# CD—
# Vocabulary, Word Formation, and Lexicography

By Richard Sharpe

The word hoard of Medieval Latin has never been effectively compassed in a dictionary. The reasons for this are various. First among them is the geographical spread of Latin, as a spoken and written language in the Romance language area, as a second language where the first language had no Latin basis, and as a strictly learned language used as an international medium. Another reason is the readiness of Medieval Latin to admit new words or to readmit words fallen from use, to change the meaning of words, and to form new words from Latin building blocks. This openness extended to words from the first languages of those who used Latin as a second language, whether that was Irish or Finnish or Hungarian. The way in which Latin was used allowed for new formations or loans to be created almost at will, giving a very wide range of words between those permanently part of the word hoard and mere nonce words. Third, Latin has a very long history, and throughout the Middle Ages the texts of earlier generations were read and studied; taste could lead at one period to novelty and experiment in the use of words, and at another to a preference for the vocabulary of older and more respected authors. Fourth, the medieval use of Latin for a thousand years, through so much of Europe and for all literate purposes, produced a vast body of texts, preserving examples of all the richness and variety of the language. This would not in itself be an obstacle to the making of a comprehensive dictionary, if the language itself were not so fluid and versatile; but because of its openness to new word formations within Latin and new borrowings from outside, Medieval Latin requires that the compilers of dictionaries go through texts of all types, on all subjects, from all areas and all periods. It is not surprising, therefore, that a comprehensive dictionary has eluded us. Almost none of the modern dictionaries covers the whole alphabet, but for basic purposes it is possible to get by with a good dictionary of Classical Latin [CD17–19] and a selective dictionary of Medieval Latin [CD22]. Some skill is involved in getting the best out of any dictionary.

The classical language has a limited word hoard—the vocabulary used by approved authors over a period of less than 300 years, from Lucretius to the younger Pliny. From the end of the classical period very many words not used by classical authors are seen in the works of a wide range of authors. Some of these usages can be found in preclassical writers such as Plautus, but they were avoided by those authors preserved as the classical canon. Thus *delicia* or *facetia* are used in the singular by

Plautus and by Aulus Gellius, but in the classical period both words are used only in the plural form; medieval usage commonly retained the plural *deliciae,* but *facetia* became normal. In Late Latin, therefore, one aspect of the changing word hoard is the use in polite literature of colloquialisms, avoided by the best authors for several generations but always there in ordinary use. The formation of new words by the productive use of prefixes and suffixes had probably been going on in ordinary Latin through the classical period, but it becomes visible only at the point when the literary language shakes off the formal constraints of classical taste. The eleventh-century manuscript of Tacitus's *Annales* offers a single example of *exspectabilis* (*Ann.* 16.21), where editors, no doubt correctly, prefer *spectabilis;* the word is not otherwise recorded before Tertullian, and the prosthetic *e-* (perceived as *ex-*) before *s* + consonant is a vulgarism in Late Latin (cf. French *école < sc(h)ola*), introduced into the text of Tacitus only by a later copyist.

From the fifth century to the eighth century in the area where Latin was normally spoken, Late Latin was highly productive of new words. Phonetic changes were also under way, part of the process that led to a diversity of Romance languages, and some of these are evident in written Latin. Again, the invasion of the Roman world by Germanic peoples brought new institutions and new words for them, borrowed from the different Germanic vernaculars. Common words such as *feuum* (only later *feodum*), *uadium, warniso,* and *werra* entered the Latin word hoard in this period.

Within one or two generations around the end of the eighth century and the beginning of the ninth, Latin came to be perceived as different from the Romance vernaculars; as the spoken languages established their own orthography to reflect their different forms and sounds, so the boundaries of Latin became firmer [CD42–43]. During the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, new formations and loanwords are less conspicuous as a feature of the ordinary language, though a new avenue was opened for literary borrowings, often from Greek, to emphasize the learned character of Latin as distinct from the vernacular languages derived from Latin. From the end of the eleventh century, gradually, a change becomes apparent in the language. Latin was used by a widening range of writers for a widening range of purposes, so that more registers of Latin writing become visible in the twelfth century. By the thirteenth century this is very marked.

