

## CC— Morphology and Syntax

By A.G. Rigg

### *Morphology*

Spoken languages, especially when they are (as they were in the Middle Ages) unrestrained by the teaching of grammar, are prone to the influence of analogy in grammatical forms. The pressure of analogy is to replace unusual forms by common ones. In French, *-s* has been extended as a mark of plurality to nouns and adjectives, replacing the historically expected forms (e.g. *filiae bonae* > *filles bonnes*). In English, *-s* has been extended to most noun plurals, replacing earlier forms (e.g. Middle English *eyen*, present-day English *eyes*) to the extent that plurals with alien suffixes (*data*, *media*, *graffiti*) are often not recognized as plurals. In fairly recent times the past tenses *spake* and *bare* have been replaced by *spoke* and *bore* (with the *o* of the past participle). Analogical extension probably occurs when children are learning to generalize syntactic rules to the whole language.

The situation in Latin was quite different. The first thing to be learned (as students still know to their cost) is the inflections—the complex systems of noun, pronoun, and adjective declensions and of verb conjugations. There was no pressure to change the inflections (for example, to extend the first conjugation *-are* \* system to other verbs, or to make all nouns conform to the second declension in *-us*). Any deviations from the learned pattern were seen as errors, as, for example, in a report of a Latin examination conducted by Odo Rigaldus (d. 1275), archbishop of Rouen, who castigated such inflectional errors as *inane* (vocative plural), *ferrebat* (active voice), and *ferturus* (future participle).

Individual writers, of course, occasionally forgot their grammar and produced forms that a teacher (then and now) would regard as errors. The fourteenth-century writer Richard Rolle (d. 1349) regularly writes *sentiu* (Classical Latin *sensi*) as though it followed the model of *audiui*. Mining documents (see ch. FK) treat *fodio*, *-ere* (mixed conjugation) first like a fourth conjugation verb (active infinitive *fodire*) and then like a second conjugation one (passive infinitive *foderi*). Aelfric's *Life of Athelwold*, written in 1006, has (ch. 16) *expulsit* (formed on *pulsus*, by analogy with *fulsit*) and (ch. 21) *poposcebat* (an amalgam of *poscebat* and *poposcerat*). New deponents (e.g. *monachor*, "be a monk") are sometimes found; conversely, some deponents are treated as passives, as in *Athelwold* (ch. 13): *ortamur ingredi*, "we are being encouraged to enter." Past participles of deponents are also often passive (as in Rather of Verona: *nactus*, *largitus*), following the Classical Latin precedence of *confessus*, "hav-

ing been acknowledged." It is not unusual to see masculine dative singular *isto, illo* (Classical Latin *isti, illi*), feminine dative singular *une* (CL *uni*), masculine dative singular *toto* (CL *toti*), or *-e* for the ablative singular of parasyllabic nouns (CL *-i*). In one text of c. 1270, Classical Latin *verres*, third declension, has been reclassified as second declension ("*verri cum verris*"). Changes of gender also occur (*Carmina Burana* 145.5.3: *thymus*, CL *thymum*). Such forms should not be dismissed and emended by editors as though they were the result of slips by inattentive scribes: they are genuine, if ephemeral (and erroneous), linguistic phenomena. They are not, however, systemic: they do not enter a general morphology of Medieval Latin.

Sometimes suffixes were misunderstood and liable to reclassification. The neuter plural of the present participle (*-entia*) sometimes gave rise to a first declension feminine noun (*essentia*, "being"). Greek neuter nouns in *-ma* (genitive *-matis*) were sometimes treated as first declension feminines (accusative *-mam*). Many writers and scribes did not know enough Greek to recognize an accusative singular in *-ea*, a genitive singular in *-eos*, or a genitive plural in *-on* (which could easily be misunderstood as a neuter singular in *-ikon*). Compare the replacement in present-day English of the Italian plural *libretti* by the anglicized *librettos*.

In general, however, there is nothing in the inflectional system of Medieval Latin (apart from *-e* for Classical Latin *ae* and, conversely, *ae* for *e*, an accident of pronunciation) that would have disconcerted a Roman writer of the classical period.

