism and code-switching have all become part of linguistic study. Although the primary emphasis in such language studies has been on speech, the related discipline of historical sociolinguistics allows for the study of language in a written form. Much of the study has hitherto taken the form of theoretical discussions, but it is now possible to test the theories on the primary sources. In the last twenty years a start has been made on treating Latin from a sociolinguistic point of view. J. N. Adams, for example, has examined Latin in a broad survey of bilingual contexts in which Latin encountered other languages, in his 2003 work *Bilingualism and the Latin language*. More recently he has attempted to apply certain aspects of sociolinguistics to the Latin of the post-classical period (long designated by the unfortunate term 'Vulgar Latin'), a type of Latin thought to reflect the (spoken) language of the non-elite and keenly examined as a source of proto-Romance elements.[38] As Adams makes clear, written texts must be treated with care, given their tendency to be conservative, which means that they do not necessarily reflect the spoken Latin of the period when they were written. Another problem is the paucity, indeed the often fragmentary nature, of sources for non-elite Latin in the late Roman period.

There are, however, many interesting differences between the linguistic situation in the late Roman period and that in medieval Britain. For example, in the case of BML, the aim is not to discover Latin texts with apparently anachronistic features, merely in order to pan the written texts for the gold of a spoken language. Written Latin, ranging from the more stylistically and linguistically conservative to that which seems to be responding quickly to developments in the vernacular (as with the abundance of new terms in royal administration at the end of the twelfth century), can be appreciated in its own right, rather than as incomplete evidence for the spoken, and need not be regarded as 'bad data',[39] a label often applied to written evidence by experts in historical linguistics. The scale and range of the extant material, from the mid-seventh century to around 1500, is a further factor which makes BML appropriate for sociolinguistic study. This allows a degree of both diachronic and synchronic study, to examine the variety of register at any one time, and any changes visible over time. The fact

38 See the first two chapters of **The Oxford guide to the Romance languages* (2016). For various ways in which this phrase has been interpreted, see *Adams (2013: 7–27).

39 W. Labov (1994) *Principles of linguistic change*, Oxford, 1.11.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that after the Conquest, Latin was used in a wider range of types of writing than before 1066 invites investigation of what kind of Latin was appropriate for each and reveals an awareness on the part of its users as to what was suitable for the particular material as well as for the context.

Another difference is that since BML is a written L2 language, the label 'non-educated' is less likely to be applicable to the language, since anyone who knew Latin in anything but the most passive manner is likely to have had some education. Indeed, there is a need to review the accepted forms of classification and labelling, with regard to such terms as colloquial, literary, and high or low register, evident in sociolinguistic discussions.[40] Certainly a discussion of the Latin of this later period must take into account legal, administrative and business language as well as the literary. There is no justification for limiting the study of Latin to what are regarded as high registers. It may be easy to recognise formality in Becket's attempt at diplomacy, for example, in his letter to the Empress Matilda (Becket, *Ep*. 40), in contrast to a more direct, if not exactly colloquial tone in Grosseteste's personal letter to his sister Juetta, a nun, in response to her request for a report on his health (Gros. *Ep*. 8). However, different terms may be needed for the royal business letters in the Close Rolls, for the vivid summaries of crimes brought to court, for building contracts, wills or accounts. Are these high-register because they are official and formal? Are contracts and accounts low-register as being non-literary, even if they can hardly be termed colloquial? British Latin of the medieval period will certainly not slip easily into the existing scholarly pigeonholes, without further discussion. Such questions must be examined, too, in relation to the concept of diglossia, as discussed below.

Levels of Education and Varieties of Register

With regard to the knowledge required by the medieval writer to select the appropriate register, it is true that the term *literatus* might be applied to anyone with enough learning to use Latin effectively. It was a word that could be used in the comparative or superlative, as when Peter of Blois, in the letter in which he defends King Henry II against the charge of murdering Thomas Becket, writes that the king of England is *longe litteratior* than the king of Sicily, both of whom he has tutored (P. Blois, *Ep*. 66). It is not sufficient to talk in terms of an elite who had gained an education, as opposed to the masses who were illiterate and could only speak a vernacular language. It was not only the wealthy and powerful who gained an education. As in the case of the poet Horace, even those of a humbler background were able to do so, given ambitious parents and good fortune: Robert Grosseteste, for example, the future Bishop of Lincoln, born in poverty, was given