It is possible to detect a different attitude to word formation and the borrowing of words in the different registers. To pick out only three examples, one may say that stylish prose—papal and episcopal letters, for example—continues the habits of the best twelfth-century writers, drawing on ancient and patristic authors for their vocabulary. Academic prose has become linguistically more mundane, but the School-men produced countless new latinate words and usages to meet their new needs. So, for example, *ens,* "a being," has the appearance of being the present participle of Classical Latin *sum, esse,* but it was always used as a noun; this in turn was made more abstract by the addition of *-itas,* Medieval Latin *entitas,* "the quality that makes a being a being." And as Classical Latin *qualitas* derived from *qualis,* so Medieval Latin *quidditas* was derived from *quid.* The increasing use of the written word for everyday needs in the thirteenth century meant that more and more Latin was written by clerks of very limited education, who relied much more heavily on the vernacular and especially on the close relationship between French and Latin.

In previous centuries deeds had often been written by such people, but deeds by their nature made limited demands on vocabulary. The writing of domestic and agri-

cultural accounts or the recording of proceedings in the courts demanded a very wide vocabulary, and this produced a heavy traffic in new formations. This is very conspicuous in England from about 1200. Some of these new words can very easily be described as loanwords, from English, for example, into Latin. But in thirteenth-century England, French, and more specifically Anglo-French, was the first language of many clerks, and the formation of Latin words from French cannot always be seen strictly as a loan. The connection between Latin and French was sufficiently perspicuous that many writers could find the correct Latin stem in the French word and add a Latin suffix to it. So, for example, Late Latin *cambium, excambium* (that same prosthetic *e*-), gave Old French *cange, change, escange, eschange,* "exchange, change"; from the eleventh century on we find the word latinized as *cangium, changia* [sic], *escangium, excangium, scangium;* and alongside these forms, the knowledge of the Latin stem *camb-* reasserts itself, *escambium, eschambium, exchambium, scambium,* and similar forms. The form *eschambium* is essentially Medieval Latin *excambium* influenced by French, *escangium* is Latin formed from French, and *excangium* is the latter influenced again by Latin. In this last form, the writer knows that where French words begin *esc-* or *esch-* Latin has *ex-,* but he does not recall the more correct Latin *excambium.*

All of this sets a demanding agenda for the lexicographer, but before going on to consider how the task has been handled, I propose briefly to consider how dictionaries themselves developed in the Middle Ages [CD44–48].

Dictionaries as we know them were invented in medieval Europe, but they have their origin in two separate traditions that go back to the ancient world. Glossaries, explaining the meaning of difficult words as they occurred in texts, were compiled for Latin speakers learning to read Greek texts; and for both languages specialist glossaries of medical terms and such like were in circulation. Glossaries of this kind fall out of use in the sixth century. The second tradition was the aspect of grammar that sought to understand the inner meaning of words from their etymology and by this means to relate words derived (or thought to be derived) from the same origin. A third tradition, not directly connected but often overlapping with that of lexicography, produced encyclopedias. In the early Middle Ages the most important was the *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville, which was written in the 630s and came to be very widely distributed. Isidore actually devoted the wholle of bk. 10 to a dictionary organized etymologically in the grammatical tradition.

In the early Middle Ages, glossaries served an elementary need for people learning to use Latin. In those parts of Europe where Vulgar Latin continued to be spoken, schools were concerned to teach correct Latin grammar, but in the British Isles and Germany teaching had to begin at a more elementary level. A teacher might gloss a text, writing the meaning of difficult words between the lines, and the most elementary glossaries are no more than collections of such glosses—individual words from the text together with the gloss, copied out in order as they occur in the text so that the glossary could be used by another reader. Such "batch glosses" [CD1] soon led to glossaries arranged according to their initial letter, words beginning with *A, B,* and so on, in the order of the alphabet. Between the seventh and the thirteenth centuries glossaries evolved very slowly towards full alphabetical order [CD2].