The treatment of proper names not derived from Classical Latin varies, in names from the Bible and from the medieval vernacular languages. If a form can easily be assimilated to a Classical Latin pattern, it is: *Eva* and *Maria* are feminine first declension; *Salamon* is masculine third declension, like *Plato*, *-onis*. Some are indeclinable: *David*, *Nabugodonosor*, *Naboth*. Sometimes the form is unpredictable: *Adam* has a genitive *Adae* (*Ade*). Treatment of vernacular Germanic names is also unpredictable; sometimes they are provided with feminine *-a* and masculine *-us* terminations, assimilating them to the first and second declensions (*Atheldrida*, "Audrey"; *Alfredus*, "Alfred"), but they are often treated as indeclinable. Aelfric in his *Life of Athelwold* usually latinizes names, but the mother of King Edred (ch. 7) is *uenerabilis regina Eadgiuu*. Frankish names in *-o* (*Frodo*, *Dudo*) are treated like *Plato*.

The modern reader is sometimes faced with a dilemma in translating Medieval Latin surnames, especially in England after the Norman Conquest, when there were two vernaculars in use, English and French. For example, is *Johannes filius Stephani* "John Fitzstephen" or "John Stephenson"? Is *Stephanus* "Stephen" or "Etienne"? Is *Johannes Faber* "John Smith" or "Jean Le Fèvre"? Should Irish and Welsh patronymics, expressed in Latin by *filius* plus the genitive, be rendered in English by *O'*, *Mac*, or *ap*? Modern practice varies.

The morphology of place names is even more arbitrary. Some are neuter (*Eboracum*, "York"); many are given feminine terminations in *-ia*, perhaps originally seen as an adjectival ending agreeing with *urbs* or *provincia* understood (e.g. *Cantuarua*, "Canterbury"; *Abandonia*, "Abingdon"). Note the unusual locative *Parisius*, "at Paris." Adjectives derived from placenames are formed in *-ensis* (*Eboracensis*, "of York"). It is common to translate transparent elements: *Fons Clericorum*, "Clerkenwell."

## Syntax

In comparison with the development of the vernacular languages, Medieval Latin syntax shows relatively few changes from its classical ancestor. In the vernaculars, the widespread loss of inflectional endings caused massive dislocation and restructuring: the loss of case endings in both Romance languages and English caused dependence on prepositions and on a more fixed word order. In Latin, however, as noted above, the inflectional system remained intact and there was no internal pressure on the structure of the language. Such changes as there were came from two sources: tendencies already at work in Classical Latin and external forces, often in combination.

1. Already in Classical Latin the subjunctive was extended into all *cum* clauses, even simple temporal ones. In Medieval Latin it was sometimes extended into *dum* clauses, even when they mean "while," e.g. *Aethelwold* (ch. 2): *felix eius genitrix, dum in utero eum haberet, huiuscemodi somnium . . . uidit*.
2. It is a short step from the Classical Latin use of the instrumental gerund (*fugiendo vincimus*) to the Medieval Latin gerund in the ablative of attendant circumstances, e.g. *ambulando loquebamur*, "we talked while walking," which becomes as common as the Classical Latin use of the present participle (*ambulantes loquebamur*). Some uses of the gerund and gerundive seem confused, e.g. Bede (d. 735), *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.13: *Tunc benedixi aquam, et astulam roboris praefati inmittens obtuli egro potandum* (one would expect *potandam* or *ad potandum*).
3. In Classical Latin the perfect passive is formed by *esse* and the past participle (*iussus est*, "he was ordered"); in Medieval Latin the verb *esse* sometimes regains its literal tense, so that *amata est* can mean "she is loved"; consequently, to form the past, past tenses of *esse* are needed (*amata erat/fuit*); this is a natural consequence of the adjectival nature of the past participle.
4. In Classical Latin the infinitive is a neuter indeclinable verbal noun (*hoc ridere meum*, "this laughter of mine"), but it is used only in the nominative or accusative cases. In Medieval Latin its nominal uses are extended; sometimes it is used after a preposition (*pro velle*, "in accordance with one's wish"; *pro posse*, "according to one's ability"); sometimes it is even found in the ablative (*meo videre*, "in my view"). In philosophy, as is well known, the infinitive *esse* is commonly used as a noun ("being"). In Classical Latin the infinitive of purpose is usually found only after verbs of motion, but in some medieval authors it is used more generally.
5. In Classical Latin the past participle is sometimes (though rarely) used predicatively after *habere*: *domitas habere libidines*, "to have one's desires tamed," i.e. "to have tamed one's desires." From this it is an easy step to the French *Je l'ai tué*, "I have killed him." English developed *I have killed him* in the same way, not from French influence but from the senses inherent in *have* and the past participle. When Medieval Latin uses such constructions (*habere* plus perfect participle to form a transitive perfect tense), it is probably in imitation of the vernacular rather than of the rare Classical Latin construction.