40 For a discussion of registers in Latin writing, see *Dickey and Chahoud (2010).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

an education by the mayor of Lincoln and eventually described by Matthew Paris as *vir quidem nimis literatus* (*Chr. Maj.* 3.306). In this way, education, though not available to all, did allow a degree of social mobility, even if the areas in which that education could be used were quite specialised.[41] As Latin came to be used also for types of writing such as business accounts, training could be provided for specific purposes involving the ability to write and the use of a particular jargon. Even such everyday uses of Latin display evidence of a knowledge of grammar and cannot be labelled as sub-standard. Furthermore, it should be remembered that the ability to write Latin lay at the top of a range of familiarity with the language. Throughout British society, contact with Latin would occur in different forms: at one end of the spectrum people might listen to the liturgy in church and recite prayers and sing hymns in Latin, and grow to understand this Latin by means of the priest's explanations. At school or at home they might learn the Latin alphabet and be able to read aloud and copy words in Latin and other languages. As a further stage they would read Latin with a view to increasing their understanding of the language, and finally acquire the linguistic confidence to compose in Latin. That readers or listeners had various levels of Latin understanding is clear from many texts. In the introduction to his work *The Conquest of Ireland*, for example, Gerald of Wales claims to be writing in an unadorned and easy style (*plano facilique stilo*) because he is writing for lay people and for the *parum litterati principes*, i.e. the aristocracy, only able to read Latin if it is not too complex and abstruse.[42] Characteristically, Gerald also mentions the importance of an elegant style, even when adjusting the words to the understanding of his readers, but he does at least recognise in theory the importance of clarity, quoting the phrase *satius … est mutum esse quam quod nemo intelligat palam proferre* ('it is better to remain silent than to say publicly something that no one is going to understand') from Cicero's *Philippics* (3.9.22), though he attributes the words to Seneca. This passage of *The Conquest of Ireland* is of great interest: it includes Gerald's assertion that he has chosen to use words that are *popularia*, rejecting the *durum et austerum* style of some ancient writers and agreeing with the philosophical advice to imitate the way of life of the older generation, but to adopt the speech of the younger generation.

In short, it is important to realise that each individual would be different, with his or her own level of (multi-linguistic) expertise, as is the case in any society.

41 Cf. Walter Map (*De nugis curialium* 1.10), who takes a dim view of the ambitions of the lower classes (*servi*) for their children's education, playing on the words *liber*, *liberi*, *libertas* and *liberales artes*.

42 Cf. the preface to Anselm's *Monologion*, in which he uses the phrase *plano stilo* in response to his students' request for a clear exposition of his views on the essence of God. For a seventeenth-century British Neo-Latin revision of a passage of Gerald's work *The Conquest of Ireland*, see J. Barry (2004) 'Richard Stanihurst's *De rebus in Hibernia gestis*', *Renaissance Studies* 18: 1–18; for another Neo-Latin revision, see Section II.33.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

However, in multilingual societies like that in which BML had such an important role to play, there is not always an overlap in people's knowledge of the different languages, which is why translators and interpreters are needed, and this was certainly the case in medieval Britain, where texts can reveal scenes of mutual incomprehension. For example, Gerald of Wales (*Expugnatio Hibernica* 1.40) tells of an encounter between a man who addresses King Henry II *Teutonice*, i.e. in English ('God holde thee, cuning') and the king who speaks French and cannot understand the man: a knight accompanying the king is able to speak both French and English and can interpret for them, and the incident is then recorded by Gerald in Latin.

Diglossia and Code-Switching

Even if one accepts that there were individual differences in Latin competence across society, it is still true that Latin's particular role as the dominant written language of Britain over roughly a millennium sparks the question of whether the term diglossia, current in sociolinguistic discussions, can be applied to post-Conquest Britain. This would mean that Latin acted as the high-register form, with French and English acting as lower registers within the linguistic context of Britain.[43] Diglossia was originally applied to varieties within a single language, as with standard and colloquial or regional Arabic, or Katharevousa and demotic Greek, but it was extended to apply also to different languages used for different functions within a single community.[44] Peter of Blois appears to provide an example of Latin as the high-register language when he writes to a friend (*Serm.* 65), *petis … ut habitum sermonem ad populum … tibi communicem et quae laicis satis crude et insipide (sicut eorum capacitatis erat) proposui, in Latinum sermonem studeam transferre* ('You ask that I impart to you a sermon given to the people, and that I attempt to translate into Latin what I presented to the laity in a very rough and watered-down style (in accordance with their ability to comprehend)'). Here it seems that a sermon given in an unsophisticated form to a lay audience is now being turned into a more elegant (with quotations from Juvenal and from Ovid's *Fasti*), expansive (as demanded by *Latini eloquii dignitas*) and more effective Latin version. It is possible that the original sermon was communicated in a vernacular rather than in colloquial Latin, but the semantic ambiguities of such words as *idioma*, *quotidianus*, *sermo* and *transferre* make certainty impossible.