The tenth-century Latin–Latin/English glossary in British Library MS Harley 3376 [CD3] illustrates several aspects of how glossaries developed. Words are mostly arranged by the first three letters, *ere-, eri-, eru-, erp-,* but not in full alphabetical or-

der, and some words are out of sequence: *erga* and *ergenna* are 30 entries apart. Some of these keywords are in the inflected forms as they occurred in the texts from which the glosses were extracted, as *erugine* .i. *rubigine*. Others are entered under the form chosen to illustrate the inflection of the word—nominative singular, present infinitive, or whatever. This form is termed the lemma, and *erigor* stands as the lemma for all the inflected forms of the word which together make up the lexeme or unit of vocabulary. The glosses, in both Latin and English, sometimes translate the word specifically as appropriate to the context from which it has been taken and sometimes in a wider, more general way, but there is no attempt to show the range of different meanings of a word. Some of these glosses are derived from batch glossaries on individual texts, some from earlier more general glossaries, but there is no system.

The first fully recognizable dictionary was compiled in Italy before 1050, Papias's *Elementarium doctrinae rudimentum* [CD4]. He sets out his principles very precisely in a long preface. His alphabetical order is based on the first three letters, though he is aware that spelling could be inconsistent, as between *hyena* and *iena*. He adds some important new features. First, he recognizes that the lemma cannot always indicate the grammatical status of a lexeme, so he adds an indication of gender, declension, or conjugation; he also proposes to mark long vowels in cases where this is not obvious. He is also the first to mention authors or texts as the authorities from which words are taken. Papias's book proved very successful, and more than a hundred manuscript copies survive.

The grammatical tradition, on the other hand, was concerned to show that a particular root could produce a verb, an agent noun, a verbal noun, participles used as adjectives, and so on; with prefixes its meaning could be changed in a variety of ways. This principle of *deriuatio* was pushed beyond obvious connections to associate words of similar form and meaning but with no philological connection: scientific etymology is a nineteenth-century development. The earliest example of a treatise on *deriuationes* was put together by Osbern Pinnock, a monk of Gloucester, in the mid-twelfth century [CD5]. It is much less easy to use than Papias, but it aspires to understand the basis of meaning by showing the etymological relationship between different lexemes. These are grouped in paragraphs hung on primary words; these paragraphs are arranged in no particular order except as essays on each letter of the alphabet. For each letter there is an exotically phrased preface, a series of *deriuationes,* and then *repetitiones,* lists of words and meanings with very little attempt at alphabetical order. Two features of Osbern's work are significant in the progress of lexicography. He replaced Papias's symbols for gender, declension, etc., with a system based on the termination of inflected forms; so, for example, the first and second conjugation verbs *dico, -are* and *dico, -ere* are given as "dico, cas" and "dico, cis." More importantly, he includes quotations from authorities to illustrate the use or meaning of words, and his reading was influenced by the desire to make his collection as full as possible. Thus he quotes Plautus several hundred times as evidence for preclassical Latin words that were no longer in active use; he is the first medieval author to show any familiarity with Plautus, and his interest lay in using him as a quarry for rare words [CD6].

Osbern's work is known from about thirty medieval copies, including an early one from Dore Abbey, now in Hereford Cathedral Library, MS P.v.5 (twelfth/thirteenth century), which was annotated in the early thirteenth century by a reader,

John of Bath; the work lent itself to expansion. Indeed, before the end of the twelfth century Hugutio of Pisa had merged some of the methods of Papias and Osbern into a new dictionary [CD7]. It is perhaps surprising that Hugutio did not take over the *ABC*-order of Papias but used only a rudimentary *A*-order, and added further difficulty by incorporating additional words out of sequence. In spite of these drawbacks Hugutio's work proved very successful, and some two hundred manuscript copies are known today. To overcome difficulties in consulting the work, Petrus de Alingio and others in the thirteenth century compiled alphabetical finding lists sometimes copied with Hugutio. In due course a complete revision of the work was produced in 1286, the *Catholicon* of Ioannes Balbus Ianuensis (John of Genoa), which used full alphabetical order [CD9]. Although manuscript copies of this are not as common as those of Hugutio, the *Catholicon* served as the basis for future work and was the first Latin dictionary to be printed, at Mainz in 1459/60, perhaps by Gutenberg.

The works of Papias, Osbern, Hugutio, and John of Genoa were not intended for readers in the first stages of learning Latin. They were treatises on the language which could be used for reference by intermediate students. Archbishop John Pecham, for example, in 1284 ordered that copies of Papias and Hugutio be provided at Merton College in Oxford so that the scholars could extend their Latin vocabulary (*RSer* 67.3:813). He also required a copy of William Brito's more advanced *Expositiones difficiliorum uerborum,* compiled in the 1260s, which uses the dictionaries and a wide range of classical, patristic, and modern authorities to explain some 2,500 words from the Latin Bible [CD10].