Most of the syntactic developments in Medieval Latin arise from the fact that all its users were, by birth, speakers of a vernacular language. While they might learn the inflections of Latin, their mental syntactic structures were English, French, German,

Italian, and so on. Thus they frequently expressed themselves in structures that reflected their native habits, even when using Latin words and inflections.

6. Classical Latin lacked definite and indefinite articles ("the," "a," "an"), though Greek had a definite article. Many medieval writers, accustomed to distinguishing between "man," "the man," and "a man" (French *le/la, un/une*), used forms of *ille* or *ipse* for the definite article and *quidam* for the indefinite; *ipse* is used to translate the Arabic definite article. The definite article usually points to something or someone already mentioned or known to the listener or reader, and *so predictus, prenominatus, memoratus* (all meaning "aforementioned") often mean little more than "the." In grammatical writings, forms of *hic* are used to indicate gender (*hic vir, hec puella, hoc verbum*); this may have been preferred to forms of *ille* as *hic* could be abbreviated to a single letter with a suprascript *i* or *o* or bar through the ascender.

7. Medieval Latin usage of the reflexives *se* and *suus* is often careless by classical standards, e.g. in the *Historia destructionis Troiae* (1287) of Guido delle Colonne: *Quem ut uidit rex, illari uultu suscepti et ab eo causam aduentus sui est gestis honorificis sciscitatus* (that is, the king asked Jason for the reason for Jason's arrival), and *Quem Medea tenui sono uocis furtiuus uerbis alloquitur ut veniente noctis umbraculo securus ad earn accedat* (that is, Medea invited Jason to visit her, not a third person). Another example is from *Flores historiarum* 2.85: *Ipsa die . . . tradidit Deus regem Scotiae Willelmum in manus suas* (that is, into the hands of Henry II, so that *suas* refers neither to God nor to William but to someone mentioned in the previous sentence). Uncertainty over *suus* may account for the frequent use of *proprius* in the same sense, e.g. *Aethelwold* (ch. 2): *quod [vexillum] inclinando se honorifice circumdedit fimbriis propriis inpregnatam* ("the banner, bending itself down, respectfully surrounded the pregnant woman with its streamers").

8. In Classical Latin, reported statements (after verbs of saying, thinking, discovering, etc.) are usually expressed by the accusative and infinitive construction: *Dixi me abiturum esse* ("I said that I was going to leave"), *Comperiit Caesarem iam abisse* ("He discovered that Caesar had already left"). In Greek, such clauses are introduced by the particle/conjunction ὅτι, followed by a finite verb; in the Latin Vulgate Bible, this conjunction is rendered by *quod, quia, or quoniam*, e.g. *Act* 4:13: *comperto quod homines essent sine litteris*; *Act* 3:17: *scio quia per ignorantiam fecistis*; *Act* 3:22: *Moyses quidem dixit: Quoniam prophetam suscitatib vobis Dominus Deus vester*. This use of *quod, quia, and quoniam* to introduce indirect speech quickly spread in Medieval Latin. It was reinforced by the common Classical Latin use of *quod* to begin a noun clause ("the fact that . . .") and later by the influence of the vernacular languages: English introduces such clauses by *that* and French by *que* (itself derived from *quod*), thus increasing the tendency away from the accusative and infinitive construction. There was considerable doubt about whether to use the indicative or the subjunctive in such clauses; the quotations from the *Actus Apostolorum* cited above use both (*fecistis, suscitatib, essent*). Compare also Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.13: *antistes Acca solet referre quia . . . crebro eum (= Uilbrordum) audierit de mirandis . . . narrare, but ibid.* 3.14: *Scio . . . quia non multo tempore uicturus est rex*.