Code-switching, when the speaker or writer switches between languages, has already received attention with regard to its use in Latin and in the

43 *Garrison et al. (2013). On functional diglossia in BML, cf. *Ashdowne and White (2017: 22–6).

44 C. Ferguson (1959) *Diglossia*, repr. in T. Huebner (ed.) (1996) *Sociolinguistic perspectives*, Oxford.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

multilingual context of medieval Britain, but much remains to be done.[45] It is a phenomenon found in many different kinds of texts in BML, usually with French and/or English words, sometimes flagged by the French definite article 'le' or 'les', embedded in a Latin (or occasionally Anglo-Norman) matrix. Laura Wright has demonstrated in a number of articles the linguistic competence and subtlety of the code-switching between Latin, French and English in late medieval business accounts.[46] Sermons are another type of text in which code-switching occurs (Section II.38). However, the reasons for code-switching in a Latin matrix are not always clear and merit further examination within a wider context. Certainly the corpus of BML texts includes many multilingual texts (as for example the Account Rolls of Durham Priory (Section II.48C) and the Fabric Rolls of York Minster) that offer an opportunity for the study of code-switching and such concepts as bilingual teaching, functional bilingualism and coordinate bilinguals.

However, the most marked feature of BML after the Conquest that appears to make it fertile ground for sociolinguistic discussion is, as mentioned, the explosion of borrowings from the vernaculars and its inventive use of neologisms. Readers of BML need to adopt a more open attitude to the Latin in front of them, bearing in mind that borrowings and neologisms are accepted elements in both colloquial and literary languages, as a natural consequence of language contact.[47]

An investigation into how such sociolinguistic terms might apply to BML is likely to reveal hitherto unappreciated features of the Latin of post-Conquest Britain. Indeed, if BML is considered on its own terms, it should gain a more equal status alongside other languages of the period than it has had hitherto. Further research may well challenge existing sociolinguistic theories to explain how the Latin of the Middle Ages perhaps accords with certain theories but not with others. There are certainly a number of rather paradoxical features of the Latin of medieval Britain. It is a regional version of a more universal language, which, like Modern English outside Britain, produces a confident literature of its own among those who have learned it as an L2. Despite being a regional version, BML can in some respects be described as a standard language, and yet it avoids

45 *Adams (2003); H. Schendl and L. Wright (ed.) (2011) *Code-switching in Early English*, Berlin; H. Schendl, 'Multilingualism, code-switching, and language contact in historical sociolinguistics' in **The Handbook of historical sociolinguistics* (2012).

46 See e.g. L. Wright, 'Non-integrated vocabulary in the mixed-language accounts of St. Paul's Cathedral, 1315–1405' in *Ashdowne and White (2017: 273–98).

47 Modern Swedish, for example, adopted many everyday words from French in around 1800, partly as a consequence of having imported a Frenchman as the Swedish king, producing e.g. 'pjäs' for a theatre play from the French 'pièce', retaining the French pronunciation but altering the orthography. This continues with such recent colloquial borrowings as 'hajpa', from the English 'to hype' (apparently an abbreviation of 'hypodermic'), with the Swedish verb-ending -a added to the English word in a spelling conforming to Swedish principles.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the lack of variation usually associated with this term. In fact it provides further evidence in support of Adams' discovery that linguistic innovation is possible at higher educational levels. However, in the case of BML the innovation comes not only from within but also from the adoption of elements from the spoken vernaculars, which arguably make this written language more colloquial than one might expect. To what extent such changes over time amount to a development in the language remains to be evaluated: for this, the evidence of the BML of the late fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries needs to be measured against that of the earlier post-Conquest period.