For the elementary learner a different sort of guide was necessary, and in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries we see a wide distribution of textbooks used for elementary purposes [CD11]. Among these there stand out a few that were designed to introduce a broad range of vocabulary, organized by subject but presented as continuous prose. Such works, written by Adam of Balsham, Alexander Neckam, and John of Garland, served as pegs for glosses explaining the Latin words in the vernacular. They provided students and clerks with a great deal of everyday Latin vocabulary (see ch. DL). Towards the end of the Middle Ages simple vocabulary lists, often organized by subject, seem to have become more popular as the elementary aids in acquiring a sufficient knowledge of Latin vocabulary for these purposes [CD12]. Lexical aids, whether continuous text with gloss or simple glossaries, stand far apart from the medieval lexicographical tradition. They can also be a snare for the modern lexicographer, because words often pass from glossary to glossary without ever appearing in ordinary use. Latham's *Word-List* [CD34] stigmatizes such forms with a double dagger. We should not assume that students really learned all the wide vocabulary offered in such works.

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries saw great changes in the status of Latin. Medieval Latin came to be despised as "rusty" (*rubiginosus*), and the dictionaries, from Ambrogio Calepino onwards, were intended to help users of Latin write "better" Latin. The truly medieval element was left to the antiquaries [CD13–14]. The dictionary which dominated the field in Medieval Latin for two hundred and fifty years was compiled by a learned French aristocrat, Charles Du Fresne, Sieur Du Cange (1610–88) [CD15–16], whose work was closely associated with the Benedictine historical scholars at Saint-Germain, Dom Jean Mabillon and his colleagues and successors. Du Cange was primarily concerned with medieval society and institutions; though he used the form of a dictionary rather than an encyclopedia, his interests

were historical rather than linguistic. Thus the entries for *annus* and *moneta* are in fact essays on chronology and numismatics. Even by the standards of the seventeenth century, his work was very weak on the philological side, but his reading was voluminous and the usefulness of the result was the basis of its success. He himself published a revised and augmented text, and in the eighteenth century one of Mabillon's successors, Dom Pierre Carpentier, produced a four-volume supplement to the six volumes of Du Cange's glossary. In the nineteenth century the glossary and supplement were merged to produce the dictionary most familar to modern medievalists as "Du Cange." By then lexicography was developing into a much more rigorous discipline; by the time Du Cange was last reset in the 1880s it was clearly obsolete, but the task of replacing it with a modern dictionary of Medieval Latin was too daunting even for that age of enterprise.

Two features of modern lexicography, which advanced greatly in the nineteenth century, were etymology—establishing by philological methods the origins of words—and historical semantics—the classification of senses in a way that illustrates the changing meanings of a word and its extension into new senses. Modern methods also require that a good dictionary be based on a systematic reading of the texts that provide its linguistic foundation. This may be achieved by sampling rather than by comprehensive excerpting, but, before relying on any dictionary, the user needs to know on what range of texts it is founded.

The foundations of the modern dictionaries were laid in the 1920s; decisions taken then have determined the shape of our reference books even today. Proposals for a new Medieval Latin dictionary had been made in the 1880s [CD49–51], but it was only in 1920 that a scheme was adopted for a collaborative project involving the national academies of the countries of Europe. It evolved as a three-tier project: each country should produce a dictionary based on its national sources; overarching these there should be a single dictionary for the period of greatest unity in Medieval Latin usage, a period which was eventually agreed as A.D. 800 to 1200; for the more technical branches of knowledge there should be specialist dictionaries. Different countries set to work with little coordination, so that now we have a range of national dictionaries based on quite different principles [CD25–41]. The Italian dictionary, very restricted in scale, focused only on the earlier Middle Ages; the German dictionary, though based on an extensive body of sources, excluded texts from the end of the thirteenth century. And naturally, progress was better where the task was smaller. The only national dictionaries that have reached completion even now are those based on sources from Finland and Croatia, both small-scale tasks. Of the larger-scale projects, the furthest advanced are those of Poland and the Netherlands. The German dictionary is far behind, and there are no dictionaries even in progress that attempt to survey the Latin vocabulary of medieval France, Italy, or Spain. Only the British dictionary attempts to cover the whole of the Middle Ages, from Late Latin authors such as Gildas and Aldhelm to the humanists in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. It is fortunate that the French language was so important in medieval England, because the British dictionary is the best available source for the interaction between Latin and the Romance vernaculars in the later Middle Ages. The supranational dictionary, *Novum glossarium mediae latinitatis* [CD24], began publication in 1957 with a draft of the letter *L;* and work has now proceeded as far as the letter *P*. Among all the available dictionaries, it is still very difficult to get an overview for words that do not begin with a letter near the start of the alphabet. For words to-