9. Even in Classical Latin, prepositions were being used to give specificity to overworked case endings: duration of time is sometimes expressed by *per* as well as by the simple accusative; specification was particularly necessary with the ablative, which had subsumed the cases of both separation and instrumentality, and *cum* is

sometimes used to indicate the instrument. This tendency continued in Medieval Latin: many medieval vernaculars had begun to lose their own case endings (notably English and French) and relied more heavily on prepositions. Some usages deserve comment: *ad* often means "at," e.g. Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.13: *quae ad reliquias eiusdem reuerentissimi regis . . . gesta fuerint* ("which had been done at the relics of this most reverent king"). Sometimes *ad* is used for the simple dative after verbs of speaking. The range of *de* is extended to include many functions of the genitive and of English "of" and French "de": *capellanus de Colston* ("a chaplain of Colston"), *Bartholomeus de Florentia*; a specifying genitive: *tentas de lardo* ("pledgets of lard"); two phrases in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* seem to understand *aliquid* (resembling French *de*, "some," though there can hardly be a connection): 3.13: *Habeo quidem de ligno, in quo caput eius . . . infixum est* ("Indeed I have some of the wood on which his head was fixed"); 3.15: *misit de oleo in pontum* ("he threw some oil in the sea"). *Iuxta* and *secundum* can both mean "according to (an author)." *Infra* often has the sense of *intra*, e.g. Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia Britonum* (ch. 18): *Brutus . . . naues munit, mulieres et paruulos infra eas iubet manere* ("Brutus . . . orders the women and children to stay inside them"). Prepositional phrases and compounds were common in Classical Latin, but their number increased greatly: e.g. *abinde*, "thereafter, from there" (cf. CL *abhinc, deinde*); *ab olim*, "from long ago"; *ad modicum*, "a little"; *ad tunc*, "then"; *ad statim*, "immediately"; *de facili*, "easily"; *de raro*, "rarely"; *ex tunc*, "from then"; *in breui*, "briefly"; *in antea*, "before"; *per sic ut/quod*, "on condition that."

10. Verbs do not always govern the same cases as in Classical Latin: Isidore, *Etym.* 1.3.4, has *utor* and the accusative: *Hebraei viginti duo elementa litterarum . . . utuntur*; *iubeo* sometimes has the dative; *noceo, doceo*, and *impero* sometimes have the accusative. Impersonal verbs of feeling such as *pudet, penitet, piget*, etc., vary in the case of the person.

11. Conjunctions are much as in Classical Latin. *Licet* becomes very common for "although," introducing clauses (in the subjunctive) and modifying nouns, adjectives, and adverbs. To introduce purpose or final clauses (in addition to Classical Latin *ut* or *qui* and subjunctive) Medieval Latin uses *quatinus* and *quo* (which in Classical Latin required a comparative) and the subjunctive. *Quominus* is often used for "lest" (Classical Latin *ne*) for negative purpose and does not have to be introduced by a verb of preventing. *Quod*, "that" (for Classical Latin *ut*), is very commonly used to introduce result clauses after *sic, ita, in tantum*, etc.

12. Some auxiliary verbs extend their syntactic range. *Habeo* may be used to form the perfect tense (see no. 5 above) and also, as sometimes in Classical Latin, with infinitive to express "have to, be obliged to." In imitation of English "will," *volo* plus infinitive sometimes forms a future tense. *Valeo* is more common than in Classical Latin as an auxiliary equivalent to *possum*, "be able."

13. Some Medieval Latin writers were inexact in their use of tenses; this imprecision was encouraged in Germanic areas, since Germanic languages (e.g. Old English) used the past tense to cover the past, whether imperfect, perfect, or pluperfect. Two passages from the *Cnutonis gesta regis* (*Encomium Emmae*) illustrate this:

2.11: *Tunc uictores sua leti uictoria, transacta iam nocte plus media, pernoctant quod supererat inter mortuorum cadauera.* ("Then the victors . . . spend what remained of the night. . .")

2.20: Ingressus monasteria et susceptus cum magna honorificencia, humiliter incedebat, et mira cum reuerentia, in terram defixus lumina, et ubertim fundens lacrimarum ut ita dicam flumina, tota intentione sanctorum expetiit suffragia. ("... he was walking humbly and ... sought the support of the saints.")