Conclusion

There is, then, much more to the study of medieval Latin than quick glances and broad generalisations. There is a need for close consideration of the evidence in the light of recent research and with the assistance of the many new editions and reference works that have appeared in the last half-century, as well as the increasing number of digital resources, allowing analysis of the language. For such study, the national medieval Latin dictionaries already produced or currently in production in Europe, based on the extant sources of each country, as well as the dictionaries of Old and Middle English, the *Oxford English Dictionary* and the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*, are indispensable, enabling the student and scholar to explore both the lexical and semantic history of each word now stored in the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*. A huge amount of exciting work remains to be done: in fact, in many areas the linguistic study of BML and its impact on British and Continental European culture has scarcely begun. As the European medieval Latin dictionaries gradually reach completion, comparisons between regional variations in different areas and the relation of Latin to the local vernaculars become increasingly possible.[48] The Anglo-Norman and various English dictionaries will enable the reader to trace the way the three main languages of medieval Britain interacted over the centuries, developing different forms and senses and passing them to each other. This may provide answers as to the broader question of what effect BML had on the linguistic situation one finds in the extant texts of the three main languages. How does this situation differ from that which might have developed if Anglo-Norman had been used instead of Latin, or had become the dominant vernacular instead of English, or if English had continued to develop its strong role, as a written as well as a vernacular language, after the Conquest?

48 Cf. *Adams (2007); A. Adamska, 'Latin and three vernaculars in East Central Europe from the point of view of the history of social communication' in *Garrison et al. (2013).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

However, the primary aim of these volumes is to encourage and assist engagement with the literary and documentary sources from medieval Britain, in which one witnesses a language of enormous cultural richness being transposed into a new context, engaging with society on every level to produce a body of writings of interest in its own right. Detailed exploration across the range of BML texts will allow readers to appreciate these writings more profoundly. If readers can approach them with a sense of perspective, aware that there are complexities and gradations in the language and its usage, they will be better able to understand the texts within their social and linguistic context. To be sure, different texts may initially attract different readers. For example, readers who are engaging with medieval Latin for the first time may find the saints' lives and letters of the early period an attractive place to start. Classicists may principally be interested by the large number of classical words, and by examples of semantic extension as well as evidence of etymological senses not attested in surviving CL, as with senses 1–2 of *stipulari* (from which the English verb 'to stipulate' is derived) relating to *stipula* ('stubble') which are recorded in *DMLBS* from the thirteenth century. For students of Latin literature, the period has much to offer, down to the renewed classicism of the fifteenth century, as in the Abbot of St Albans' epic-style description of his sea crossing in 1423 (John Amundesham, *Annals* 1.126–7). Historians will find much of interest in the historiography and in the administrative texts providing information on a national and local level. Throughout there are observations about human life. There is satire and black humour, for example in the chronicle of Meaux Abbey in Yorkshire, whose author comments (*RS* 43.3: 45) that after the naval battle of Sluys in 1340, the fish had eaten so many dead Frenchmen that if God had given fish the ability to talk, they would have spoken French. And everywhere there are records of human tragedy, often in unexpected places, as in the royal household accounts where an early indication of the death of Henry, the six-year-old son of King Edward I, in 1274 is given by the simple mention of eight pounds of wool purchased to line his bier at Westminster.[49]

It is hoped that from an engagement with the particular, with Latin itself, will develop the desire to explore more widely and deeply, as well as a familiarity with the language, allowing the reader to deal with texts and linguistic corpora that have not yet been translated or analysed. However, stepping back from the particular, one might venture to claim that as a written language, engaging with many aspects of contemporary society but also expecting to be preserved, it was a language of the long term, looking both to the past and the future. The Latin of medieval Britain provided important linguistic continuity in a multilingual society, offering a framework within which the vernaculars could develop until Latin was gradually superseded by English in almost all its roles, as by other

49 H. Johnstone (1922) 'The wardrobe and household of Henry, son of Edward I', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 7: 384–420.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

vernaculars in other countries at that period. By 1500 Latin across Europe had been reduced to a largely rigid and artificial language: as such it was to continue in a restricted role as a literary plaything, a language of record for certain types of documents and as an academic language, occasionally of international use into modern times,[50] to which it has bequeathed a vast amount of information about life throughout the thousand years of medieval Britain.

50 D. Verbeke, 'Neo-Latin's interplay with other languages' in **The Oxford handbook of Neo-Latin* (2015).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316890738.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press