wards the end of the alphabet there is almost nothing available, more than seventy years after the commencement of the project.

To get the best out of dictionaries, the user must be reasonably well acquainted with the way they are put together. The first need is to decide which dictionary will best serve one's purposes. For reading a text written in Germany before the end of the thirteenth century or in medieval England, obviously the national dictionary will answer any questions about the meaning of words, providing full illustration so that one can form a sense of the semantic range of the word. For words too late in the alphabet, then the classical dictionaries and a dictionary such as *Niermeyer* [CD22] may serve. For other purposes, it may be more appropriate to consider the examples quoted in all the national dictionaries, looking for whether a word is in universal use or is peculiar to a particular area. The user needs enough linguistic knowledge to recognize where a different national dictionary will be useless or where it may be better to go to the dictionary of the underlying vernacular language. For words towards the end of the alphabet, there are few dictionaries available, and the answering of complex semantic questions will depend on going directly to the primary sources.

Medieval Latin presents some problems to the lexicographer that are quite different from those of Classical Latin.

First, there may be a problem in how to spell the lemma under which words should be entered. Papias recognized this problem in citing the straightforward medieval spelling *iena* alongside Classical Latin *hy(a)ena*. Initial *h-* was not regarded as a letter—it can come and go at will; but this may produce some confusion in the reader's mind between, for example, Classical Latin *hora* and CL *ora*, CL *hostium* and CL *ostium*. By the twelfth century the diphthongs *ae* and *oe* had both become simply *e;* so in the infinitive and in some tenses CL *caedere* and CL *cedere* become homographs. In such cases classical orthography will be the guide to choosing the lemma. Similarly, Medieval Latin *caenouectorium,* "dung-cart, wheel-barrow," will be so spelt, even though it is nowhere recorded until after the diphthong *ae* had become *e,* because to do otherwise would be to divorce it from its root, CL *caenum,* "mud, filth." The question of whether the letters *i* and *j* or *u* and *v* should be differentiated will affect the placing of words. The medieval fluctuation between *c-* and *ch-*likewise, or the indifference to whether certain words should be written with *f* or *ph,* can drastically affect the order of entries. The dictionary compiled in the Netherlands has adopted some practical solutions: the diphthongs *ae* and *oe* are so printed but alphabetized as *e, h-* is disregarded, *y* is treated as *i, c-* and *ch-* are merged, *ph-* is merged with *f-,* and so on. This produces a sequence that is logical but not alphabetical; for example, [1]*cestus,* [2]*caestus, caesura, ceterus,* [1]*coetus,* [2]*cetus, ceu, keurmede, cyaneus, ciara, chiasma, chiasmus.* The British dictionary, on the other hand, tries to follow etymology. Both systems in their different ways require the user to understand the variables of medieval spelling (see ch. CB).

Papias's other example, the writing of Classical Latin *uerbena* as *berbena,* reflects a phonetic rather than an orthographic variation; indeed, it represents what one can almost call a dialectal variation in Late Latin. The treatment of *w-* in Late Latin as *g-* or *gu-* in Medieval Latin is a more significant variation, for it represents a real phonetic development. Late Latin *uadium,* "pledge, wage," was borrowed from Germanic early enough for the sound \w\ to be represented by Latin *u;* words entering Latin later will be written with *uu* or *w,* and still later with *gu* or (in England) *g*. So *warda* can be written *guarda* or *garda* at different dates, and English has preserved

the word in both forms, "ward" and "guard." In choosing where to enter such words, the lexicographer may have regard to the date at which the word is first used or to etymological relationships—with possibly different results. In the British dictionary such words are treated under *W* as a matter of policy, though cross-references are provided from all the recorded spellings.