This imprecision is also seen in uses of the subjunctive: *Aethelwold* (ch. 11): *nisi fouea eum susciperet, totus quassaretur* ("if the ditch had not caught him, he would have been entirely crushed"). In dependent clauses the moods and tenses often shift alarmingly, as in *Aethelwold* (ch. 26):

En fateor plane quod non facile mihi occurrit scribere quanta uel qualia sanctus Atheluuoldus *perpessus sit* pro monachis et cum monachis, et quam benignus *extitit* erga studiosos et oboedientes, aut quanta in structura monasterii *elaboraret*, ... aut quam peruigil *erat* in orationibus, et quam benigne *ortabatur* fratres ad confessionem.

14. Sometimes we see a nominative absolute construction instead of the expected ablative, e.g. *Gospel of Nicodemus* 16.3:

Tunc Annas et Cayfas sequestratos eos ab inuicem interrogantes singillatim, unanimiter ueritatem dixerunt uidisse se Iesum ascendentem in caelum. ("Then, Annas and Caiphas questioning them [the Jews] ... , they [the Jews] said the truth, that they had seen Jesus ascending into heaven.")

Sometimes the ablative absolute is used inappropriately, as in these quotations from commentaries in two British Library manuscripts (Harley 1808 and Cotton Claudius D.VII):

Quo reuerso omnes aduersarios suos occidit et fugauit. ("When he [Ethelbert] had returned, he [Ethelbert] killed all his enemies ... ")

Arthuro letaliter uulnerato, Constantino cognato suo filio Cadoris ducis Cornubie dyadema Britannie concessit. ("When Arthur had been fatally wounded, he [Arthur] gave the crown ... to Constantine ... ")

15. The ablative absolute, with the noun element a *quod* clause ("the fact that ..."), developed especially in bureaucratic Latin, so that *considerato quod* ... means "the fact that ... having been considered, considering the fact that ..."; similarly, *dato quod* ("given that ...") (see ch. DC). The verb *excipio* in Medieval Latin came to mean "to take out of consideration," particularly in the past participle, e.g. Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.17: *nil propriae possessionis, excepta ecclesia sua et adiacentibus agellis, habens* ("having no property of his own, except his church and the adjacent fields"); from this arose another quasi conjunction, *excepto quod*, "except for the fact that." Some other legal and semilegal expressions give rise to new English prepositions: *durante bello*, "while the war lasts, during the war"; *pendente lite*, "while the suit is in process, pending the (outcome of) the litigation."

16. It is mainly in vocabulary that we see the specialized languages of professions, trades, and crafts, but there is one legal syntactic idiom of interest: *facit ad* is used to indicate the support given by a *quod* clause (subject of *facit*) to a proposition governed by *ad*: *faciat ad predicta quod statim tangam in ultima responsione* ("let what I shall say immediately in the final reply give support to what has been said above"); *ad quod bene facit quod scribit Augustinus* ("this is fully supported by what Augustine writes").

Of the syntactic usages listed previously, some are natural developments of Classical Latin syntax; some seem to have been prompted or at least encouraged by vernacular usages. The latter form part of the "substratum theory," that Latin was modified according to the native language of the speaker or writer. Sometimes a substratum is fairly clear, but more often a Medieval Latin development can be seen to be endemic to Indo-European languages. The development of the definite article happens in such widely different languages as Classical Greek and late Old English. The perfect in *have* and the past participle arises independently in French and English and is also inchoate even in Classical Latin. The use of "prepositions" to clarify the function of case endings happened independently in English and French in response to the weakening of the endings, but was already at work in Classical Latin. Nearly every substrate idiom that has been proposed can be shown to have some antecedent in Classical Latin. For instance, *habeo* plus infinitive, "be obliged to," seems certain to arise from English "have to," but in fact has parallels in Classical Latin. Sometimes Latin texts that have been translated from other languages render their sources somewhat literally, but even here conclusions must be drawn carefully: in translations from Arabic, *ipse* is used to translate the Arabic definite article, but as *ipse* (along with *ille* and *iste*) was coming into use as a definite article in French and English Latin, an Arabic influence is not absolutely certain.