The same word may be written in quite different spellings, quite different words may be spelled the same. In reading a text, sense will usually determine whether "oram" is from *hora* or *ora.* This is a matter of spelling, but there are also true homographs, different words always spelled the same. Etymology can differentiate homographs, even where medieval authors were unaware of the difference: thus Medieval Latin *flos, -ris,* "flowers, menstrual flow," was probably regarded as the same word as Classical Latin *flos,* "flower," which had a wide range of other meanings; but this has arisen from the similarity of Old French *flor,* "flower," < CL *flos,* and OF *flor,* "flux, discharge," < CL *fluor.* Pairs of this kind can also arise erroneously, for example: [CD33], s.v. 2 *hereditare,* **C1112** "spreuerii, falcones, et ostorii ibi hereditantes"; *hereditantes* here means "nesting," a mistaken latinization from Anglo-French *eir,* "heir," when the clerk was seeking to latinize AF *eire,* "nest," from which came Medieval Latin *aëriare* (of which there are no examples before the thirteenth century).

Classical Latin *galea,* "helmet," is obviously a different word from Medieval Latin *galea,* "galley." Because of the way in which Medieval Latin picks up words from its immediate surroundings, it is of more importance to look to the nearest possible source of the word rather than to its ultimate source. There is another word, Medieval Latin *galida,* which has the same sense as ML *galea,* "galley"; both words first appear in Crusade contexts in the twelfth century and may be presumed to derive from a Middle Eastern language. *Galida* is probably closest to that; Old French tends to lose *-d-,* whence OF *galee,* from which Medieval Latin *galea* and Middle English *galei* were both derived. On the basis of immediate source, therefore, ML *galida* and ML *galea* are different lemmata. It is very common to find pairs comprising a Latin word (of whatever period) and a medieval usage latinized from the Old French derivative of the original word: so CL *cauea* > OF *cage* > ML *cagia;* CL *fetus* > Provençal *fedon,* alongside which we find ML *feto* > OF *feon, faon,* "fawn" > ML *feo, fao.*

The link between the French word and its Latin source may be invisible. The common word, ML *homagium,* was formed from OF *homage,* which in turn can be derived from Late Latin * *hominaticum;* this is only arrived at by putting together the obvious stem *homo, hominis,* and the suffix *-aticus,* which became *-age* in French. Knowledge of the relationship to *homo* gave rise to more etymological forms in Medieval Latin, *hominagium* and *homanagium* (cf. AF *omenage*), though these are rare in comparison. Medieval Latin *homagium* was part of the permanent word hoard; *hominagium* may have been an occasional formation by someone conscious of the Latin root. The rare form *feodelitas* is similar but reflects a false etymology: the writer is latinizing from AF *fedeilte,* OF *fealte,* "fealty," < CL *fidelitas;* not recognizing the true derivation, users have associated the word with feudal tenure and guessed at *feodum* as the root.

The capacity to form Latin words at will could produce a wide diversity of forms. An extreme case of this is *garillum,* "barricade," common in England; it has no obvious etymology in Latin, though the immediate source must be Anglo-French *garoil,* of which a single example is recorded in the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* [DL5], though the word must have been in common use. In Latin use the word has no con-

sistent form, varying in spelling, phonetics, declension, and gender; its users clearly had no sense of this as part of the Latin word hoard, but "borrowed" the word from Anglo-French over and over again, producing a different form almost every time. The variation in sound and spelling reflects the variety of Anglo-French; the variation in gender and declension shows that the word has no stable place in Latin; but in spite of thirty or so forms, these represent a single lemma. Here the number of examples required in a dictionary is out of all proportion to the semantic simplicity of the word.

In England ad hoc borrowing of this kind was extremely common in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Until the late thirteenth century words most often come from French, thereafter from Middle English, though the Middle English source may itself have been borrowed from French. By the end of the fourteenth century, it was acceptable simply to use the vernacular word in a Latin context with hardly a gesture towards the provision of a Latin termination. Instead of writing the word in full, it was common to write the English word, ending with a mark of suspension: [CD33], s.v. *groundsella,* **1388** *cum pinnacione grunsill' diuersarum domorum,* **1389** *pro iij peciis meremii emptis pro gronnesellis pro reparacione domus.* The word here, Middle English *groundsille, gronsel,* "groundsel," has no recognizable Latin termination; even *gronnesellis* could be a simple English plural in *-is* rather than a Latin ablative. In a case such as this, it is open to doubt whether the word should be treated as latinized at all, though with the more common examples some users may have provided a termination while others have not. So, for example: **1390** *in stipendio carpen<tan>cium grunsullam;* one example has led to the treatment of the word as a Latin *a*-stem in the dictionary. It is extremely difficult in cases such as *garillum* or *groundsella* to decide on the spelling of the lemma in the dictionary.

Words entering Medieval Latin in this way, raising questions about their status and form in the language, are for the most part relatively straightforward from the semantic point of view. Most of the words with a really wide range of meanings had been part of the language since the classical period, though they may have branched out in different directions over the centuries. There are some words, such as prepositions or the very common verbs, that will always be difficult to treat in a dictionary, and for which the entries will often be difficult to use. The extreme example in modern English is the verb "to set," which runs to 154 numbered senses in the *Oxford English Dictionary* [BF32] (and the last of these, with the adverb "up," has more than fifty subdivisions). In Medieval Latin *ad* and *de,* for example, or *esse, facere, habere,* not only have the complexity of the classical words but have developed many new senses or uses. Other words may ramify in sense, sometimes without clear semantic connections, and it is advisable to become familiar with how a large entry may be handled in a historical dictionary. I have already mentioned Classical Latin *flos;* other words with many senses in Medieval Latin are CL *gratia,* LL *grossus,* CL *hora.* Some words may demand elaborate treatment even where their semantic range is not great: CL *homo,* for example, or especially ML *homagium,* where most of the extensive entry is devoted to illustrating the contexts in medieval society where homage was required.

Wherever the evidence allows, the makers of dictionaries will choose examples that make clear the meaning of a word in its context, that show its grammatical construction, and, in a good medieval dictionary, that place the word in its historical as well as linguistic context. Reading the quotations is an essential part of making full

use of a dictionary, and it is often helpful to go to the dictionary principally for the examples of a familiar word. The dictionary entry for *horologium,* for example, not only illustrates the technological variety of medieval clocks but leads the user to many sources to find fuller information. Consulting the appropriate entries in a dictionary can open up innumerable lines of inquiry.

No amount of knowledge of the foundations and methods of the available dictionaries can lead to the right results unless the user also has sound linguistic judgment. There are various perils. One is to assume that the text may be wrong. Another is to presume that the dictionary has overlooked some meaning or usage. And the third, and most widespread, is to use the dictionary to prop up a tendentious reading of the text. It is true that there are errors in the transmission of texts, some of them no more than errors of transcription or proofreading in the printed editions, and there are also errors even in the best dictionaries. But it requires good judgment to pinpoint such mistakes, and one should not be hasty in making these assumptions. One should also beware not to form an opinion as to what an obscure passage means without reference to *all* the information in the dictionary for a particular word. The fact that one sense offered may suit a desired interpretation does not mean it is the appropriate sense: a usage attested only in the thirteenth century and later cannot safely be applied to a tenth-century text, for example, and one confined to agricultural accounts is unlikely to fit a theological treatise. And one must always resist any temptation to knock the dictionary senses into the sense one would like. Inappropriate attestations and near-misses in sense do not help elucidate a text. One must acquire an understanding of how Latin works, backed up by the evidence of the dictionaries, and not try to force a passage into a sense that goes against the linguistic grain. Only with confidence in such a policy does it become safe to begin identifying the errors of others. Far more people are misled by wishful thinking than by blunders in their texts and dictionaries.

## *Select Bibliography*

### Glossaries, Dictionaries, and Lexical Aids

#### *(a)—*
#### *Medieval and Early Modern Works*

A.S. Napier, ed., *Old English Glosses, Chiefly Unpublished* (1900, r1989): prints a number of batch glosses **[CD1].**

L.W. Daly, *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (1967) **[CD2].**

R.T. Oliphant, ed., *The Harley Latin-Old English Glossary* (1966) **[CD3].**

Papias, *Elementarium doctrinae rudimentum* (c. 1040–53) (Milan 1476; Venice 1485, 1491, and 1496; r1966); a new ed. was begun by V. De Angelis, *A* fasc. 1–3 (1977–80) **[CD4].**