### *Ungrammatical Latin*

Although the forms and usages described above might distress a modern classicist, they are quite common—sometimes even the norm—for most Latin writings of the Middle Ages. The degree of classicism would depend merely on the extent to which a writer was familiar with, and eager to imitate, classical style. The medieval usages would not even be noticed by, let alone horrify, the normal educated medieval reader—any more than a modern American notices "Americanisms" in English. There are some texts, however, in which the rules of concord, case, tense, and mood are disregarded so completely that they can be described as almost grammarless. Often their information has simply been latinized by someone who knew some Latin—enough to give the impression that what the author wished to report was now encoded in the universal language, but not enough to satisfy normal linguistic criteria. Both care and flexibility are needed in the translation of such texts. They are valuable reminders that not everyone in the Middle Ages who could read and write was ipso facto a latinist: in some cases (as in pre-Carolingian Germany) the fault lay with community standards, but any age could produce a poor latinist; perhaps the clerk who failed the Latin examination mentioned above went on to write documents in this fashion.

### *Summary*

Medieval Latin was a synthetic language in an analytic world. In a synthetic language, the functions and relationship of words are indicated by inflections, and since Latin was always learned from teachers and books it retained its synthetic nature artificially. Nevertheless, in the Middle Ages it existed in a world of analytic languages, in which the meaning of a sentence is indicated primarily by word order rather than by inflections. As Latin was not just read and written but also spoken (in monaster-

ies and universities), its synthetic nature was constantly under pressure from its analytic users. Very slowly—unless checked—it began to imitate the linguistic structures of its speakers. In extreme reaction to this tendency, some writers, especially schoolteachers, affected a very tortuous and elaborate style. On a different level, the syntax of Latin (as the language of record) became rigid and formulaic, in order to codify and perpetuate certain types of utterance, such as land transfers, letters of appointment, and the like: as in modern do-it-yourself forms for wills, all the user had to do was to insert names and the other variables. (For this type of expression, see chs. DC–DG).

Paradoxically, it was the rise of the vernaculars that led to the "classicization" of Latin. As French, Italian, English, etc., became the normal languages of communication in government, law, religion, and science, and as literacy increased among lay people, Latin retreated into the schoolroom. It became the object of scrutiny and scholarship rather than a tool of normal communication; thus, free from the pressures to change, it was in a position to be "purified" by the humanists. As Medieval Latin had never had a codified grammar, it was to the established standards of Classical Latin that the humanists returned. Although some medievalisms remained in the writings of some humanists (see ch. CH), Latin style and syntax gradually began to aim at the model of Cicero, and it is on the latinity of the late Roman Republic and early Empire that modern grammars of Latin have been based.

### **Select Bibliography**

By "grammar," in the present context, we mean a book describing grammatical forms (mainly inflections) and syntactical patterns or "rules"—books such as B.H. Kennedy, *The Revised Latin Primer*, ed. and rev. J. Mountford (1962, r1976) [CC1], or B.L. Gildersleeve and G. Lodge, *Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar*, 3rd ed. (1895; numerous reprintings) [CC2], or J.B. Greenough *et al.*, *Allen and Greenough's New Latin Grammar* (1888, r1983) [CC3]. In this sense of the word, no one has yet written a comprehensive grammar of Medieval Latin. In my opinion, no attempt to do so will be made, or should be made—not because it would be extremely difficult, but because it would give a shape to the idea of a single language, something that never existed. A grammar implies a language that was shared by a definable community, but the medieval "community" that used Latin was spread all across Europe and lasted for over 1,000 years. The spoken and written forms of this community varied considerably, by date, region, and function. The only agreed common denominator was a written standard, but any attempt to describe this "written standard" would at best reflect the grammars of Donatus and Priscian from the fourth and sixth centuries (see ch. DI), which themselves reflected the literary language of what we call "Classical Latin." Later deviations in morphology and syntax from this "standard"—between 500 and 1400—came from a variety of sources, from the idioms of the Vulgate and Christian Latin (see ch. DA), from new forms of expression peculiar to specific linguistic areas (administration, philosophy, theology, technology, science, etc.), but above all from simple failure to observe the old rules. Such deviations were not mutually recognized, and so did not constitute a language, though a few specialist

philologists noted them. Generally speaking, if medieval writers of Latin had been so sensitive to language as to notice deviations from ancient grammar as described by Donatus and Priscian, they would not (like modern linguists) record them as new developments but would simply mark them as solecisms or blunders—unless, of course, they were biblical, and so above the rules of mortal grammarians.

Several books and studies purport to give a linguistic history of Medieval Latin. Some concentrate on developments in Vulgar Latin that led to the vernacular Romance languages (e.g. D. Norberg, *MPLM* [CC4]). This approach is perfectly legitimate, but does not address the ordinary Latin that arose from the learned tradition, e.g. the latinity of papal letters, Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153), Walter Map (d. 1209–10), and so on. The only successful enterprises in the description of Medieval Latin grammar are studies of the usage of specific authors or in limited collections of documents or texts from a particular period or region, e.g. P.L.D. Reid, *Tenth-Century Latinity: Rather of Verona* (1981) [CC5]. A small selection of similar studies is listed here, and the reader is also referred to the bibliographies on specific topics in this volume.

M.A. Adams, *The Latinity of the Letters of Saint Ambrose* (1927) [CC6].

J. Bastardas Perera, *Particularidades sintácticas del latín medieval (cartularios españoles de los siglos VIII al XI)* (1953) [CC7].

M. Bonnet, *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours* (1890, r1968) [CC8].

P.B. Corbett, *The Latin of the Regula Magistri, with Particular Reference to Its Colloquial Aspects* (1958) [CC9].

D.R. Druhan, *The Syntax of Bede's Historia ecclesiastica* (1938) [CC10].

G.H. Freed, *The Latinity of the Vitae Sancti Bonifatii Archiepiscopi Moguntini* (1926) [CC11].

H.J.E. Goelzer, *Étude lexicographique et grammaticale de la latinité de Saint Jérôme* (1884) [CC12].

M. Hoonhout, *The Latinity of the Poems of Hrabanus Maurus* (1936) [CC13].

P. Hoonhout, *Het Latijn van Thomas van Celano, Biograf van Sint Franciscus* (1947) [CC14].

C.C. Mierow, "Medieval Latin Vocabulary, Usage, and Style: as Illustrated by the *Philobiblon* (1345) of Richard de Bury," in *CPh* 25 (1930) 343–57 [CC15].

L.B. Mitchell, *The Latinity of John de Trokelowe and of Henry of Blanford* (1932) [CC16].

E.M. Newman, *The Latinity of the Works of Hrotsvit of Gandersheim* (1939) [CC17].

A. Önnersfors, ed., *MP*: reprinted studies, including O. Haag, "Die Latinität Fredegars" [1898], pp13–87; D. Norberg, "Die Entwicklung des Lateins in Italien von Gregor dem Großen bis Paulus Diaconus" [1958], pp88–105; U. Westerbergh, "Über die Sprache des Chronicon Salernitanum" [1956], pp106–91; E. Voigt, "Die Sprache im 'Ysengrimus' des Nivard von Gent" [1884] pp192–211; U. Kindermann, "Sprache und Stil in der 'Consolatio de morte amici' des Laurentius von Durham" [1969] pp231–241; F. Blatt, "Einleitung zu einen Wörterbuch über die Latinität Saxos" [1957] pp242–60; P. Klopsch, "Die Sprache des Pseudo-Ovidischen Gedichts 'De vetula'" [1967] pp261–82. Includes very useful, indexed bibliography (pp425–55, 456–62 [index]) of studies of medieval latinity by region, author, text [cc18]. For a recent bibliography of "Hibernian Latin" see T. Halton, "Early Christian Ireland's Contacts with the Mediterranean World to c. 650," in *Cristianesimo e specificità regionali nel Mediterraneo latino (sec.*

*IV–VI): XXII Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Roma, 6–8 maggio 1993 (1994) 616–17 [CC19].*

G.W. Regenos, *The Latinity of the Epistolae of Lupus of Ferrières* (1936) [CC20].

L.F. Sas, *The Noun Declension System in Merovingian Latin* (1937) [CC21].

P. Taylor, *The Latinity of the Liber historiae Francorum* (1924) [CC22].

J. Vielliard, *Le latin des diplômes royaux et chartes privées de l'époque mérovingienne* (1927) [CC23].

Many other such studies have been published in the series *Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva: Studia ad sermonem Latinum Christianum pertinentia* (Nijmegen 1932–) [CC24], and in The Catholic University of America's *Patristic Studies* (Washington 1922–), e.g. [CC6] [CC25], and its *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin Language and Literature* (Washington 1933–), e.g. [CC10] [CC26].