Osbern Pinnock of Gloucester, *Panormia siue Liber deriuationum* (c. 1150–70), ed. A. Mai: *Thesaurus novus latinitatis, sive Lexicon vetus e membranis nunc primum erutum,* Classici auctores e Vaticanis codicibus editi 8 (1836); Osbern's preface to Hamelin is printed and the notes of John of Bath discussed by R.W. Hunt, "The Lost Preface to the *Liber deriuationum* of Osbern of Gloucester," in *Mediaeval and Re-*

*naissance Studies* 4 (1958) 267–82. A new ed. by F. Bertini and others is in preparation **[CD5].** R. Sharpe, "London, British Library, MS Royal 15 C. XI and Osbern of Gloucester's Use of Plautus," in *Scriptorium* 45 (1991) 93–98, provides a test of Osbern's efficiency at excerpting this source **[CD6].**

Hugutio of Pisa, *Magnae deriuationes* (c. 1190), has never been printed; the manuscripts are surveyed by A. Marigo, *I codici manoscritti delle Deriuationes di Uguccione Pisano* (1936) **[CD7].** See also C. Riessner, *Die "Magnae derivationes" des Uguccione da Pisa und ihre Bedeutung für die romanische Philologie* (1965) **[CD8].**

John of Genoa, *Catholicon* (1286) (Mainz 1460, r1971); a new ed. by A. Della Casa is in preparation **[CD9].**

William Brito, *Expositiones vocabulorum Biblie* (c. 1250–70), ed. L.W. and B.A. Daly, 2 vols. (1975) **[CD10].**

T. Hunt, *TLLTCE:* provides basic texts of the *De utensilibus* of Adam of Balsham (Adam of Petit Pont) (V1:172–76), the *De nominibus utensilium* of Alexander Neckam (V1:181–90; N.B.: the last page of text was omitted from the printed book and must be obtained as an erratum slip from the publisher), and the *Dictionarius* of John of Garland (V1:196–203); the vernacular glosses are printed in V2, and there are word indexes in V3. The first volume lays the foundations for a study of these texts in their wider context **[CD11].**

T. Wright and R.P. Wülcker, *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies,* 2 vols., 2nd ed. (1884) **[CD12].**

T. Blount, *Nomo-Lexicon: A Law-Dictionary* (London 1670, r1970), was meant as a guide to the special terminology of the common law, much of it belonging to the twelfth to fourteenth centuries **[CD13];** H. Spelman, *Glossarium Archaiologicum* (London 1664; 3rd ed., London 1687), was expressly designed to help the student of medieval institutions and customs **[CD14].**

C. Du Fresne, Sieur Du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae latinitatis,* 3 vols. (Paris 1678); supp. (Lyon 1688); new extended ed., 6 vols. (Paris 1733–36), repr. several times; P. Carpentier's supp., 4 vols. (Paris 1766); new ed. by G.A.L. Henschel, 7 vols. (Paris 1840–50), repr. by L. Favre in 10 vols. (Niort 1883–87, with subsequent reprintings); addenda and corrigenda by various compilers: see, e.g., *ALMA* 1 (1924) 223–31; 2 (1925) 15–29, 51–52; 3 (1927) 12–21; 22 (1951–52) 89–156; *L'antiquité classique* 10 (1941) 95–113; 11 (1942) 67–85 **[CD15].** For a biography of Du Cange, a critical assessment of his *Glossarium,* and an account of its publication history, supps., etc., see the articles by M. Esposito and H. Leclercq: "Du Cange," in *DACL* 4.2:1654–60; "Latin. 1. Le *Glossarium,*" in *DACL* 8.1:1422–52 **[CD16].**

*(b)—*
### Modern Latin Dictionaries

*1—*
*Classical, Late, and Medieval Latin*

The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* [*TLL*] (Munich 1899– ) is by far the most comprehensive dictionary of Classical and Late Latin, being based on an exhaustive excerpting of classical texts and a thorough use of authors down to the end of the sixth century; *A–M* (1900–66), *O–*(1968–81); work now proceeding on *P.* It is a monoglot dictionary, with definitions and editorial comments in Latin; its systematic classification is easy to follow once understood, but it is confusing to the reader who expects a historical-semantic approach. Preparation of a computerized version of the *TLL* is under way at the University of California at Irvine **[CD17].**